

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

Pagination is as follows: [2], [1079]-2048, [i]-lxiii p.

Pages 1392 & 1660 are incorrectly numbered pages 393 & 660.

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

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
BY
T. J. RICHARDSON.

FIRST SESSION—FOURTH PARLIAMENT.

42° VICTORIÆ, 1879.

VOL. VII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL, 1879, TO THE
FIFTEENTH DAY OF MAY, 1879.

SECOND VOLUME OF THE SESSION



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

1879.

ERRATA VOL. VII.

—:—

Page 1728, 2nd col., line 23, for

“ 192 Intercolonial Railway..... \$5,000,000 00 ”

read

“ 192 Intercolonial Railway..... \$1,500,000 00 ”

Page 1981, 2nd col., for paragraph commencing line 13, *substitute* :

“ MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) moved in amendment, that all after the word ‘that’ in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—‘The said matter be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, with instructions to enquire into the facts alleged, investigate precedents, and report to this House thereon.’”

Page 1982, 1st col., after line 6, *insert* :

“ Amendment (Mr. Cameron, North Victoria), with leave of the House, *withdrawn*. ”

ADDENDA VOL. VII.

—:—

Page 1354, 2nd col., after the division, add the following :—

“ MR. VALLÉE said that the second motion contained in its first part the item of wheat, on which he had previously voted. He maintained his first vote on that article, but he desired to express his dissent in reference to the other two items mentioned in the motion. That was the reason why he had voted against the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

“ MR. TULLIER said he was in the same position as the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée) in regard to this motion. He maintained his vote in reference to wheat; but, as he was obliged to vote on the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), he had voted against it, in order to express his dissent in reference to the two items which were mentioned beside that of wheat.”

Page 1992, 2nd col., after “After recess,” add the following :—

“ On the Orders of the Day being called,

“ MR. CONNELL stated that he had received several telegrams and letters, stating that there was considerable dissatisfaction in the county he had the honour to represent, in consequence of steamers being unable to pass the Woodstock Railway Bridge, on account of insufficient draw, and the draw-bridge not being in the proper place. He again directed the attention of the Government to it, and trusted it would receive their earliest attention.”

THE DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA

IN THE

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

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

SECOND VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 8th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SEPARATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA FROM THE DOMINION.

PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE A BILL.

MR. DECOSMOS: I move for leave to introduce a Bill, entitled an Act to provide for the peaceful separation of British Columbia, seconded by any gentleman opposite who thinks proper to second it.

MR. SPEAKER: Who seconds the motion?

MR. DECOSMOS: The hon. member for Sunbury?

MR. BURPEE (Sunbury): No.

The motion was not seconded.

MR. DECOSMOS said he was glad to find that certain hon. gentlemen who were condemning British Columbia from hour to hour on the floor of this House as an incubus, an excrescence; those who threw insolent epithets at the Province of British Columbia—

MR. MACKENZIE said there was nothing before the House.

MR. SPEAKER called the hon. gentleman to order.

MR. DECOSMOS said he thought he had as much right—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. DECOSMOS said he hoped the House, or the Speaker, would not ask him to take his seat, because, before the day was out, the occasion might arise when

he would insist on that indulgence which was granted to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) moved the adjournment of the House.

MR. DECOSMOS said he had heard from time to time, in this House, the grossest insults that had ever been offered to any people, cast on the people of British Columbia. That Province had been called an excrescence, an incubus, had been charged with endeavouring to gain something from this Dominion without any equivalent. He moved this resolution, and he asked those hon. gentlemen, who said they wished to get rid of the Province, to second the motion. Not a single hon. member, from the Premier, down even to the member for Sunbury, or the member for Charlotte, dared to second that motion.

MR. HOLTON said the hon. gentleman could not introduce a Bill, and claim a seconder on a motion to adjourn. It was utterly irregular.

MR. DECOSMOS said he merely wished to draw the attention of the House to the unfortunate position in which the Opposition stood; also, to the unfortunate position in which the Government stood. The people of British Columbia had as little faith in one side as they had in the other.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 74) Further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 75) To amend an Act for the more speedy trial, in certain cases, of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanours, in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Andrew Mercer Ontario Reformatory for females.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

ENGINEERS' REPORTS ON PACIFIC RAILWAY TENDERS.

REMARKS.

MR. TUPPER said, before the Orders of the Day were called, he would, with MR. DECOSMOS.

the permission of the House, say a word in reference to the application made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, for a report of the engineers on the tenders submitted to the House for the construction of the two sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway recently put under contract. The effect of making public those reports, which were, to a certain extent, confidential, would not be in the public interest; it would tend to prevent the Government receiving as full information as they otherwise would. It would render engineers more cautious in their statements, lest their reports might bring them into personal collision with men of prominent positions, such as contractors. He proposed to place these reports in the hands of the hon. the leader of the Opposition for his personal information, and he was sure the hon. gentleman would exercise a wise discretion in not making public reports of a character considered confidential by the parties who made them.

MR. HOLTON said he ventured to state, before his hon. friend replied, that it was not in his private or individual capacity he desired to be put in possession of these reports, but to be used on the floor of Parliament. He had the utmost confidence in his hon. friend, who was his chosen leader. There were matters passing between the front benches which might be considered confidential, but this was not one of those matters. It referred to an important administrative act of the Government, which must form a subject of discussion if it was to be communicated at all. Therefore, his hon. friend ought not to accept the reports on the terms offered. Every member had a right to this information if it was to be communicated at all, and it was for the Government to take the responsibility of withholding or supplying it.

MR. MACKENZIE said, when he asked for those papers, he ventured to draw a distinction between those parts which related to the standing, morally or otherwise, of the contractors, or anything of that kind, and those which bore upon the advisability of accepting one or other tender, apart from such considerations. He suggested, then, that the reports, so far as they were of an official

technical character, ought to be placed before the House. It would be a very inconvenient practice for any hon. member to accept documents which he could not use in debate. Rather than accept them under that condition, it would be better for him to discuss the matter as it appeared on the surface, without the engineers' reports.

MR. TUPPER said he thought it was in the public interest that such reports should not be considered public property, because that would tend to restrict the expression of opinion of engineers in relation to the capacity of contractors to fulfil their contracts, which, becoming public, would be likely to bring into collision public officers holding very important positions and contractors who might subsequently be discharging the duties of contractors under them, and would thus prejudice the public service. He (Mr. Tupper) would have no objection to take the hon. member for Chateaugay into his confidence, as well as his leader. He would be quite willing, indeed, to place all the reports of the Engineers on those tenders in the hands of the leader of the Opposition, with the statement that, if, on their perusal, in consultation with so leading a member of the House as the hon. member for Chateaugay, he thought it would be wise to lay them before the House, he (Mr. Tupper) would accept his judgment and do so.

MR. HOLTON said he did not want to be understood as affirming that those papers ought to be brought down in all cases, or in this particular case. He did not know anything of the character of the report, whether it would be proper to bring it down or not; but he did say, that, when papers were demanded, Ministers must, on their own responsibility, decide as to the propriety of producing them. But his principal object, on the spur of the moment, was to protest against private communication of public papers being made, as was done in this case by an hon. Minister to an hon. member. It might be quite true that his hon. friend was the leader of one side of the House, but, after all, he was here simply as the member for Lambton. He had no priority of claim to the public records over the mem-

ber for Chateaugay, or any others; and, therefore, he (Mr. Holton) had taken the earliest moment to protest, on principle, against the partial, secret, confidential communication to a member of the House of public measures. They would, perhaps, have occasion to debate the matters to which those reports referred, and ought not to have their hands tied in any way. Therefore, he desired simply to proclaim what he conceived to be the true doctrine with regard to the matter. Hon. gentlemen must decide on their own responsibility what papers they would bring down.

MR. TUPPER said he ought to have added that, in acting as he had done, he was only reciprocating a courtesy which he had on more than one occasion received from his predecessor in the Public Works Department. If his hon. friend from Chateaugay would throw his mind back to what took place a few evenings ago, he would remember that the leader of the Opposition stated, in reference to these papers, that he had on more than one occasion submitted to gentlemen opposite reports of a somewhat similar description, and information which he did not think it desirable to lay on the table of the House. He (Mr. Tupper) had only followed this precedent.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he thought that this matter was of too great importance to permit of its being disposed of by a conversation across the House between a Minister who made the proposition and the leader of the Opposition. He thought that, where millions were involved, and where, by the law of the land, this House was to pronounce upon the contracts entered into by the Department of Public Works, hon. members should, at least, have the opportunity of knowing what had been done; because, as he understood it, these contracts did not take effect until they and the reports of the Department were laid on the table of the House for a certain period. Therefore it seemed to him it was their right and their duty, as members of Parliament, as trustees for the people, to have all the information material to the formation of a judgment upon the propriety of the action of the

Government placed in their hands. With regard to the engineers, he had had a little experience in the Department himself, and could not call to mind any case in which their reports were confidential. He thought that the duty of the engineers was rather to state, from a professional point of view, the nature of the works to be undertaken, the number and regularity of the tenders, with such recommendations as might be thought desirable for the guidance of the Minister. If necessary, the engineers should report on the character of the contractors, whether they were fit and proper persons to be entrusted with a public work, whether or not they had previously acted dishonestly, or caused delays and embarrassment to the Government. Such communications could be kept separate, and treated as confidential. But, with regard to any other matter, the action of those public officers should surely be submitted to the review of Parliament. He could understand that it would be very unfair to those officers to submit their private and confidential reports to Parliament without their having been previously informed that such a course was to be adopted. But, he thought the practice of receiving and acting upon these private reports unfortunate, as tending to excite suspicion in the public mind with regard to the *bona fides* of Ministers. They all remembered that it was the practice of the hon. leader of the Opposition, when Minister of Public Works, and when challenged before the House, or the people, with reference to matters of administration in his Department, to fall back on his engineers, and content himself with the statement that they had made this or that recommendation. In his capacity as a public man, he (Mr. McDougall) had felt justified in arraigning that hon. gentleman for not having exercised his own discretion and judgment, for not having acted upon his own responsibility in matters involving such important consequences to the people. His hon. friend the present Minister of Public Works, on more than one platform had agreed with him (Mr. McDougall) in his condemnation of that objectionable practice. Now, he believed, without expressing any doubt, or lack of confidence in the honesty, ability or integrity of the Min-

MR. MACDOUGALL.

ister of Public Works, and his colleagues, that it would be to the advantage of the Government and greatly to the comfort of their friends, since certain matters had been challenged in the public press—since statements had been made as to the commission of acts wearing an appearance of irregularity or of divergence from the ordinary course—if all those transactions were made plain, and all the facts put before the House and the country. He assumed there had been nothing wrong; but was afraid, if the reports of the engineers were suppressed, if information due to Parliament and the country was withheld, if private conferences were held between the present and the late Minister of Public Works on such subjects—in view of the charges against that hon. gentleman—it might be suspected by some, that he desired to cover up his own misdeeds, when in office, by approving of similar transactions on the part of his successor. That suspicion might arise, and he did hope, with regard to those reports, that, if there was anything in them of a confidential character—any personal reflections, on the part of the engineers—those passages would be eliminated, and that the House would be permitted to see the portions dealing with the material facts of the case, in order that hon. members and the whole country might judge as to the propriety of the final determinations of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) was quite mistaken if he meant that he (Mr. Mackenzie) initiated any new practice when Minister of Public Works. He initiated no new practice whatever. But he could recollect some few reports in respect to particular persons, some confidential remarks as to the moral standing of tenderers for public work, which he did not think it desirable to make public. But he had no recollection of any engineers' reports or papers on public works, called for, having been refused. The hon. gentleman said he had arraigned him for desiring to shelter himself behind engineers' reports. He was mistaken, as he (Mr. Mackenzie) had always assumed the full responsibility of his transactions; but he had stated that his course in certain matters was

sustained by the reports of the engineers, and that, if the engineer had approved of any transaction, it was *prima facie* evidence that it was a proper one. With regard to the other point the hon gentleman had referred to, namely, that all the documents ought to be before the House, he had already stated that everything that referred to the giving out of contracts—of a technical and public character—everything except the moral or personal reasons why any persons had been passed over—should be laid before the House. He thought it was fair that the Minister of Public Works should, on his own responsibility, leave out such portions as were strictly confidential, given to him as a Minister, and bring down the remainder. He recollected well, on certain disputed occasions, such as that of the award of the contract for Section 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Georgian Bay contract, reports of the engineers were brought down, with the documents embodied in them, and published at once, the moment they were called for. There was no change of practice made while he (Mr. Mackenzie) was head of the Public Works Department. He had felt it essentially a part of his duty, as the political head of a Department, to see that the officers charged with the engineering and business responsibility of such contracts were in accord with the political head, and he in accord with them. He had no recollection of a single contract having been given out during his term, in which everything concerned in those contracts was not concurred in by the deputy head and engineers of the Department.

• MR. TUPPER said that the moment he should have adopted the course suggested by the leader of the Opposition, he would have exposed himself to the charge of garbling the reports of the engineers, and he did not intend to expose himself to any such suspicion. The hon. member for Halton said that suspicion existed with regard to his (Mr. Tupper's) course in this matter. He had never heard any hon. gentleman say so, and would be glad to have the grounds of any such suspicion stated to the House. He would not have it said that he had refused to show engineers'

reports to hon. gentlemen opposite who were desirous of seeing them. He had stated already his reasons for treating such reports as private and confidential, and the hon. member for Halton, who had been a Minister himself, ought to have known that they were sufficient. He (Mr. Tupper) had stated that it was desirable that the Government of the day should have the full benefit of the knowledge and opinions of the engineers in relation to all parties tendering; that, if the question was simply one of amount, the Government, with all the figures before them, would not want the engineers' reports; but, if they had from them reports dealing with the professional character and capacity—not the moral character—of the tenderers, it would not be judicious to make them public. Such reports were private and personal, and the engineers would, if they knew they were to be published, be more cautious in their statements. But, after what had fallen from the hon. member for Halton on this case, he (Mr. Tupper) would lay all the papers on the table, and allow the hon. gentleman to see whether he, or any other hon. member, could find any grounds for the imputation, or suspicion, in relation to this matter, which he had, for the first time, mentioned. He would at once lay on the table all the reports in relation to the contracts recently submitted.

VICE-CHANCELLOR BLAKE.

REMARKS.

MR. COSTIGAN said, before the Orders of the Day were called, he would like to ask the Minister of Justice if his attention had been called to a certain serious complaint that had been made through the public journals against a very high official of the country. He alluded to certain expressions used by Vice-Chancellor Blake on certain occasions, which seemed to have given dissatisfaction in the country. His attention might already have been called to the fact that this hon. gentleman was charged with using language unwise and objectionable, holding the position he did. He (Mr. Costigan) did not pretend the hon. gentleman did use this language; but he was desirous of impressing the

House with the importance of ascertaining whether he did really use the language attributed to him. Hon. gentlemen might, perhaps, be disposed to blame him for introducing this matter into the House, but he could point to a precedent from the English House of Commons. Sometime ago in England, a man named Johnson, holding office under the Imperial Government, made use on some public occasion of expressions which were calculated to give serious offence to a portion of the people of that country, and Mr. Sullivan, a member of the House of Commons, called the attention of the House to the fact that an official, in the pay of the Government, had abused his position, and asked the Government if any notice had been taken of it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said :

"As the House was aware, Mr. Johnston was a salaried official of the Crown, as a Commissioner of the Fishery Department, but Mr. Johnson had only recently been taken into the permanent Civil Service, and, perhaps, was not aware how objectionable it was for him to use the language attributed to him, holding the position he does. His right hon. friend the Chief Secretary had given Mr. Johnson a caution, which would probably be sufficient."

He thought hon. gentlemen would be satisfied that he was not out of place in rising on this occasion. The English Government had characterised Mr. Johnston's language as objectionable, and he thought the language of the hon. Judge he alluded to was still more objectionable. We had, in this country, all to look to our Judges with confidence, respect, and esteem. We wanted them to be above even the prejudices that sometimes influenced men belonging to different political parties, and we all wanted to feel that they were qualified and willing to dispense justice in an even-handed manner. When any Judge, no matter from what part of the country, gave evidence of what people believed to be a want of liberality in his public expressions, that was calculated to shake the confidence in such Judge of a portion of the people of this country who had to look for justice at his hands. He had no notion to make in reference to this matter. He felt confident, if the matter had not already been brought before the hon. the Minister of Justice, that that hon. gentleman would now deal with it

MR. COSTIGAN.

in such manner as he should deem it his duty to do. He (Mr. Costigan) now left the matter entirely in his hands, having performed what he deemed his duty to the public. He would just quote the exact words which the hon. Judge was reported as using. Several charges had been made against him in the newspapers, but he would refer to only one, in which he was stated to have said, at a meeting in Toronto of the Episcopalian Synod :

"He sincerely trusted that former differences ceasing to exist, they should become the pattern Diocese, and shoulder to shoulder fight the battles of the Church, and, with other Protestant denominations, go strongly against Popery and infidelity."

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) : I have only one observation to make, in reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., relating to a very high official in this country, Vice-Chancellor Blake. I have received a letter from a gentleman, calling my attention to some such observations, stated to have been made by that high dignitary, which I am ready to bring down, should any hon. member of the House require it. It was addressed to myself by, I think, a gentleman named Boyle. I have just another observation to make. I think my hon. friend will see that the high dignitary of whom he has just spoken, stands in a very different position from that of the official to whom he referred, Mr. Johnston. Vice-Chancellor Blake is a Judge of one of the Superior Courts of this country. He holds his position for life, or during good behaviour, and the Constitution provides that the only mode of impeaching or correcting the conduct of a Judge of the Superior Courts, is by an address of the two Houses of Parliament. It would be unbecoming and improper for me to say more.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree to resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th), and Mr. Mackenzie's motion in amendment thereto (April 4th).

MR. CARON said, after the protracted debate already had on the tariff, not too long, however, considering the importance of the subject under discussion, he felt more than ordinary hesitation in asking the attention of the House to the few remarks he deemed it his duty to make. He felt, moreover, especially unfortunate in following so many hon. gentlemen who had discussed this question with so much ability and eloquence. His excuse for taking up the time of the House now was that, owing to the gravity of the question under debate, he considered it the duty of every member to place upon record his views, so that his constituents might know if he had faithfully looked after the interests confided to him. At the outset, he must say, that this tariff should be framed, not upon the taking into consideration of the interests of one Province alone, but it should be framed on a consideration of the interests of the whole Dominion, and of all the political institutions of this country. Who ignored what a difficult task it had been for the statesmen of Canada to organise, under different political circumstances, this great Confederation of ours? It was a difficult task, because various interests had to be reconciled, and then, as to-day, it became necessary to consider the various interests of the several Provinces which were coming into the Confederation. If Confederation, so far, had been a success; if the statesmen of Canada, belonging to both sides of politics, had been able to organise and work successfully that great scheme, it was due, in a great measure, to the concessions which were mutually made by the different Provinces, concessions without which it would have been impossible to carry out Confederation. He hesitated not to say that the difficulties which Canadian statesmen had to meet to-day in preparing this tariff were very nearly as great, if not as great, as those just referred to. To-day, like twelve years ago, it was necessary to harmonise all the various interests of the several Provinces, and he believed that, if a proper spirit of concession were shown by the representatives of the various sections of the Dominion in discussing the tariff, it would have a great success in the country, taken as a whole. This trade question was agitated long before

the hon. the Finance Minister brought down his Budget speech. After a fair trial of the late system of Free-trade, the people had decided to introduce the Protective system, and, at the same time, they condemned the policy of the late Government. That policy had not produced the effects expected from it, and it was only after having given it a fair trial for many years that at last the people of Canada determined upon introducing a new policy, and this policy had been approved by the greatest majority that any political party had ever obtained in this country. This brought him to refer to the financial system of the late Government. Gentlemen now occupying the Opposition side of the House, as far back as 1872, decided that Protection should be introduced into Canada, and that without Protection Canada could not prosper. He saw sitting opposite several of his hon. friends with whom he differed in politics—with whom he had fought more than one political battle; but with whom, nevertheless, he was happy to believe friendly sentiments existed outside of politics. He remembered when his hon. friend the late Minister of Inland Revenue was addressing a public meeting in the city of Quebec on political matters, when he explained, with his usual eloquence, the platform of the *Parti National*, which he and others were organising. On that occasion the hon. gentleman laid it down as one of the planks of his party that this country should adopt a Protective policy. He remembered well, on another occasion, when that hon. gentleman delivered one of his most eloquent speeches in the Quebec Parliament, it was in defence of the great principle of Protection. He (Mr. Caron) might be mistaken, but he believed one of the principal reasons those hon. gentlemen had lost the favour of the people was, that they had abandoned the Protection plank of their platform. It was to be remembered, however, that when those hon. gentlemen advocated that policy they were not in a position to carry it into effect. They were a small minority in the Province of Quebec. But if there was one thing more than another which shook the confidence of the people in them, it was the fact that, when they came to occupy the Treasury benches, instead of being true to their policy, in-

stead of being true to the pledges they had made, they reverted to the policy of Free-trade. As a Conservative, he was proud to congratulate his party upon having been true to their principles, and carried out faithfully the promises which they had made to the people on the hustings. The Conservative party had been true to the pledges it had made to the people in the cold shades of Opposition, and he was sure that nothing was more calculated to popularise the Conservative party than this Protective policy. The Government, in framing this policy, had carefully considered the different interests which it affected, and the returns from the different Provinces showed that the policy was acceptable to them. Since the inauguration of this policy, several industries which had been closed for many years, had been again set in operation. A few days ago he received letters from Montreal, informing him that new factories were about to be opened, thanks to the new policy. Messrs. Redpaths' refinery had already been opened. So little importance did the late Minister of Finance attach to that industry, that he never attempted, by his policy, to give it any encouragement. Instead of giving it encouragement, he drove it from Canada and transferred it to the Americans, who were coming into Canada and carrying away money which, under a proper financial policy, should have been expended amongst our own people. Among the new industries which were being started, he might mention a rumour in the city of Quebec that a very important tweed factory was likely to be established. He knew his hon. friend the late Minister of Inland Revenue might have his doubts about this policy. But that hon. gentleman, when he was elected in Quebec East, told the people that he would do all he could to help the ship-building interest, but when he came up to Ottawa, shortly afterwards, no doubt the strong Free-trade views of the hon. the late Minister of Finance prevented him from carrying out those pledges.

MR. LAURIER asked if the ship-building interest would not be fostered by the opening of Free-trade with France.

MR. CARON.

MR. CARON said he did not propose to discuss that point, but that point could fully be carried by a change of tariff, with reference to French wines imported here. What he asked was what the hon. gentleman had done to foster that industry. He remembered very well the brilliant promises the hon. gentleman had made, but he did not remember that these promises were ever carried out.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH: Are they being carried out now?

MR. CARON said, in speaking of this subject, he believed that just on the eve of the election some letters passed between the hon. member for Lambton, and the French consul in Quebec.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was eight months before the election.

MR. CARON: That is not very long before the election.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not on the eve of the election.

MR. CARON: If I remember aright, then, the letters may have been written eight months before the elections, but they were published almost immediately before the election in our papers. In fact, a few days before.

MR. MACKENZIE: They were published at the time.

MR. CARON: The hon. member for Lambton may have forgotten about the matter, as he generally does about every matter having reference to Quebec interests.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not forget much.

MR. CARON said he had no doubt the hon. gentleman might have forgotten the exact date at which he wrote those letters. He (Mr. Caron) believed that the object of Protection was to promote the interest of the different classes of the community. He did not consider that the agriculturists of the Dominion could complain of the tariff. Speaking more particularly in the interest of the farmers of the Province of Quebec, he found, looking over the

imports and exports, that last year the Americans introduced into this country 1,697,700 bushels of oats, amounting in value to \$610,491. These oats came from the United States, and the result was that the value of oats was considerably reduced, very much to the detriment of the farmers of the Province of Quebec. During the same period, we exported to England and other countries 2,970,284 bushels of oats, which showed we were producing more oats than we consumed. It was impossible for us to compete against this foreign produce which was coming into our markets without we had the same privilege of sending our surplus productions on the same conditions into the United States. It seemed to him that the present Government, in imposing this duty, had in view the agricultural interest of this country, and they could not be too highly eulogised for having protected this important branch of our national prosperity. As he viewed it, the result of the present tariff would be to increase the production of oats in Lower Canada, and the Province of Quebec was a Province in which oats could be produced on a very large scale. Last year we imported from the Americans very nearly 8,000,000 bushels of Indian corn, and, if he understood the question at all, he believed that this Indian corn was used to a very great extent for distilling purposes, and could be very well replaced by Canadian oats. The effect of the tariff would also be to induce our agriculturists to give more attention to the production of Indian corn. There was absolutely nothing to prevent us in Canada from producing Indian corn, except the policy which had so long prevailed in Canada. He considered that, under this tariff, not only the farmers of the Province of Quebec, but of the whole Dominion, would be stimulated to increase their agricultural productions, and more particularly the production of Indian corn. What he complained of was that, under the old tariff, the Americans had absolute control of our markets, without paying any duty. It was impossible to read the late Canadian tariff, and the United States tariff, without coming to the conclusion that the policy of the United States tended to make the Dominion a slaugh-

ter market for their goods, and to deprive Canada of a reciprocity of tariff with them. As an instance of the absence of reciprocity, he would state that, last year, we exported to the United States 6,243,033 bushels of barley, on which we paid a duty of 15c. a bushel. It seemed to him that, if the Americans could collect 15c. a bushel on barley, it could hardly be considered an advantage to Canada to allow American produce to come into Canada without imposing any duty whatever. No one could come to any other conclusion but that the American tariff was unjust as far as Canada was concerned; that our late tariff was simply ridiculous in admitting all these articles of commerce without any reciprocity of tariff. Not only was that the fact, but the late Administration, for a time, considered it was necessary to change the tariff which existed in this country. He remembered very well when the Hon. Mr. Brown went to the United States for the purpose of negotiating a reciprocity treaty. In his speech to the Senate (22nd February, 1875), after alluding to the way in which the American tariff would affect Canadian agricultural interests, he stated:

"And now let us place in contrast with this the great agricultural interest, with its half million of hardy workers—which has no Protection—which feeds the whole people, and contributes, besides, annually to the foreign exports of the Dominion, commodities to the value of thirty-four millions of dollars."

He thereby admitted that, under the system which the hon. gentleman considered should exist in Canada, their agricultural interests were ignored, and that it had become necessary to protect those interests against American competition; and, therefore, he and his political friends considered that the position of Canada was such that they had to look somewhere to improve the relations which existed between the United States and Canada, as far as the Dominion was concerned. He believed that the present Government, in adopting their present Protective policy, were carrying out these very views, which struck the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite when in power as proper, and which, to-day, had become an absolute necessity, if Canada wished to keep within this country those hard-working families, those young

men, hard-working farmers, to whom the Hon. Mr. Brown referred, and who had been compelled, under the old system, to leave the country and settle in the neighbouring Republic, under whose financial system they found that protection which had been refused to them in Canada, for their products, and their skilled labour. He was free to admit that, if he looked to the interests of the Province of Quebec solely, he would certainly have preferred that a duty had not been imposed on flour and wheat; but he considered it would be a very narrow-minded policy for any Government to frame in a country like this, a financial policy, which would not be one of mutual concessions, of give and take, so far as the different Provinces were concerned; so that the present tariff ought to be one which would be acceptable to the whole Dominion. He considered that this Protection which had been accorded to agricultural products would have one very beneficial effect, as far as the Province of Quebec was concerned. They had, as hon. gentlemen knew, north of Quebec, the great valley of the Lake of St. John, than which—and he could state it without fear of contradiction—there was no better wheat-producing district in the Dominion of Canada. Last year, without any railway communication, without advantages possessed by other portions of the Province, some 10,000 bushels of the best wheat ever known in Canada was taken out of that valley, and, since the introduction of the new tariff, he knew that a number of people who had lived in the older parishes in the different counties round Quebec were going to settle in that valley.

Some HON. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

MR. CARON said the hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear;" but he knew some 40 or 50 families who had left their old homes in his county and elsewhere, and gone to the valley of the Lake of St. John. This district was considered of so much importance that some of the wealthier capitalists in the city of Quebec, aided by municipal subsidies, and also by one granted by the Local Government of Quebec, were now trying, and would succeed, to build a railway

MR. CARON.

between that valley and St. John, a distance of 150 miles, which would open up to the Quebec market one of the richest wheat growing districts in the Dominion, and give Quebec a valuable back country. That was an advantage which hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec could not overlook, and which, certainly, must be taken into consideration. In favouring a policy like the present one, it was necessary to take the future into consideration, and construct a tariff which would foster every branch of industry, as far as was practicable, and give that Protection to commercial interests which would render this country hereafter rich and prosperous. The valley of the Lake of St. John, as was well known, was not only considered to be one of the richest agricultural districts in the Province, but it was destined to become the home of the half million of people who, for several years past, had been leaving the country and going to the United States. If this railway could be built, as he hoped it would, and he hoped the Government of the day would see their way clear to help the road, the district referred to would contribute its full share to the wealth and prosperity of the country. Besides this Protection, which he considered the policy of the hon. the Finance Minister would give to agriculturists, he was of opinion that Protection had also been extended to the different interests which they must take into consideration, and which certainly contributed so largely to the welfare of a people. If this tariff was destined, as he believed it was, to produce these happy results, was it not a policy which should be acceptable to the whole of the people of Canada? In Quebec they had a ship-building industry, and they had large and important factories: such as cabinet factories, carriage factories, rope-walks, which required to be fostered, which they certainly were not under the system which prevailed when the late Government were in power. Last year alone, they imported \$399,794 worth of furniture; also, \$85,634 worth of carriages. Whilst at the time they had in Quebec alone—of course, he spoke of the locality which he was most acquainted with—they had a large cabinet manufactory, in which had been invested a very

large amount of Canadian capital, and which had been practically closed under the late fiscal policy. Some eight or ten years ago this factory gave employment to some two or three hundred people; but immediately after the late tariff was brought into operation, they had, in the newspapers of the day, published in Quebec, notices of auction sales of manufactured goods from the United States, actually underselling furniture that could be manufactured in Quebec by Canadian hands and with Canadian capital. He could very readily understand how it was possible for American goods to come into Canada, and undersell Canadian home-manufactured goods. It was easy to understand that the Americans, with a population of 40,000,000, producing more than sufficient for themselves, were able to send their surplus stocks into Canada, and undersell Canadians, thus keeping their factories going without reducing their working staff, and, in that way, controlling our markets as well as their own. The result would have been, if this system had continued, the closing of our factories; and, when once this had been achieved, then the Americans would sell Canada their goods at their own prices, and destroy for ever our industries. Considering this branch of industry alone, he believed this tariff would have a very good effect as far as the Province of Quebec was concerned. Under this tariff, he was confident they would prevent Americans from coming into this country, underselling our own manufactured goods, and closing our factories, and that it would result in keeping in the cities of this Dominion our labourers, mechanics, artisans, who, wherever they went, had always been considered the best workmen that could be found in any country. Would it be possible, if it were not for the fault of the fiscal system of the country, that these hardy sons of Canada would go out of Canada merely for the love of living under a different flag? No; the reason the sons of Canada left their native country and their homes was because it was impossible to obtain the labour necessary to enable them to bring up their families respectably. And, in this connection, it was an interesting fact to note that these emigrants

immediately sought a country where a strong Protective tariff existed. There was another branch of industry upon which the new tariff would have a beneficial effect. He referred to the imposition of 20 per cent. on Roman cement. They had in Quebec a cement factory which for years had been struggling against very great difficulties for existence, but it had succeeded in holding its own, and had taken a first prize at the Philadelphia Exhibition. The duty imposed on this cement would enable this factory, within a reasonable time, to become prosperous, and he hoped the Government would show their Protective views in preventing imported cement from being used on their public works. It was all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite and the Liberal Press of the country to raise the cry that this tariff would increase taxation; but for years they had been rolling up deficit after deficit, and how would it be possible to make up for these deficits and prevent a recurrence in future, excepting by changing the fiscal policy under which these enormous deficits had accumulated, and adopting such a one as that now before them, which he had no doubt would give that stimulus to our industries, and would give us that prosperity which the country so much needed? Had the hon. gentlemen remained in power, they would have gone on for years imposing duties, without any predetermined system, to make up these deficits. They would no doubt have increased the duties on two or three articles, but they would not have established a complete system that the country could understand. The people of Canada now, at least, could under the system submitted by the present Government. The Liberal Press got up a cry about our people paying more than they did before for certain articles. Upon that point he would quote the utterance of an hon. gentleman who belonged to the opposite side in politics. He would quote an extract from the letter of Mr. Joly in reply to some questions which had been submitted to him by a Committee of this House upon this most important question. This extract read as follows:—

“ Q.—Is it in the interest of the Dominion that we should continue to admit American produce free, while Canadian produce exported

over the border has so heavy a tax levied on it?

"A.—No; it is against the interest of Canada! I humbly think we should not admit anything free of duty, except the raw material required for our manufactures.

"Q.—What effect has free admission of Indian corn on price of coarse grains, in your section of the country?

"A.—We are not much affected in our part of the country, because, unfortunately, we do not produce much more than what is required to supply our own wants; but it appears to me that wherever the farmer produces more than he requires for his own use, and has a surplus for sale, he must suffer by the competition. It is true the purchasers, among whom the manufacturers and the workmen ought to count, for a very large proportion may buy a little cheaper than the farmer, but, as a natural consequence, they will have to sell their goods cheaper to the farmer, whose purchasing powers are diminished. It is not by cheapening everything we can hope to attain national wealth. The dearer we pay the better for us, provided our paying power keeps pace with the increase of price. Ask a workman which of the two he prefers, flour at \$4.50 a barrel and no work, or flour at \$6 and plenty of work. Farming and industry are a strong team when they are driven together. Divide them and you have a one-horse concern, or rather two that will not do anything like the work of a good strong double team.

"Q.—Does the free importation of American flour, without reciprocity, put you at a disadvantage, as compared with American competitors; and if so, state reasons?

"A.—I think those who have grain for sale must feel it seriously."

This indicated perfectly what the hon. gentlemen and their friends considered the true policy, which ought to be introduced, and which was similar to the one proposed by this Government. He must also refer to another important subject, the iron interest, which would be fostered under this tariff. It was impossible to deny that this country possessed mines of great wealth. We had, for instance, not far from Quebec, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, the great iron mine of St. Aubain. Upon that mine an English company had expended one million of dollars already. The money for the time being was a complete loss, as it was impossible to compete against the imported iron from the States, and the mine was therefore closed. The iron obtained from it was admitted to be fully equal to the best Swedish iron. Under this tariff, this important industry would be developed, and with that development there was nothing to prevent us hereafter from building our own iron ships, making

MR. CARON.

our rails, bridges, and every article of iron which was now imported. It was difficult to understand how this industry had been so long neglected, especially when it was seen that under the Protective tariff of the United States the Americans had been able to produce iron, not only to supply their own market, but to compete against English iron in the English market. There could be no doubt whatever that the same result would be obtained here under this policy. In 1873, the United States imported from England £4,897,208 sterling of iron, while, in 1878, they reduced their importations to £434,929, making a diminution of £4,000,000 in the period between 1873 and 1878, and, if hon. members referred to the *Iron-monger*, they would see that that well-informed paper state that, so far as could be judged from existing conditions, the loss to England on the American market for iron and steel seemed to be permanent. It appeared to him that a tariff which could foster that great industry in Canada, which could lead to establishing in our midst hereafter the building of our iron ships, the making of railway-rails, could not fail to be acceptable to the people, and to advance their interest. When they looked into this tariff more closely, as a question outside of any party struggle, or political feeling, but as a question affecting the dearest interests of the country, they must all arrive at the conclusion that it was a tariff which would do more benefit to Canada than any that had been introduced. He, for one, was not only ready to give it his entire approbation, but he believed in his section of the country the people would find it was one which did not sacrifice their interests, but which would, on the contrary, be of great advantage to them. He was quite ready to take the responsibility of that measure before the people who had elected him for the purpose of supplying a Protective tariff—this was the issue before the country at the last election—and to represent their interests in Parliament. He arrived at this conclusion, not so much through his own researches as by the researches of men whose experience and knowledge of the business, commerce and trade of the country gave weight to their opinion,

and who were satisfied that the tariff was one which would work to the good of our country.

MR. KILVERT said it was not his intention to discuss general principles, because, at this stage of the debate, they had been fully discussed. He would be excused if he referred very briefly to the position which the constituency he had the honour to represent occupied in reference to this important question. They all knew that the city of Hamilton was a very important manufacturing centre, that the majority of its people belonged to the industrial class, and that for several years this question had been widely discussed in that locality. The gentlemen who represented this constituency in the last Parliament were advocates of the policy similar to the one now under consideration. They made speeches in this House, and elsewhere, advocating their principles; there were other gentlemen, also, belonging to the Reform party, who made speeches affirming the principles of Protection to our native industries. These gentlemen were skirmishers who sallied forth in advance of the great Reform party, and were instrumental in the way of moulding public opinion in regard to this question; but, when the stern interest of the party required that they should abandon those principles, they, at the very first sound of the bugle, were obliged to retire from these principles, and return to the ranks of the party to fight the battle of Free-trade. He supposed there were no people more astonished than the gentlemen on the Opposition benches, when they heard the disclosure made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. He could not help noticing the dismay which it caused in the ranks of that party. They came here prepared to condemn the Government for not carrying out their pledges, but now that they had to abandon that line of argument they made other objections, to some of which he intended to refer. The first one to which he would call the attention of the House, was the loyalty cry. They heard from gentlemen on the Opposition benches that this policy was disloyal to the interests of Great Britain. This must be a new discovery on their part, because they knew from the leaders of

that party and their leading organs throughout the country, that they were clamouring for the introduction of that policy ever since the elections, and, if they now discovered it was disloyal, they did not so designate it before the Budget was brought down. He would refer to a few articles which would indicate the trade between Great Britain and Canada as compared with the trade between Canada and the United States, which would show the tendency of the policy of the late Government in favour of the United States:—

Furniture—In 1827-73, we imported from Great Britain to the value of \$37,378; from the United States \$104,221. In 1874-75, from Great Britain, \$20,732; from the United States, \$204,757. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$12,201; from the United States, \$387,270.

Coach and Harness Furniture—In 1872-73 we imported from Great Britain, \$50,941 worth; from the United States, \$89,365. In 1874-75, from Great Britain, \$45,425; from the United States, \$96,834. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$20,532; from the United States, \$96,029.

Stoves and Iron Castings—In 1874, we imported from Great Britain \$376,926 worth; from the United States \$360,717. In 1875, from Great Britain, \$344,032; from the United States, \$356,768. In 1876, from Great Britain, \$71,173; from the United States, \$318,560. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$34,058; from the United States, \$357,714.

Spikes, Nails and Brads—In 1872-73, we imported from Great Britain, \$94,015 worth; from the United States, \$55,693. In 1874-75, from Great Britain, \$66,036; from the United States, \$232,590. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$24,562; from the United States, \$154,679.

It indicated that, if this mode of business was to be carried on in the same ratio, the United States would have all the profit in connection with it. In reference to the loyalty of the people, he would not venture to say that gentlemen on either side were disloyal. They had several instances of the people showing their devotion to the Mother Country by coming forward in times of danger, and offering their assistance to the Empire. Therefore, it was unnecessary to go further into that question. Another objection to the tariff was the burden of taxation it would impose on the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, had ignored altogether the object and intention of the tariff. They assumed that all the goods on which the higher duties were placed would continue to be im-

ported, and that, therefore, the people would be obliged to pay them. But the object of the tariff, if he understood it, was that a great portion of the goods on which the high duties were to be placed should be manufactured here, and their price kept in the country. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said, in reference to the stove business, that there was a combination to raise prices since the tariff came into force. He (Mr. Kilvert) had the best authority for denying that statement, and for asserting that stoves were cheaper to-day than five years ago, there being, in addition, 50 per cent. more work on them. In reference to the other item, carriages, referred to by that hon. gentleman, he said that there would not be any additional market for them in consequence of the high duty. The imports for 1878 showed that from the United States they brought in carriages to the value of \$85,304, and from England \$2,130. Now, if either of the amounts thus represented were made in this country, it would give much more employment to the people in this trade. It was not necessary for him to discuss the question of the increase of price to the consumer. They all knew—and he thought it had been established by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) in his speech in reply to the Finance Minister—that one effect of the tariff would be to encourage many manufacturers to go into business, when prices would become so low that many would be ruined. That, he (Mr. Kilvert) thought, was a conclusive answer to the hon. member for South Wellington. Another objection made to this tariff was its immorality—that it was obtained through the bribery of individuals, classes, sections, and Provinces, into accepting that policy. He denied that statement. True, appeals were made to all classes of the community from the national standpoint, and the response was patriotic and general. He thought that it was the gentlemen on the Opposition benches who were guilty of endeavouring to array class against class in reference to this question. They had particularly relied upon and appealed to one class, the farmers, for their support; they pleaded that they were Free-traders, and that, from the position they held, they could

be useful to the farmers. The late Government, believing that, as there was a majority of agricultural constituencies the majority would go in favour of Free-trade, adopted that course, relying upon that interest for support. With regard to another objection to the tariff, the people of this country were said to be ignorant in adopting it. He did not think that any greater insult could have been offered to the people than that found in the remarks of the member for Centre Huron, considering the general diffusion of education. He (Mr. Kilvert) ventured to say that, in future, if the same means were followed by hon. gentlemen opposite as in the past, it would be a long time before the Reform party would occupy the Treasury benches. He desired now to state briefly a few of his reasons for approving of the National Policy. They all knew that, for several years, this country had suffered very seriously from the slaughtering of goods in various industries in vogue. He would refer to an extract from a report of a Select Committee of the House in 1874, in order to show that such slaughtering practice did exist in this country:—

“Your Committee, upon the evidence thus obtained, have arrived at the following conclusions:—

“1st. It appears that the competition with the United States, in those classes of manufacture which come under the influence of such competition, is seriously complained of, on the ground that it is an unequal competition fostered by the different fiscal systems of the two countries.

“The American manufacturers, having the exclusive control of their own market, find it convenient to relieve themselves of their surplus products in Canada, in many instances at prices less than the cost of production, thus making of Canada a slaughter market.

“It has been established before your Committee that Canadian manufacturers have seriously suffered from this cause, and that the effect of it must be, in some cases at least, to so hamper the Canadian industry as to seriously embarrass it, while the country itself would be injured by the withdrawal from it of large numbers of operatives who would be compelled to seek work in the United States.

“This disturbing element in the manufacturing industry of the Dominion arising out of our geographical position, and out of the trade policy of our neighbours, should induce even those who may regard Free-trade as a correct principle, in the abstract, to recognise the necessity for a modification of that principle as a measure of self-protection, and your Committee respectfully recommend the enact-

ment of such laws as will regulate, if it cannot altogether prevent, the evil complained of.

"2nd. The almost uniform testimony before your Committee was to the effect that an increased Protection to manufactures will not necessarily increase the cost of the manufactured article to the consumer; and, in the opinion of your Committee, the witnesses have made out a very strong case in support of this view.

"It appears to be well established that the cost of manufacturing decreases as the quantity of goods manufactured increases. Thus a large manufacturing establishment can afford to sell its products at a lower rate than a smaller one. If, therefore, Canadian industry is relieved from the pressure of such undue competition as that referred to in the first paragraph of this report, the effect will be that the manufacturing establishments will be worked to their full capacity, and the cost of production, and the consequent cost to the consumer, will be proportionately reduced.

"Some instances in proof of the correctness of this principle are given by witnesses whose testimony accompanies this report."

He would also refer to a short extract from the London *Fortnightly Review*, bearing upon the same subject :

"It is difficult enough at any time to establish manufactures in a new country, but altogether impossible if the local manufacturers are unfairly handicapped. The foreign manufacturer has possession of the market, to begin with. Next, he is usually a man of large capital, while the local manufacturers, as a rule, are men of small means. Once in possession of the market, with unlimited command of capital, it is a very easy matter to maintain it. No sooner is he informed, through his agents, that a certain commodity which he has been supplying is being superseded by a local production, than the foreign manufacturer immediately forwards to that market an extra supply of the commodity in question. The market being thus supplied with more than is required, prices recede, and the local manufacturers, not having capital enough to enable them to hold out for a remunerative price, succumb to the pressure. The latter out of the way, the foreign manufacturer has the field all to himself again, and, from the high prices he can now obtain for his goods, he may easily recoup himself for his previous losses. This is a plain statement of what occurs every day in the colonies when any attempt is made to compete with old established industries."

That was a plain statement of what occurred every day. Now he believed that this tariff would materially help to do away with this slaughtering system. He believed also that a number of new industries would be started, and that the people would be more largely employed in industrial pursuits. The woollen trade would be stimulated, and the iron

trade would receive a new impetus. He was informed that the hon. member for Lambton had made some startling remarks with regard to the clock factory in Hamilton. A gentleman interested in that industry, having read the report of those remarks in the *Globe* of that morning, had sent him the following telegram :

"F. E. KILVERT, M.P.—Mr. Mackenzie's statement is absolutely false; it is calculated to inflict the most serious injury upon our business, and ought to be contradicted. Ours was the usual experience of pioneers, and the first small batch of clocks made by us, three years ago, were spoiled by an incompetent foreman. The moment the mistake was discovered they were recalled. We have since sent out forty thousand clocks, which have given entire satisfaction, and are equal to any made anywhere.—Hamilton Clock Co., Geo. Lee, manager."

He (Mr. Kilvert) thought it was very uncalled for, in an hon. gentleman occupying the position of the hon. member for Lambton, to step out of his way to discredit a young industry like that. In addition to the new factories that would be started, many of which were now under way, many old ones, hitherto on short time, would resume full time, and have to increase their production. Those of J. M. Williams & Co., Meakins & Sons, the Forging Works, and others, in Hamilton, were now working overtime. He found, therefore, that all classes would be benefitted by this new policy of Protection. On referring to the census of 1871, he found that the agriculturists in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, numbered 479,512; the commercial class, 75,201; domestics, 60,104; industrial, 212,748; professional, 39,224; and not classified, 143,079; and for every 1,000 agriculturists there were 443 industrial. Those figures showed that there were other classes to be served as well as the agricultural, and that employment should be found for the large industrial classes. He understood the hon. member for Lambton to say that the only producers of wealth in the country were those who tilled the ground.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never said that; but that the men who performed actual labour, either in tilling the soil, producing lumber, or otherwise, were the

real producers of wealth,—not the parties who were brokers between the producers and consumers.

MR. KILVERT said he accepted the explanation, and would read an extract from a high authority on those subjects, to show that industrial classes produced wealth more rapidly than the agricultural class. Walker, on the Science of Wealth, said :

“It is, without question, true, that in an equal manufacturing population will be found a greater accumulation of wealth. One important reason of this is, that a larger share of the population are engaged in production, and a larger amount of capital is required. Women and children, who could earn but little in agricultural labours, can earn much in manufacturing. This is one of the most striking results of a division of labour, as we have already shown. As we carry on agriculture, women and children do little, though in continental Europe they do much. Agriculture, too, can be performed only in certain portions of the year. Manufacturing need never stop, summer or winter, cold or hot, fair or foul. This makes a wonderful difference.”

Now, he maintained that the Government should favour the policy that would give employment to the industrial classes, and thought that this tariff would have that effect. Besides, this tariff was a most perfect vindication and fulfilment of the pledges made by the leader and members of the Conservative party, to the country, at the last elections. He held in his hand a letter from a gentleman largely engaged in manufacturing, and who was a constituent and supporter of the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), in which he said :

“I may add that in the matter of the tariff or National Policy, or whatever name it goes by, the Government has relieved itself from the odium of obtaining power under false pretences, and I think that every leal-hearted Canadian should assist the Government as much as possible in carrying out fairly and squarely these great fiscal changes. I deprecate the abominable tactics of setting farmer against manufacturer, and Province against Province, it is a revival in another form of the sectarian feuds that kept Upper and Lower Canada in a fever for many years. As far as I am concerned, therefore, though opposing you at the last election, I now give you and your friends credit of good faith, and I will assist in every way I can to give the National Policy a fair trial.”

There were some features to which he would like to refer in reference to this tariff, and one was the drawback system.

MR. MACKENZIE.

They had, in Hamilton factories, been manufacturing goods for nearly every market in the world. Some of their sewing machine factories sent goods to Japan, Turkey, South America, and to different places in Europe. This tariff would enable them to compete with our neighbours on the other side of the line, in foreign markets still more successfully than at present. Another feature which should commend itself to this House was the new regulation to secure correct valuations. He thought this should have been adopted long ago. If it had been rigidly enforced, this system of slaughtering would have been materially lessened. If it had been enforced during the last year, he believed the Customs Department would have been in receipt of \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 more than they had received. He thought that, on the whole, the country was well satisfied with this policy. He believed that Canada, under this new order of things, would rise in the near future to a state of prosperity unprecedented in her history, and, instead of disunion resulting from this policy, as predicted by the Opposition, he believed it would strengthen the ties binding Canada to the Mother Country, and that Canada would continue to be, as she was to-day, the foremost colony of the Empire.

MR. BÉCHARD said that, when the hon. the Finance Minister laid his tariff resolutions before the House, he concluded his speech by appealing to the House to say whether or not he and his colleagues on the Treasury benches had redeemed their pledges to the country. He (Mr. Béchard) thought this might fairly be granted, so far, at least, as they had promised the people that, if returned to power, they would gratify the country with a Protective tariff. It seemed to him that the question they had now to consider was whether this tariff would operate as an efficient remedy to remove depression, and restore prosperity to all classes of our people. Let him say, at once, that he had no faith in the action of tariffs as distributing agents of wealth, and he considered any legislation attempting to regulate the conditions under which wealth should be acquired as an undue interference with the operation of the laws of nature, as well as with the

legitimate results of work, and of the exertions of intelligence. In his humble judgment, such a policy could be of no avail to remove depression, and restore prosperity to a nation. Depression would come and go, at certain periods, in spite of any legislation, whatever it might be. What did they see to-day? Depression in Canada with a revenue tariff; depression in the United States with a Protective tariff; depression in England with a Free-trade tariff; depression the world over, despite all tariffs, either Free-trade, revenue or Protection. There was no doubt that, at some future day, though it might be far distant yet, depression would disappear, and we would see a return of prosperity. It would come, not as a necessary result of this tariff, but as a logical consequence, as the irresistible result of the natural course of things, notwithstanding any impediment or obstacle thrown in its way. This prosperity, which they all hoped for and expected, would not be confined to Canada because we should be enjoying a Protective tariff; it would shine as well upon other countries, and wherever the commercial crisis had been felt. It would be restored to Free-trade countries as well as to Protectionist countries,—to England as well as to the United States; but in England the restoration of prosperity would be accomplished without the interference of a Protective tariff, whilst in the United States it would be done, he ventured to say, in spite of Protection. So it would be in regard to Canada, where a return of prosperity would take place independently of this or any other tariff that might be imposed upon the country. Some of his hon. friends from the Province of Quebec had expressed great confidence in Protection, and no doubt they hoped sincerely that the application of this system would promote the interests of our country. He regretted sincerely to be compelled by his convictions to dissent from those hon. gentlemen. He had no faith in Protection, and the more he had considered this system, the more odious it had appeared to him. He looked upon it as unjustly increasing the burden of taxation upon the great mass of consumers for the benefit of a few manufacturers; and, in dealing with this question, he held that the interest of

the consumer must be constantly kept in view, because that interest coincided and was in perfect harmony with the social or general interest. A Protective duty was a tax imposed upon the foreign produce imported into this country; but that tax, it should never be forgotten, unavoidably fell upon the national consumer, who was no one else than the taxpayer who contributed to the public revenue. To impose Protective duties was, in his humble opinion, the same as telling that taxpayer: It is true that you find the burden of taxation heavy, yet we will still increase the price of nearly everything you consume; it is true that the Government takes a portion of your revenue, yet we will still so readjust the tariff as to give another portion to monopolists. Anyone who had given serious attention to this matter understood very well that, whilst a Protective tariff threw some money into the Public Treasury, it had also the effect of taking larger sums from the pockets of the consumers, and of throwing them into those of the manufacturers. But he must not forget, here, that some hon. gentlemen opposite had expressed the opinion that the consumer did not pay the duty, but that, on the contrary, it was paid by the producer, and that the Finance Minister, by means of this tariff, would realise large sums of money from the Americans. His hon. friend from Quebec county (Mr Caron) had also given utterance to the same opinion, when he said that we paid 15c. duty to the Americans for every bushel of barley we sold them. He must confess this was a most admirable doctrine; but it was as unsound and absurd as it appeared admirable. If this doctrine was true, this tariff was insufficient, and we should have an average one of at least 50 or 60 per cent., so as to enable the Government to realise from foreign countries all the money they wanted to meet our public expenditure, and relieve entirely our people from any taxation; it would enable the Government to collect from foreign people all the money they wanted for the construction of the Pacific Railway, and of our other great public works, without their being obliged to borrow a single dollar; a stringent application of it would enable the Government to realise from

foreign nations, within a few years, all the money necessary to pay our national debt; it was not desirable, as held by Protectionists, that the amount of our importations should be reduced; on the contrary, importations ought to be encouraged; in a word, if this doctrine was true, there could be no such thing as Protection, because Protective duties, in that case, would fail to effect the purposes for which they were established. Anyone who would take the trouble of considering the logical consequences of that doctrine, would see at once its unsoundness, because to show the absurd consequences of a principle was to demonstrate the fallacy of the principle itself. It had been said, in the course of this debate, that Protection did not increase the price of commodities. If such was the case, he could not see the utility of Protection. Manufacturers asked for Protection, in order to increase and keep up the price of foreign produce, and to be thereby enabled to sell theirs at advanced prices; but, if Protection did not increase prices, he failed to see the reason why there should be a single Protectionist in the country. The whole argument could be summed up in the following manner:—If they admitted that Protection increased the price of commodities, they must also admit that it was detrimental to the interests of the consumer. If, on the contrary, they denied that fact, then they must confess that Protection was useless; therefore, Protection was either injurious or useless, and could not be beneficial.

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

After Recess.

MR. BÉCHARD said that, when the the House rose, he had just concluded that part of his remarks wherein he was endeavouring to show that Protection could not be beneficial. He should now proceed to review another branch of this question. Hon. members in Opposition, particularly those from the Province of Quebec, had been taunted by hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial benches. They had been charged with being guilty of inconsistency with regard to this question, and, to prove that charge true,

MR. BÉCHARD.

reference had been made to opinions expressed by some distinguished members of the National party, who, according to report, had pronounced themselves Protectionists in 1872. Particular reference had been made to his hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) who was quite able to defend himself, and also to Mr. Joly, Mr. David and others. Admitting, for the sake of argument, this to be true with regard to some of those gentlemen, did it follow that their opinions should bind every man in the ranks of the Liberal party? Had those declarations ever bound the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) for instance, who, for more than twenty years, had been acknowledged as one of the leaders of the party? Let him tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the opinion of no mortal man, however distinguished he might be in the ranks of the Liberal party, could ever bind him to any particular course, with regard to any new question of public policy. But, if he wanted to retort the charge, he would have only to turn his eyes to the opposite side of the House, where he could see many hon. gentlemen, who, during their whole lifetime, had advocated the principles of a revenue tariff, and who had thought fit to change their opinions only two or three years ago. He could refer, in particular, to a very distinguished statesman in the Conservative party, Sir A. T. Galt, who, a few years ago, wrote a letter, which was quoted during the last two Sessions of Parliament by hon. gentlemen on the present Opposition side of the House, as sustaining their position on this question. He could, also, refer to another letter, published a little later, by the same distinguished statesman, and which was, at the same time, quoted by hon. gentlemen on the present Government side of the House, as sustaining their position with regard to the same question; and he should not be surprised if, within two or three years after the results of this tariff had been felt throughout the country, the same distinguished statesman should publish a third letter in order to harmonise the two preceding ones. But why should he not allude, for further demonstration of his proposition, to another distinguished member of the Conservative party now hold-

ing a seat in this House ; a gentleman whose great abilities were acknowledged by every one, and whose opinions had generally great weight with his friends. Let him read a few lines from the proceedings of the Dominion Board of Trade at their Session in 1872—precisely the same year in which some gentlemen in the Liberal ranks were said to have advocated Protectionist principles. He read from these proceedings the following resolution, moved by Mr. T. White, of Montreal :

“That without offering any opinion upon some of the details of the present Customs tariff, or upon the anomalies which are inevitable in all tariffs, this Board is of opinion that no change should be made in it, unless the exigencies of the public service demand larger revenues ; and that in such case, any increase to be made should be in accordance with the principle of the present Customs tariff, which, while not interfering with the commerce of the Dominion, affords incidental Protection to its manufactures.

“That this Board is further of opinion, that permanence in the fiscal policy of the country is most important, alike to its commerce and manufactures, and that no changes should be made in the tariff not demanded by the absolute necessities of the revenue.”

This resolution, he thought, showed, conclusively, that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) in 1872 upheld the principles of a revenue tariff. It was true that the able speech delivered yesterday by the hon. gentleman indicated that his opinions were completely modified, but was he to be blamed for this ? He (Mr. Béchard) thought not ; and this example only showed that even distinguished men would occasionally change their minds like ordinary mortals. But, if this spectacle could be seen on both sides of this House, he thought that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to refrain from throwing stones, seeing that they were living in glass houses. During the course of this debate, their attention had often been called to the United States ; and they had been invited by several hon. members, amongst whom he particularly noticed his hon. friend the member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) to behold the great prosperity prevailing in that country under the rule of Protection. His hon. friend was by no means an Annexationist, and, if anyone ever doubted his loyalty, that doubt might have been removed when he delivered

his able speech. The hon. member seemed inclined to denounce not only annexation, but even those who, in years gone by, might have entertained annexation proclivities. He devoted a considerable part of his speech to the late L. A. Papineau, particularly deprecating the admiration of that celebrated tribune of the people for American institutions. However, as the delivery of the speech proceeded, he (Mr. Béchard) could soon infer that, after all, his hon. friend thought there was something pretty good in the United States. He spoke in glowing terms of the wonderful prosperity of that country, and, doubtless following the example of his hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), he was pleased to quote largely from Henry Clay, one of the United States' most gifted sons. It seemed, indeed, as if his hon. friend thought Henry Clay the only authority worth being quoted, and, as if he had entirely forgotten great British authorities, such as Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright and other distinguished British statesmen, whose opinions, on economic matters, had, of late, thrown so much light upon the commercial world. But that pretended prosperity of the United States had not been demonstrated by hon. gentlemen opposite to be a reality, whilst his hon. friends from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had clearly shown, by referring to incontrovertible facts, that that prosperity, so much boasted of, was nothing but a sham, as compared with the prosperity of that country in former years. Who did not remember that, for years, four millions of individuals called tramps totally ceased to be producers, whilst remaining consumers, under the so-called benevolent rule of Protection ? Such a state of things was unknown to the United States before. Who did not remember that, during the summer of 1877, an immense row, extending from East to West, and provoked by a reduction of wages, took place in that country, and that, after having almost assumed the proportions of a rebellion, it could only be put down by the concentration of troops, after the destruction of eight or ten million dollars' worth of property ? Surely such facts as those were not indications of a very high state of prosperity.

However, if there was on this vast globe a country where Protection could show its beneficial results, that country was the United States, with a territory including all kinds of soil, from which could be raised nearly all kinds of produce, favoured by all varieties of climate, and enjoying an inter-State trade more than ten times greater than her foreign commerce. Notwithstanding all those natural advantages, Protection had failed to secure permanent prosperity to the United States, or to shield that country against the strokes of a commercial crisis, the most severe, perhaps, that it had ever felt. Some hon. members had stated that the Americans, under a Protective policy, had considerably reduced their national debt. He had always thought this had been accomplished by taxation, but he was quite willing to admit that Protection and taxation were synonymous terms, and, consequently, meant the same thing. Their attention had also been invited to Old France, as being a prosperous nation under Protection. It was true that France had on the whole been Protectionist, but her prosperity was due to the activity, the working energies, and particularly the saving habits of her people, rather than to Protection. If she had adopted, forty years ago, the more enlightened principles in commercial matters of her great neighbour, England, she would be to-day a still richer nation. Her marine would be the double or the treble of what it was to-day; her manufactures would have been still more perfected by foreign competition; the cost of living would have been cheapened, and her numerous working classes would have lived more satisfied, contented and happy; and, above all, she might have been saved from some of those political revolutions which seemed to have become as periodical in that country as commercial crises elsewhere. His hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) quoted Colbert as a Protectionist. It was very well to quote great men when they wanted to point out the good they might have accomplished; but, surely, their errors ought not to be transformed into models to be followed. The initiative taken by Colbert did not altogether turn to the advantage of France; it was followed, a little later, by a series of re-

taliatory measures between France and Holland, which were considered as one of the principal causes of the war of 1672, which terminated in 1678, by the peace of Nimègues. He might add that, when Colbert lived, the principles of political economy were not so well understood as to-day; at all events, they were not studied as a science. But no one could deny the considerable progress of Free-trade principles in France within a certain number of years, and he remembered having read somewhere the report of a fact which was illustrative of that progress. In 1842, the cloth manufacturers of Elbœuf petitioned the French Government against an introduction into France of Belgian cloths, whilst, at the same time, the cloth manufacturers of Verviers were petitioning their Government against an invasion in Belgium of French cloths. But a few years afterwards, in 1866, the Board of Trade of Verviers solemnly placed the bust of Cobden, that apostle of Free-trade, in the chamber of their deliberations, and, in the year following, during the Universal Exhibition held in Paris, in 1867, the bust of the same great man was seen, crowning a pyramid of the products of that great city's manufactures. They all remembered the violent recriminations which were raised against the treaty negotiated by Cobden with Napoleon III. According to those clamours, the English manufacturers would crush the French, yet nothing of the kind took place, and the treaty had proved to be equally advantageous to both parties. But, if they noticed to-day a certain current of opinion in France inclining towards Protection principles, they saw, on the other hand, that there were groups of educated and distinguished men, and even of manufacturers, who were strongly advocating the principles of Free-trade, and he had no doubt that, before long, France would join hands with England, and become her commercial as well as her political ally. They had also been referred to Germany and invited to contemplate Bismarck, as being in favour of Protection. It was a wonder to no one that, in a country where military despotism was the governing rule, where political liberty was crushed under the iron heel of a despot, commercial liberty

should also be proscribed; the very name of liberty, under whatever form it might appear, was a permanent threat for the rulers of that country. His hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) attempted the other day to throw ridicule upon the assertion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) who had said that Protection had a tendency to develop socialistic ideas. He (Mr. Béchard) thought the hon. member for Lambton was not wrong, for Protection was the first step towards acknowledging the doctrine of the right of work—a fundamental principle of socialism. One of the main reasons advanced in favour of Protection was that this system gave work to a certain number of people; consequently, that everyone in the community must be taxed, and, therefore, bound to sacrifice an indefinite portion of his labour, his income, his property, under whatever form it might be, for the benefit of others. He (Mr. Béchard) held that this was preaching, although unintentionally, the doctrine of the right to work, which was in direct antagonism with the right to property. Hon. members would remember that celebrated answer of M. Proudhon, an apostle of socialism, to M. Thiers: "Grant me the right to work," said he, "and I'll grant you the right to property." M. Proudhon understood very well that these two rights were incompatible. But he (Mr. Béchard) hastened to add that he had no fear of socialism being developed in this country, at least for a number of years, by the introduction of a Protective policy, because this country was abundantly provided with bread, space and liberty, three of the principal elements of satisfaction and happiness in the life of nations. Now, after having dwelt, perhaps at too great a length, on those generalities, he would approach, before concluding his remarks, a more practical branch of the subject. On the 17th of September last, the people of Canada rendered a verdict in favour of Protection, and they had sent to Parliament a large majority of members who were disposed to vote for it. Nothing could prevent, he presumed, the introduction of that system; and, since the people had pronounced for it, he felt pretty much inclined to say: let them have it and bear the consequences. But,

since they were bound to have Protection, he wanted it to be just and equitable to all classes, and not favouring one class at the expense of another. He would undertake to say a few words in the interest of one class with which he was more particularly connected, as he had the honor to belong to it: he referred to the farming class of the country. He could easily see that, under this tariff, the farmer would have to pay higher prices for his cotton goods, his woollen goods, his shoes, for his sugar, all his agricultural implements, and many other articles which he was obliged to purchase, but he failed to see how he would receive compensation for the new sacrifices which were imposed upon him. There was no kind of produce from which the farmer would receive any benefit under the tariff by way of an increase of price. The duties levied by this tariff upon wheat and flour were, doubtless, intended to raise the price of that commodity; and, if such an increase would occur, it would be detrimental to the Province of Quebec, where wheat was not grown in sufficient quantity for the consumption of its people. But there was, in the Dominion, taken as a whole, a considerable surplus of wheat, for which we were bound to seek a foreign market, and according to the rule, which was perfectly rational, that whenever a country possessed a surplus of any kind of produce, the price of it at home was fixed by the price it was worth abroad, it followed that the price of wheat and flour could not be increased, at least in Ontario and Quebec, by the importation of any duty.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BÉCHARD said he heard the cheers of some hon. members from the Province of Quebec, sitting on the Ministerial benches, on hearing his statement that the imposition of duties on imported wheat and flour would not increase the price of that product in their Province. But he supposed those hon. members would continue to cheer him when he told them that the price of wheat and flour being not increased by those duties, it necessarily followed that the wheat producers of Ontario or Quebec, would not be benefitted by them; and that, those duties being of no avail to anyone, they became absolutely use-

less. The same argument held good with regard to oats, of which we had a large surplus, which we were obliged to send to foreign markets. The same thing must be said of barley and peas, which we largely exported, and which we did not import. The same thing must also be said of horses, horned cattle, sheep, hay, butter, and cheese, which were products we exported, and did not import. But it was not the same thing with regard to corn, which was not grown in this country in sufficient quantity for our consumption; and the price of that produce would be advanced by 7½c. per bushel—the amount of the duty. Now, how many farmers in Canada would receive the benefit of that increase in the price of corn? There was one produce of the farm upon which the imposition of a duty would have been really beneficial to the Canadian farmer—he referred to pork; for, whilst we exported a small quantity of pork, we imported a much larger one for home consumption. It was true that this tariff increased the duty on pork by 15c. per barrel; but this increase was so trifling that the benefit resulting from it to the farmer, could not be appreciable. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his tariff, took good care to protect the woollen goods manufacturer; but he entirely forgot him who provided wool, which would continue to be admitted duty free; he took care to protect the shoe manufacturer, but seemed to forget him who provided hides, which were also admitted free. Now, he (Mr. Bechard) asked what benefit could result to the Canadian farmer from the imposition of duties upon produce which we did not export, or of which we had a large surplus that we were bound to send to foreign markets? He did not hesitate to say that, under this tariff, the Canadian farmer would receive no compensation for the higher prices which he would be obliged to pay in the purchase of a great many articles of which he was a consumer. In concluding his remarks, he called to this fact the special attention of his hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), who had been pleased to allude to him in his speech. The hon. member represented a constituency which was like his, essentially agricultural; and he had no doubt that, within two or three

years, after the results of the tariff had been felt, his constituents would be in a position to tell him that, at least, one of the promises he made them during the electoral campaign, and which his leaders made to the country, had not been fulfilled.

THE CASE OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR LETELLIER.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, by the kind consent of the hon. member for Portneuf, who has the floor, I rise to speak for a moment on a matter personal to myself. There is an article on the front page of the *Globe* to-day, which arrived by wire, in anticipation of the post, and which was communicated to me. I will read the paragraph. It is in the Ottawa correspondence, and is as follows:—

“Further developments affecting the present political crisis are being hourly made. Those which have become public property to-day, in no wise reflect credit on the Premier. Indeed, in so discreditable a light does he appear, that the stigma of cowardice must be in future borne by him as a fitting compliment of a long list of political crime and ingratitude. There can be no doubt that he has sought to betray the confidence of the Governor-General, and make that illustrious personage a sacrifice to appease the wrath of the Government's Quebec followers. He was coward enough in doing this to take advantage of the Governor-General's position, which prevents him from replying to his slanderer. Such was the Premier's action when he informed the House he regretted the Governor-General had declined to follow his advice, and dismiss Mr. Letellier, but had referred the matter to England for consideration. It has been learned from a reliable source that the Governor-General did not personally propose that the matter should be referred to England, but such was done at the personal solicitation of the Premier, who afterwards, in the House of Commons, sought to direct the venom of his angry Quebec supporters towards the Governor-General. The Marquis of Lorne was so shocked on reading the falsehood told by the Premier in the House of Commons on Thursday last, as reported in the newspapers, that he wrote a letter to Sir John, sharply reprimanding him for his cowardly conduct. On Saturday morning the Premier was compelled to have an interview with His Excellency, and as a result of that interview, this afternoon, on the floor of the House of Commons, he contradicted his former statement, and stated that the reference of the matter to England by the Governor-General was not made without the advice of the Government. A more disgraceful proce-

sure than this on the part of a constitutional adviser to a viceroy, or even a sovereign, has scarcely ever been recorded. The Governor-General, having his confidence in the personal integrity of the leader of the Government destroyed, has sent Captain Harvey, his A. D. C., to England as a special messenger, bearing despatches, and to make such other verbal explanations as may be necessary."

This is *verbatim et literatim*, as sent over the wires by a friend of mine, and communicated to me in advance of the mail. I showed it to His Excellency, and asked his permission to contradict it. I have His Excellency's permission to contradict this statement. When I asked him for this permission, he said: "Certainly, if you think it worth while to contradict such reports. There is no foundation whatever for the statements made."

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

MR. VALLÉE said that at that advanced hour of the debate it was not his intention to again go into the merits or the details of the important question now submitted to the consideration of the House. However, as the representative of a manufacturing constituency, he thought it his duty to express the satisfaction that he felt at the Protection the Government had granted to the industries that existed in the county of Portneuf. In that county, the discussion upon the National Policy had been conducted as it should be. They had not been afraid to look upon the question as it was in its application and in its consequences. He did not consider the National Policy as merely a Protective policy in the strict sense of that word. He based it upon two principles. The first was that as far as possible everything should be produced in the country; the second, that it was necessary to have as many markets as possible in order to dispose of the products of the country. This reminded him of the interruption of the hon. member for Quebec East, who had observed to the popular member for the county of Quebec that the obtaining of the French markets for Canadian vessels was an act of Free-trade. As far as the construction of ships was concerned, Free-trade was, in this respect, Protection. He would now refer to the practical application of the

policy now before the House. There was Protection for the manufacturer, for the workingman, for the farmer. The manufacturer found in the Protective tariff a security for his capital by being protected against foreign competition, such as he had been exposed to. For three or four years, Canadian markets had been flooded with products, particularly furniture, carriages and agricultural implements. Now, it was unquestionable that these industries might be fostered and developed by the home trade of Canada. That was how the manufacturer was protected. As to the workingman, there was no doubt but that Protection would be immediately profitable for him, for it was the opinion of the Liberal party itself, and of its press, that Protection would have for immediate result the creation of a large number of new manufactures. Certainly, if this was so, the workingman would have more work at better prices. As to the farmer, he had at home all that was required for food, clothing and shelter. Protection would teach him to practice more economy, and employ more art in cultivating, and would likewise develop agriculture. In the first place, the farmer could furnish his own food; it was an unquestionable fact that the soil of Canada produced everything that was required for food. He had at home all that was needed for clothing, and in his field, and in his wood, wherewithal to shelter himself. He, therefore, only required the luxuries of life, the delicate products of other climates. If the farmer had at home all that he needed, and if he could dispose of the surplus products of his farm, it would be easy for him to procure the luxuries of life. The manufacturer, being able to maintain his manufactures and open new ones, the workingman having more employment and higher wages, they would naturally require more farm produce, and would have more money to pay for it. Therefore, the farmer would be afforded an effective Protection, for he would have a market where the demand would be greater, where money would be more abundant, and where there would be no competition as at present. Mention had been made of protection given to wool. The hon. member for Iberville had seemed to re-

proach the Government for not having put a duty on foreign wool. This gentleman was, perhaps, not aware that this imported wool could not be produced in this country. It was a fine, delicate wool that Canadian sheep could not produce. Naturally, Canadian manufacturers who made use of this article required, for the best quality of goods, this foreign wool. By imposing a duty on this import, the Government would have denied the protection required by Canadian manufacturers of woollen goods. The farmer could take his wool to the manufacturer and bring back the cloth he needed for his clothing, and he could, moreover, sell his surplus wool for cash. He thought that as legislators it was their duty to teach the people how to live and clothe themselves at home rather than to flatter popular prejudices. The farmer was happier when he wore clothes made by his wife than he was to-day, wearing, as he did, clothes manufactured in England or the United States. Then he had gold and silver in his strong-box, but, to-day, having contracted the habit of purchasing these products abroad, he had neglected this former national and domestic industry. Did the farmer enjoy the Protection that the new tariff seemed destined to grant him? Were the advantages he obtained greater than the few sacrifices he was obliged to make as a citizen of the State? He thought so. The protection upon oats, rye and barley, would give him profits greater than the few duties he would have to pay on certain articles of luxury. It must be admitted that every one was obliged to contribute towards defraying the expenses of public administration. The Government could not be maintained without revenues; public improvements could not be made without money. The people who asked for these public improvements understood this. With regard to these taxes, it was astonishing to hear the Liberal party blame the Government for the present increase, for this party, whilst they were in power, had considerably increased taxation. If, to-day, the Government was placed in a rather awkward position, which required an increase of revenue, the cause of this might be laid at the door of the late Liberal Administration. But, without wishing to enter into recriminations

against the late Administration, he thought that the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition was a proof that this increase was necessary, for in the first part he stated that, in order to maintain public credit, he was ready to admit an increase of taxation; what he condemned was that the present distribution of the duties did bear equally on all classes of society. With respect to this, the leader of the Opposition had, the previous evening, while speaking of Protection, endeavoured to show that it would not have the expected result, and speaking half seriously, he pointed to the case of several American workmen who had come to seek employment on the Welland Canal. This example did not prove that Protection was not advantageous to the United States, but it showed that the late Premier, in giving out contracts, favoured American rather than Canadian contractors. Another example was that at Hamilton a large asylum had been built, the contract had been given to Americans, who, naturally enough, had brought from the States all the material required, as well as the workmen. Well, if the hon. the leader of the Opposition had then been mindful of Canadian workmen, he would have granted them Protection by giving them this work. There was contradiction on the very face of the opposition brought against the new policy by the Liberal party. Some said that it would increase the burden of taxation; others, and these were the principal members of the Opposition, stated that the revenue was going to decrease. That was, evidently, paradoxical; there was a flat contradiction between these two statements, for revenue was taxation. If the revenue decreased, the people would, necessarily, have less taxes to pay. This contradiction showed what a difficulty hon. members who opposed the new tariff, without knowing exactly how to do so, were in. If they were logical, they ought all to maintain that the Protective policy meant an increase of taxation, and that the revenue was going to be considerably increased. But there was nothing surprising in contradiction even, from a party which did not seek for the interests of the country, but rather endeavoured to excite popular prejudices, in order to regain power. Another remark

that had been heard, inside and outside of this House, was that Protection had not yet produced any result, that the country was just as poor to-day as on the 17th of September. This impatience seemed rather extraordinary, and those who made a profession of it were evidently not serious. For, after all, the tariff was not yet adopted. It was true that it had been in force for a few days, but it was hardly known all over the country. A year, or a year and a half would be required before the new system would be put to an ordinary trial. This impatience reminded him of the proverb which said that the fruit could not come before the flower. Complaints had been heard with regard to the sacrifices imposed by the new tariff upon the poor man. These complaints might be answered by saying that, if the people were taxed to-day, it was, in the first place, in order to cover up the deficits of the late Liberal Administration, and to continue the public improvements that had been undertaken. It had been said that the Conservative party were afraid to meet the electors since the tariff had been brought down. He was not of that opinion. In his county, the question had been placed squarely before the electors, and every time mention was made of the National Policy, his opponent took good care to draw the attention of the electors to the fact that Protection signified an increase of taxation. A familiar, and rather striking, illustration he made use of was to tell the electors that the hats they wore would be taxed to the extent of 15 or 18 sous, and that it would be the same with regard to all articles of general consumption. Then, the news that the people would have more taxes to pay than before would not surprise them. Moreover, he had answered this argument, as it should be answered now, by stating that the electors should not buy their hats from foreigners, but that they should buy them at home, and that it was better to pay a little dearer for them and keep the money in the country. He had to thank the hon. the Minister of Finance for having kindly paid attention to the remarks that he had made to him, with regard to protection of paper manufacturers. He had been pleased to grant his request in

the name of the industries of the county that he (Mr. Vallée) represented. He trusted that the protection granted to the paper industries would infuse new life into the four large paper mills now at work in his county, and that others would be opened. There was also in his county a furniture manufacture that would be greatly helped by the new tariff. Mention had been made of deputations that had come to interview the hon. the Finance Minister since he had brought down his tariff. He had been present at some of these interviews, and he had heard the delegates approve of the tariff as a whole. It was true that some wanted a little more Protection, and that others, strangely enough, wanted less. He had thought that these few persons were actuated rather by selfish motives than by a desire to forward the general interests of the country. Some had gone so far as to say that the new tariff would create too much competition in the country; that a great number of capitalists would come and establish the same kind of manufactures as those they possessed. Naturally, public sentiment, the general interest, ought to predominate over private interests. It might be said in a general way that the new tariff would develop industry, favour agriculture, and cause the country to enter upon a new era that would lead to prosperity. The policy of the Government on this question ought to be approved of as a whole. He trusted that before long the country would feel the beneficial results that were hoped for, and the dark days and the hard times that the country had just gone through would give place to prosperity. He would conclude by applying to the arguments of the Liberal party an incident, of which he had been an eye-witness. Once an unfortunate man was blown up while blasting. He fell to the ground, bruised, his skin torn and his flesh mangled. A skilful doctor was called in. This had taken place in a small village, and all the gossips of the place gathered round to view the sad sight. When they saw the doctor cutting away a part of the skin and flesh, he heard them utter some very severe remarks against the man of science. They thought it hard to make the poor man suffer by cutting away his flesh and pieces of his skin. But, after a fortnight,

the unfortunate man was restored to health, strong, happy and robust. Then the gossips admitted that the doctor knew better what he was doing than they did, and that by hurting the wounded man a little he had saved his life and restored him to health. That was what the Liberals would say before long, for the sick man was Canada and the doctor was the hon. the Finance Minister.

MR. ROCHESTER said he would not have troubled the House but for some assertions that had been made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; he alluded more particularly to those who had stated that the lumber trade would be greatly injured by the present tariff. Though he had heard a number of gentlemen say the lumber trade was going to be injured, he never heard one say in what way it was going to be injured. He had asked the hon. gentleman from South Wellington, the other day, if he could explain how the lumber interest was going to be injured by the present Government. He failed to see, if the present tariff was carried out, that it would add to the expense of the lumber trade. It had been stated that it would add 60c. on the cost of each thousand feet of manufactured lumber. He was sure it was not the extra duty on pork that would have that result. Then, what was it? Here, he would say, that he thought the Finance Minister should have put on a sufficient duty on pork to make it an inducement to the farmers of this country to raise pork, instead of depending, as they did, to a very large extent, on the United States. Looking at the woollen goods used in the lumber trade, he could not see that that was the cause of the alleged increase in the expense of the manufacture of lumber. He knew, from his own experience, that Canadian blankets and cloth had been used for years; but he regretted that, under the late tariff, a great many Canadian factories had been compelled to shut down, including the Cornwall factory, whose blankets were known to, and used by, nearly every lumbering firm in the country. He was glad, however, to be able to inform the House that this factory was going to resume work again. Under these circumstances, he could not

MR. VALLÉE.

see where the expense was to be increased. Certainly it could not be caused by the additional imposition of 10c. on the 200lb. of pork. Then take the article of saws, one of the principal articles used in the manufacture of lumber. Taking the saws made in the United States and those made in Canada, he would say, distinctly, as a practical man, that the saws made in this country were just as good as those made in the United States. He would not say that they were as inexpensive, for the reason that Canadian factories were not as large as those across the line. He had purchased saws from American factories, and from nearly every factory in Canada, and was practically acquainted with the merits and demerits of each. He had shown that this 60c. increase a thousand on lumber could not come from pork, wool, or saws, and certainly they were not going to get axes from the United States. They had a number of axe factories in Canada, and they knew how to make axes to suit the climate, which they could not do in the United States. They imported very little iron in connection with the lumber trade; steel was the principal material, and that came in free. It was true they used a large number of files. There was now, at least, one factory in the Dominion of Canada, and he was satisfied that, under the present tariff, there would be more in a very short time. The files got in this country were just as good and just as cheap as those purchased in the United States. He had asked some gentlemen, who had talked about the additional tax on lumber, what would cause it, but they could not point out where the extra expense would occur. Of course, if he had his own way, there would be additional expense, as he would put two cents a pound on pork coming from the United States, and thereby protect the farmers of this country. He represented an agricultural constituency and had promised his constituents to give them every protection practicable, and this article of pork was mentioned to him particularly by them. They desired a higher duty, so that they could raise pork advantageously, which they could not now with only a cent a pound duty. He hoped the Finance Minister would see

his way clear to change the duty on pork from 1c. to 2c. per pound. What would become of Canada if the United States put a duty on lumber? This was simply absurd. It was true \$2 a thousand feet was charged on all lumber entering the United States which was consumed there; but a very large portion of the lumber which went from this country to the United States went through in bond. He had any amount of figures and statistics with regard to this question, but he had been unable to obtain the exact amount of Canadian lumber that was consumed in the United States, from the fact that nearly all the lumber shipped from Canada to the United States went there in bond; the shippers in bond in the cities of New York, Boston and Portland had their bonded yards, into which all lumber went, and part of it was re-sold there, and part shipped to South America and the West Indies. On that account, he had not been able to get the amount of Canadian lumber actually consumed in the United States. He regretted that very much, as he would like to have had the figures as they stood, the statements in the Blue-books showing an immense amount of lumber shipped to the United States, but not the quantity consumed in the States out of that amount, and the quantity shipped to the West Indies and elsewhere. Why did this lumber go to the States? Simply because, a few years ago, we had sugar refineries in Canada, as the late Finance Minister expressed it, the privilege of washing our own sugar, while, under their policy, they had to shut down. Instead of lumber being shipped, as formerly, from Montreal, Quebec and the Lower Provinces, it was, to-day, and had been for the last five years, shipped from Portland, Boston and New York. All the sugar shooks that were manufactured here a few years ago, and shipped in in large quantities to the West India Islands, were shipped now from American ports, the reason being that our sugar refineries were standing still, and the trade transferred to Portland, Boston and New York. This tariff would not injure the lumber trade. What signified 5c. on 100lb. of pork, which would make 60c. difference on a thousand feet of lumber? The thing was too absurd. As to the Americans raising the duty on

lumber, the thing was preposterous. There was no hon. gentleman opposite who would not give Brother Jonathan credit for being a practical business man, who would do nothing to injure himself. The United States had adopted a policy of Protection to better their interests, and had improved their position, notwithstanding the assertions and reports of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Norfolk treated this House, the other day, to a long array of figures, which he must have got from some musty almanac that had been lying on somebody's shelf for many years, so ridiculous did they appear in comparison with what he wished to make out. He stated the American factories were one mass of ruins, and that the working people were going about idle. No painter could paint on canvas anything more dark and gloomy than what the hon. gentleman depicted to be the position of the United States at present. Such assertions were simply ridiculous. He (Mr. Rochester) knew, personally, that the contrary was the case. For the last eight or nine months he had never met with an American, engaged in commerce, who had not distinctly stated that trade was reviving and money plenty. All their trouble, they said, had been want of confidence, and that was being now rapidly regained; factories were starting up, and they had no doubt that, within a few months, they would be doing a flourishing business. He knew that on the 1st February, 1879, all the cotton manufactories of the town of Manchester, New Hampshire, were running on double time, day and night, and up to that date had sold, in Europe, about three million dollars' worth of cotton; and yet, the hon. gentleman could tell them the factories in the United States were a mass of ruins. The hon. member for Bothwell said there was over a hundred million dollars' worth of machinery in the United States standing useless. He would just read one or two extracts, from a very good authority, which would show, better than anything else, what the position of the United States was to-day. The business notes in the New York *Herald* of March 24th, 1879, contained the following:—

"American trunks are in great demand in Ireland.

"The sales of New England cotton goods in China have increased to a very flattering extent during the past year.

"A general revival of business is reported in the Ohio iron regions, and manufacturers are overwhelmed with orders at advanced prices.

"Nashville, Tenn., shows signs of awakening prosperity. According to a local journal \$250,000 will not cover the cost of the houses now in course of erection and to be erected during the year 1879.'

"The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company are building, at the Mount Clare shops, twenty-five engines of the 'Mogul' pattern, for use on the grades of the Alleghany Mountains, and 200 freight cars.

"A Newark (N. J.) paper says:—'Sash-weights are now manufactured so cheaply from scraps of tin—obtained from various manufactures—in this city, that no country can compete with them in cheapness.'

"The consumption of rubber by our manufacturers continues as large as ever, the imports amounting to about twelve thousand pounds per annum, chiefly from South America. The price ranges from twenty to fifty cents per pound.

"The Milwaukee (Wis.) *Bee* reports 'That the announcement of new buildings for the present season are coming in so fast that the papers do not get time enough to dwell upon the details before their attention is called to one next.'

"The Cincinnati *Gazette* has interviewed a number of the representative business men of that city with reference to the business outlook for the spring. It finds universal cheerfulness and a large increase of business over that of last year.

"Among the branches of business which will be affected by the new Canadian tariff is that of trunks. The Newark (N. J.) *Journal* says: 'The new Canadian tariff operates against the trunk manufacturers in this city, as to that country they have been accustomed to look for an important market.'

"Salem, Mass., sends encouraging news in regard to the shoe trade. The *Post* of that city, says: 'The spring trade has everywhere the fullest indications of being better than it has been for years, and all there is wanted now is for the people to fully realise the situation, and the wheels of business will "just hum."'

"A Lewistown (Me.) paper reports 'That business at the Lewistown Machine Company's works is now livelier than it has been in years. Every available space in the works is in use, and a very large force is employed. The foundry is crowded with work. A large quantity of cotton machinery is being turned out for the Cabot Company, Brunswick; for the Hallowell Mill, for the Pontiac, for the York, of Saco; for two mills in Lawrence, and for a mill in Atlanta, Ga. A very large order is being filled for a mill at Atlanta, chiefly looms and shafting.'

"The Boston *Post* prints a bright picture, as follows:—'The factories are generally resum-

ing or making ready to resume work, and if the foreign market could be still more rapidly extended by intelligent legislation their prospects would improve at a much more speedy pace. But it is all certain to come right in time. Even real estate, which is the last to rally, feels the effect of the reviving trade impulses and improves its figures and pretensions together. We have reached a stage, in fact, at which further movement is possible in but one direction. Everything must now go forward. The country is evidently about to enter on a career of prosperity, whose splendours have hardly yet been imagined.'

"The business outlook on the State canals is excellent. In the opinion of the *Buffalo Express*, the prospect for the season's trade, looked at from all standpoints, is very encouraging both to vessel owners and the managers of propellor lines, and if reasonable carrying rates are established in accordance with the demand for room, there is no reason why shippers and owners should not all wear smiling faces. It is estimated that there are at present 20,000,000 bushels of grain in store at the upper lake ports; that the amount of lumber which has been cut during the past winter, and which now awaits shipment, is larger than ever before; that miners have been unusually active, and immense quantities of copper and iron ore and pig metal are ready to be transported. These are what constitute the down-freight."

These notes from the New York *Herald* proved sufficiently that the depression which hon. gentlemen opposite talked of did not exist in the United States. He knew that depression had existed in the United States. Would any hon. gentleman say it was any wonder that depression should have existed there during the last few years, after the great internal war they had passed through. They felt the depression, and were obliged to raise money to pay their war debt by a Protective policy. If it was good for forty millions of people to have a Protective policy, was it not also good for four millions? Should we, as Canadians, only four millions of people, not protect our agriculturists and our manufacturers against forty millions of people, who have built a wall around themselves that nothing can get through without paying a large duty? He said, without fear of contradiction, that the Americans could manufacture many articles 50 per cent. cheaper than they could be made in the Dominion. For that reason its people asked for and ought to have Protection. The fly-on-the-wheel policy of the last five years had left Canada in its present depressed

condition. East, west, north and south, they would find railway cars laden with some of their best men, making for the far west. He was satisfied when they went to Manitoba, but did not like to see them settling in the Western States. A few days ago only, trains left Brockville with over 1,000. From his own part of the country, including county Carleton, a large number of families had recently gone, because they could not make a living here. The reason was obvious, having been explained by the member for Quebec, in regard to the absence of a market for Canadian coarse grains. Hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side had asked: Why was not 10c. or 20c. per bushel imposed on corn instead of 7½c.? He (Mr. Rochester) believed the duty should have been 10c., because this corn had done immense injury to the Canadian farmer. Twenty years ago they had in this country 85 distilleries, every one fed with the coarse grains raised in this country: rye, barley, oats and pease. But, for a number of years, they had but six distilleries, which made more whiskey than the 85 formerly. What was the consequence? All the whiskey was made from United States Indian corn, which had entered without paying a cent of duty, while the Canadian farmer had to shell out 15c. for every bushel of barley he sent to the United States. They had no wheatland in some sections of Canada, but cultivated oats and pease, having also any quantity of land fit to raise rye. He supposed hon. gentlemen opposite knew a good deal about rye, or, at least, the whiskey that came from it. It entered largely into the manufacture of whiskey twenty years ago, when the farmer got 60c. to \$1 a bushel for it. The price, of late years, was about 40c. a bushel, not one bushel being raised now for every 1,000 formerly. Canadian coarse grains had been superseded by Indian corn from the United States, for which Canadians had been made hewers of wood and drawers of water. If the farmers were not attended to, and suffered, the mercantile, manufacturing and all other interests would suffer with them. Hon. gentlemen opposite had spoken of the tariff raising the prices of articles, but, as the member for Quebec had explained, a man earning good wages could better pay \$6 for a

barrel of flour than a man, poor and but partially employed, \$4 for a barrel. He had found some appropriate remarks on this subject in the *Farmer's Advocate*, which he would read:

"We have examined part of the tariff now proposed, and consider it the best tariff we have yet seen for building up the agricultural interest of the country. We must draw a line between the inferior productions of the States and our products. Canada can and does produce better beef, mutton, pork, wheat, oats, peas, barley, potatoes, apples, butter, and cheese than the United States. The Americans have been purchasing our best products and selling them as their own. They have also palmed off their inferior products under the name of Canadian products. The duty charged on most articles must tend to increase the value of our productions, and to put our produce in its true light in foreign markets. We shall thus be able to obtain better prices, and this means an enhancement of the value of every acre of productive land in this Dominion."

He did not know whether this paper was Free-trade or Protectionist, but he found its remarks correct. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite showed great inconsistency on the tariff question. For instance, the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), on the 9th of April last, proposed the following amendment to the motion of the then Finance Minister, Mr. Cartwright:

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved "That a large quantity of corn and oats having been imported into Canada during the last few years, this House is of opinion that the interests of Canadian farmers would be promoted by the imposition of a duty upon the importation of those products."

Last year he wanted Protection, but now he opposed it. The Finance Minister had brought forward a policy that would benefit every industry, and had he taken twelve months to mature it, instead of a few weeks, he would have deserved much credit for it. All should know that it was difficult to rearrange a tariff; it was not to be expected a Finance Minister should be thoroughly acquainted with every business in the country. He required the opinions of all trades, and also of the merchants. He had been told that the deputations to the Finance Minister had always left satisfied with their treatment, which, he understood, could not be said of those that had waited upon his predecessor. The hon. member

for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had drawn a fearfully dark picture of the condition of business in the United States; but he did not say that he found the depression in Canada so great, and prices so low that he had transferred his large lumber business to Michigan and was there operating; he had said he could make money there, but not in Canada. This hon. gentleman was as inconsistent as the member for Iberville, who, last year, moved for Protection, and this year condemned it. The ex-Finance Minister and hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had asked where was the change for the better in wages, stocks and other things since 17th September last? The member for South Brant, by his manner, reminded him (Mr. Rochester) of the action of a locomotive which he had seen trying to force its way through a snow-bank—snorting and plunging into the drift with great noise and violence. He understood that generals, in entering battle, cast about to see how, in case of need, they could retreat safely. Well, his hon. friend, as soon as he got aground, read from lists of the ayes and noes, for the past two or three Sessions, until he recuperated himself in the same manner as the man who was shovelling snow in front of the locomotive. He could not help thinking the hon. gentleman was like that locomotive, stuck hard in the snow drift, and that while he was reading the ayes and noes for the benefit of the House, he was recuperating for another dash. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), in his speech, put him (Mr. Rochester) in mind of an incident which occurred to him, some years ago, when he was up the river examining a timber limit. He was on snow shoes, and had a very high hill to ascend, and he found it fearfully difficult work ascending that hill. His hon. friend appeared to be very much in the same condition, when he tried to make a speech against the tariff, for it was evident that the hon. gentleman was speaking against the convictions of his own conscience. The hon. leader of the Opposition, and the hon. ex-Finance Minister, had admitted that they did not believe the present administration would ever bring down a Protective policy. But he had to congratulate these hon.

gentlemen, and the country might congratulate themselves, that men of ability, men who were capable of grappling with the questions of the day, men who were capable of remodelling the tariff and putting it into a shape that would benefit the country, had been returned to power; and the people might congratulate themselves that they would derive a large amount of benefit from the revision of the tariff. But, there was one thing, he thought, the hon. gentleman had missed, and he would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to it, as he thought it was a matter of vital importance to the country. The present tariff before the House gave protection to the agriculturist and to the manufacturer, but there was nothing said about the mercantile community. He proposed, although it was not a pleasant thing to do, to perform a duty which devolved upon him—owing to the fact of there being vipers in the Dominion of Canada that had been for a number of years, and were now, preying on the vitals of the commercial community of the Dominion. The men he alluded to were a bane and a curse to this country to-day. He referred to the commercial agencies of New York and Boston that operated in the Dominion of Canada. He proposed to bring before the House a petition on the subject, signed by the principle merchants in different parts of the Dominion, asking the Government for protection against these vipers. He believed two-thirds of the bankruptcies of the country were brought about by these blackmailers. These men would rate a man according to what he paid them. All a man had to do if he wanted to start business, was to go to one of the reporters of these mercantile agencies, and if he could give \$50, \$80 or \$100 for his book, he would get a rating accordingly. He would be prepared to lay before a Committee of this House, and he hoped the House would grant him a Committee, documents which would show that one concern alone paid these reporters, in a very short time, the sum of \$800 for their rating, which was \$500,000, and a few weeks afterwards they were in bankruptcy. He could also show that, in the four months of February, March, April and May of last year, men who were rated at from \$2,000

to \$750,000 failed for millions of dollars. He merely mentioned this now because they were on the subject of Protection, and because he considered that there was nothing in this country to-day that required action on the part of the Government more than these commercial agencies. A dishonest man, who could raise \$25 or \$50, could go to one of the commercial reporters he had referred to, and get a rating prior to starting business. He could then go to the wholesale merchant and buy goods, and refer him to the commercial agency. The merchant finds the man is rated at \$2,000, and he believes the report and delivers the goods. But that man started business with a view of seeing how much he could rob the merchant of. He paid small amounts for a few months, and then failed, offering a composition of 10c., 20c., or 25c., for what he should pay 100c. And this was all the fault of the commercial agencies. He would not longer detain the House upon this subject, because he proposed to present a petition asking that a law might be framed to put these men in the same position as other companies; as for instance, fire and life insurance companies, that would require them to make a certain deposit with the Government, take out a license, and, at the same time, have a sign over their doors stating what their business is, and offer facilities to any man to examine their books. This would be some protection. It would not be too much to say that millions of dollars were carried out of the Dominion to the United States every year by these commercial agencies. He was told that in New York, and other places, their residences were perfect palaces, and that some of the dwelling houses of the managers cost a million of money. If this was the case, should not these agencies be checked? He hoped that when he brought the subject up, the Government would take the matter in hand. Now most of the gentlemen who had spoken upon this question of the tariff had given their experience about the late elections, and he had a very interesting tale he could tell about the last general elections, as far as he was individually concerned. The then Ministers of the Crown had made themselves very busy at his election, which, of course, they had

a perfect right to do. He found no fault with that. He found fault with a Minister of the Crown trying to get all the employes of the Government who had votes in the county of Carleton to vote against him (Mr. Rochester). He did not expect that these gentlemen who had worked for years in order to get an election law that would do away with bribery and corruption would be the first to break them. But what occurred in his county? He had three opponents in his last contest, whom he would divide as two Conservatives and one Reformer. And there was one who styled himself as a Tory of the deepest water. The late Secretary of State got hold of that gentleman (Rev. J. May), and they all knew that hon. gentleman was a great manipulator. He manipulated this Tory of the deepest water until he pledged that, if he was elected for the county of Carleton, he would abandon Toryism and be a good Grit in the future, if the hon. gentleman would do certain things. Now he was told the hon. gentleman did do certain things, and these certain things were that he wanted money with which to pay his debts, and he wanted money with which to run the election. The hon. the Secretary of State told parties who called upon him that they had done this, and that they had given him money for these purposes. The Reform candidate, as honest a man as ever breathed, was Mr. John A. Grant. Mr. Grant came down here for the purpose of asking the Government to give him their support as the Government candidate. But the Secretary of State said: "No, Mr. Grant, we have taken hold of Rev. John May, and we cannot give up the Rev. John May." Mr. Grant said the Rev. John May was a Tory, to which the Secretary of State replied, "You know, Mr. Grant, the county of Carleton is not well enough educated to run a Grit candidate." He (Mr. Rochester) hoped it never would be educated so as to run a Grit candidate. After Mr. Grant and his friends left the office, the hon. gentleman sent after him and invited him back. He took Mr. Grant into his inside office and said, "Now, Mr. Grant, I want you to understand that everything that is said here is confidential. We must tell you then, that we cannot help you. We are bound to run the Rev. John May.

We cannot get rid of him ; and it is utterly impossible for you to gain the election against Rochester." But, while they could not give up the Rev. John May, they could do something else. The Secretary of State removed a newspaper from the table and displayed a pile of bills, and said, " Mr. Grant, we are willing to do anything we can." There was a nice pile of bills, but his unfortunate friend was too honest to take the bait. Under these circumstances, he was going to ask the Government for a Committee to inquire into this matter. He thought those men who had forfeited their positions as members of the Crown should be brought to book. One of the employés was sent out to the county of Carleton as deputy returning-officer. Who paid their salaries while they were out there? Who paid the salaries of the agents who were sent out to work for the Rev. John May, and against him (Mr. Rochester)? He thought this was something that ought to be brought to light, and for which any Government which would allow it should be brought to book. Then Mr. Jones, who took care of the Senate reading-room, was sent out as deputy returning-officer, and he did not know how many more. He knew that men from the Departments had been stationed at the doors of the different polling-booths, who pencilled down the name of every Civil Service employé who voted. Of course they could not tell how he voted, but they reported to headquarters those who had voted. Another gentleman, who occupied a position in one of the Departments, had two sons who worked very hard for the hon. the present President of the Council, and the late Secretary of State went to the Department to this gentleman, and told him that if he did not stop his sons working he would be dismissed from his office. Hon. gentlemen might talk about the United States, and to the victor belong the spoils ; but could anything be worse than what he had pointed out. It would be interesting to know where all the money came from that was used at that election. W. J. Wills, Emigrant Agent for the city of Ottawa, spent weeks in the county canvassing for the Rev. J. May, the Government candidate, and it was said that he held the position of treasurer for

MR. ROCHESTER.

the party. Now, what he (Mr. Rochester) wanted to know, and what the country wanted to know, was, who paid this man, with all the other employés of the Government, that spent so much of their time in the county previous to, and during the late election? He was told if they examined the pay sheet, they would find that all those gentlemen were paid their full time. Now, of course, he (Mr. Rochester) had not spent any money. Hon. gentlemen opposite were sure to believe that. But seriously, he could solemnly say that he had no agents nor committee, and he spent no money. During that election a large number of buggies ran between these offices and the five different villages surrounding the city, to carry Civil Service employés to the polls. He would like to know who paid for these buggies. Anybody who knew his friend, the late Secretary of State, knew that he could not do anything of the kind. He would like also to know who paid the wages of the men who were sent out by Ministers of the Crown to canvass the county for days and weeks previous to the election? He would like to know whether the public of the Dominion of Canada were going to pay men to go around canvassing and working for a man who happened to be a supporter of the Administration for the time being? If that was going to be the case, it had better be known. He would not trespass any longer upon the time of the House. He had collected a large amount of statistics, more especially regarding the lumber trade, with considerable trouble, but there had been so much in the way of figures already submitted to the House, that he would not weary the House. He would only add that he was, on the whole, satisfied with the tariff. He had not attempted to enter into the details of the tariff, as he had no hesitation in saying that many of them he knew very little about. He had only taken up the lumber interest which he was practically acquainted with. The hon. gentlemen opposite talked about the following on his side of the House. He could say that the supporters of the Government were proud of their position. He for one was proud to be a follower of the present Administration, and he thought he only expressed the

feeling of every member on his side of the House, when he said that they were proud of the men who occupied the Treasury benches; that the men who formed the present Government were competent to grapple with the great questions of the day. They had, to-day, no fly-on-the-wheel policy.

MR. METHOT said that, at this stage of the discussion, he had no intention of making a long speech; but he believed he owed it to himself, and to his constituency, to put before the House the attitude he wanted to assume in regard to this tariff. Having, for the ten years that he had been in public life, always fought strongly in favour of the principle of Protection, and having had the honour, during the last eighteen months, of being twice elected by overwhelming majorities over his opponents, who were strong Free-traders, he felt, whatsoever might be his feelings against some of the details of the present tariff, that he could not do otherwise than vote for the tariff *en bloc*, as it was now before Parliament. But, in the difficult circumstances in which they were now placed, he wanted it to be well understood that in casting this vote he did not desire it to be taken as a mark of confidence or non-confidence in the hon. gentlemen who now governed this country. He looked at this question from a stronger point of view. He thought it was one of those measures that they must deal with purely in the interest of the whole country, without considering who had brought it forward, or who was opposing it. He must, therefore, after having reserved his opinions, and mode of acting, until the details of this tariff came before the House, declare that he would support, with all his strength, the tariff as it was now before the House.

MR. ROGERS said the proposed tariff indicated a policy so completely at variance with his own views of sound political economy, so utterly inconsistent with the progressive tendencies of the world, and so prejudicial to all the vital interests of Canada, that it was not surprising that all who were not trammelled by election pledges or party alliances, should offer an earnest protest against the infliction. Although the injus-

tice of the measure would apply to the whole Dominion, no Province would feel it more keenly than New Brunswick, and no county in the Province more than Albert, which he had the honour of representing. He need not, therefore, apologise for expressing his dissent from the opinions of the Finance Minister, whatever might be his personal regard for that gentleman. He felt that he would ill discharge his duty if he did not rise, and, at least, in a few words, express his firm protest against an imposition of taxation so fatal to every interest of his constituents. Those interests were very diversified. They included five different classes — farming, lumbering, mining, shipping, and, to some extent, fishing. These interests were variously intermixed, and all were more or less dependent on each other. The division of labour had not reached such a state of perfection there as in the older Provinces. While the farmers of his county were dependent on the soil for their subsistence in the raising of a variety of products, their surplus consisted mostly of cattle and dairy products, hay, oats and potatoes. There was no import of these articles to speak of, and even a prohibition of foreign farm products would not help their prices. Much of their products were sold in Boston, New York, and other American cities, thus giving employment to coasting vessels, which could only carry such cargoes at low rates with a prospect of return freights of cornmeal, flour, coal and other merchandise, and any restriction on this trade would at once injure the farming interest by the increased cost of importation, while the advance on all the necessaries of life which the farmer must buy would add greatly to their present depressed condition. Flour and meal, so far as required, would be higher at certain seasons, when the advantage of an overstocked New York market, combined with a nominal rate of freight, could be secured. They imported a large quantity of cornmeal, the duty on which must add to their taxation. By comparing the imports into New Brunswick, of last year, which were 65,919 bbls., it would be found the duty would be \$26,367, while the duty on the corn imported would be \$1,673, making in all \$28,040. Sugar also, and even tea, would be found

to cost the Dominion more when importers were restricted in their choice of markets. Furniture and agricultural implements, iron goods, boots and shoes, and clocks, were already sufficiently protected, and would be made dearer for the farmer as well as all the other classes of his constituents. The lumbermen, already borne down with a depressed market, would have to pay more for supplies, as had been clearly shown by hon. members on his side of the House who had preceded him, and which, notwithstanding other opinions expressed, still remained substantially uncontradicted, and higher freights on exports, if they continued business at all. The same would apply to mining, in which he might include the shipping of albertite coal, calcined plaster, gypsum, freestone, and the other products of that section of the Province. Under this tariff, labourers could not subsist on the wages heretofore paid them, their food and clothing being so heavily taxed, and, as before remarked, the small class of vessels which carried these exports to the United States markets must, of necessity, advance the freight rates or go at once out of employment. The tariff, as submitted by the hon. the Finance Minister, did not specify what was to be the system by which drawbacks were to be secured to shipbuilders. He hoped that the Finance Minister would so define it that the shipbuilder might be able to estimate the amount of the drawback before taking a contract. The article of cordage was made subject to a higher duty, and this was a burden that he thought should not have been imposed, as it not only affected the shipbuilder, but the sailing of vessels, from the largest ship to the smallest fishing boat that hugged their shores in search of a livelihood. And, though anchors, cables, oakum, foreign woods and salt were admitted free as before, he failed to find any compensating advantages for the greatly increased cost of living to the workmen employed. Those considerations in addition to the general restrictions of trade and commerce, clearly indicated, whether designedly or not, a blow at this staple industry, which had done so much to place "this Canada of ours" in a very proud position among the nations of the world. It was well known how a per-

MR. ROGERS.

icious Protective system had, by adding to the cost of construction notwithstanding their many advantages, reduced the mercantile marine of the United States, so that to-day only about one quarter of the exports of the great Republic were carried under their own flag. Was it wise, was it patriotic that our onward march to supremacy on the seas should be checked and embarrassed by such an anomalous and partial method of raising the revenue? As had been correctly pointed out by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) and others, the fine articles of commerce, the ornaments and the luxuries of the rich were subject to less duty than the necessities of the poor and those in moderate circumstances. The chinaware and the broadcloths were admitted at a lower rate than the stoneware and the coarser tweeds and cloths. Then, again, the complicated nature of the tariff was a serious objection. They had *ad valorem* duties and specific—specific as to quantity, specific as to quality, specific as to size, and specific as to weight. All these would tend to embarrass and press unduly on the small importer, and must tend to concentrate the trade in the hands of the great mercantile houses, so that the competition essential to the good of the consumer would be checked. The tendency must be to centralise the importing business in the large cities, to the serious loss and detriment of the Maritime Provinces. As had been most truly said, the rich man would, by an Act of Parliament, be made richer still, and the poor man poorer still. The worst system of the United States system might arise. Lobbyists and rings of manufacturers, who could well afford to part with a percentage of their ill-gotten gains, would be enriched by successful political log-rolling, and would, in turn, protect and assist a Government which would continue to wrest for them the hard-earned savings of the poor. The hon. member for King's must have startled the House with the intelligence that the duty on tea was reduced two cents per pound, and he (Mr. Rogers) thought it would be interesting to his (Mr. Domville's) constituents, as well as the House, to know how such a desirable consummation was to be obtained under the present tariff. For, notwithstanding the desire of the members opposite to im-

press the country with the idea that they were going to give the country a free breakfast table, none of them had gone so far as the hon. member for King's. He (Mr. Donville) had also told the House it would not cost New Brunswick anything more for coal. He (Mr. Rogers) found by the trade returns that that Province imported 21,240 tons of anthracite coal from the United States, and 4,502 tons of bituminous coal. It was only fair to say that New Brunswick would have to pay duty upon coal to the amount of \$12,000 to \$15,000. He (Mr. Rogers) thought that the hon. member was equally unhappy in his reference to the shipbuilding industry of New Brunswick, when he spoke of it as "a little shipbuilding." Be that as it might, he (Mr. Rogers) thought shipbuilding was to the Maritime Provinces what the wheat-growing fields of the West were to them. He begged to dissent from this estimate. He found, on comparison with the United States, which had ten times our population, that the Dominion had about one-third of as much registered tonnage as they possessed. It was one of the links of the great carrying trade, which, with the railway and canal system, conveyed the products of Canada to a market in the Mother Country. That hon. gentleman had also attempted to show that in New Brunswick they paid less for certain articles now than they paid before the Union, and that their per capita tax had been lessened in that way. He had stated that in 1866 the price of flour was \$10.50, while molasses and sugar were also higher than now. Had he taken the trouble to go a little further back, he would have found some very different facts. He (Mr. Rogers) would give some quotations from the prices as shown by the *St. John Morning News* of the 5th November, 1862. Flour was then quoted at from \$5.75 to \$6; molasses 26c. to 30c.; sugar 7½c. to 8½c.; deal freights to Liverpool, 75s. to 77s. 6d., and deals were quoted in Liverpool at £7 17s. 6d. per standard, while to-day freights were 55s. to 60s., and deals £5 10s. to £6 per standard. This went to show that Confederation had very little to do with the prices which were controlled by the larger markets of the world. The same member had also stated that this

was not a cast-iron tariff, but would be tried for twelve months. He (Mr. Rogers) hoped it was not a cast-iron tariff, and that the Finance Minister would consent to its being modified in Committee so as to meet the requirements of the Maritime Provinces. He predicted, if it should remain as at present before the House, that, notwithstanding the many bands of Protection which its promoters had encircled it with, the very first time the electors of this country had a chance of pronouncing their views upon it, they would declare that it was not in accordance with their views.

MR. TROW said he had listened to the debate with a great deal of attention, and had failed to find any plausible or reasonable excuse given by the advocates of Protection, why any large proportion of the population should be taxed for the express benefit of a few. He considered it was the interest and duty of all Governments to legislate for the many and not for the few, to do the greatest possible good to the greatest possible number. Hon. gentlemen opposite were somewhat intolerant in their remarks, with reference to the elections of the 17th September last; some of them even asserting the doctrine that the people had decided the matter at the polls, and the House had no right to discuss the subject at all. He believed the elections were carried in many ridings by misrepresentation and deceit. In his section of Ontario the matter was not brought up in such a manner as represented here; but only a revision of the tariff was contemplated, not an increase of taxation upon every conceivable article used, from ten to fifteen per cent. higher than before. In looking over the returns of that "glorious victory," of which they had heard so much, he found that very little change in the electoral vote would have made a wonderful change; the party with whom he was identified would have remained in power. He could point to twenty-five hon. members, supporters of the Administration, the total of whose united majorities would not amount to one-half the majority of his hon. friend from North Oxford, and yet these gentlemen would boast that they represented the people. He found that the hon. member for Cornwall was returned by 38; the

hon. member for Halton by 18 ; the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville by 34 ; the hon. member for North Middlesex by 8 ; the hon. member for Niagara by 2 ; the hon. member for South Norfolk by 17 ; the hon. member for East Peterboro' by 26 ; the hon. member for Prescott by 4 ; the hon. member for Centre Wellington, the farmers' friend, by 6 ; the hon. member for North York by 10 ; the hon. member for Portneuf by 1. Others in Nova Scotia, Conservatives, were returned by very small majorities : the hon. member for Queen's with 18, and the hon. member for Annapolis by 9. Twenty-five Government supporters, with their united majorities, would only make 630 votes. It was evident that, if a change of a few votes in the whole Dominion had taken place, the members of the Government would be on the other side of the House. He might mention that it was by mere accident that the Finance Minister was here. His majority was 9, and under protest, and, if he appeared again before his constituents, those who knew the situation informed him that there would, in all probability, be 900 majority against him. The hon. member for Niagara condemned the policy of the late Government, in regard to the construction of the Pacific Railway, stating that they had commenced at both ends, leaving a gap unfinished in the centre, that the road was totally useless until the centre was completed. He should have considered the lay of the country, the engineering difficulties to encounter, and the impossibility of constructing that work, unless at both ends, making facilities as the work progressed to carry in necessary materials. The same hon. gentleman had condemned the late Government in their immigration policy, stating that they had been the means of driving emigrants into the United States. The hon. gentleman should consider that in 1872, while the hon. the present leader was in power, there passed through Canada into the United States 52,608 emigrants, and only 36,579 remained in these Provinces. In 1873, 49,059 passed through Canada into the United States, and those landed here 50,050. The following was the result of the next five

years, during the administration of the late Government :—

	Passed into the United States.	Remained in Canada.
In 1874.....	40,649	39,373
1875.....	9,204	27,382
1876.....	10,916	25,632
1877.....	5,640	27,076
1878.....	11,226	29,807

Showing that during the years 1872 and 1873, while his leader, the right hon. member for Victoria, was in power, 24,022 more emigrants passed through Canada into the United States than in the next five years. What was the policy of this Government in reference to emigration ? He was informed that the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration had abandoned the scheme, and dismissed his emigration agents in Europe. If such were the case, he regretted it very much, because now was our opportunity to take advantage of the depression which existed in Great Britain among the tenant farmers of that country, and induce them to settle in this Dominion, where they could procure the fee simple town estate for the rental of a farm in Great Britain for one year. The hon. member for Cardwell seemed to think there was prosperity at present, even in the United States. He would wish it were so. Does the hon. gentleman know there were at present thousands out of employment ; that there were half a million clamouring for bread in Boston and other cities of the American Union ? Our commercial relations being so closely identified with that of the United States, it was natural to suppose that we should suffer in consequence of that great financial panic that swept over that great country. He (Mr. Trow) believed that it was beyond the power of any Government to bring about prosperity by any such policy as now proposed. Could the people be enriched by taxing the large majority for the benefit of the few ? If the taxes fell equally on all, it might be supposed that the Government was anxious to do what was fair and right. Would any one be uncandid enough to say that the farming interests had received any consideration, further than increasing their burdens ? What had been done to benefit them ? Had not his taxes been increased, by higher duties on every article he used ? The

labouring man and lumberman, who, with the farmers, produced most of the wealth of the country, had also been entirely ignored. Depression occasionally afflicted all nations, and the United States had been more severely visited than Canada. They had had many years of prosperity, during which hon. gentlemen opposite should have husbanded the resources of the country, and have been less reckless in undertaking costly works of great magnitude; the public debt would not then have been increased so much nor the present troubles felt so keenly. They had prosperous times during and after the American war. All our surplus stock and produce was taken at good prices, labour was in great demand, followed by a railroad mania, which was encouraged by the Government. Many millions were thus spent, causing the people to imagine they were exceedingly wealthy, when their means largely consisted of borrowed money—in imaginary wealth. In Ontario alone about \$20,000,000 was expended on new railways, the promoters obtaining bonuses and floating bonds extensively. The whole system of the country was rotten to the core. The country suffered from a partial failure of crops two or three seasons in succession, and the natural reaction took place. The Dominion and Provincial Governments having to meet the payment of interest on their borrowed loans, a reaction took place. The public feeling was anxious for a change, thousands foolishly entertaining the idea that the Government could grant them some measure of relief. To add to our misfortunes, the wholesale merchants imported enormous quantities of goods for years, amounting in four or five years to over \$100,000,000 worth more than the legitimate wants of the country required. Irresponsible persons were allowed unlimited credit; merchants' agents were pushing sales all over the country; thousands of farmer's sons left the farm and entered into business without experience, the result being financial failure. Bankruptcy goods were sold by the official assignee at sacrifice prices, and others trying to carry on a legitimate business were dragged down, hundreds failing in consequence. At the elections last fall—in regard to which he never knew the people to be more deceived—min-

isters had been accused of deceiving the electors; at all events, different versions of the Protective policy were given in different parts of the country. The character of the speeches made depended very materially upon the geographical positions of the localities visited. It was wrong to accuse the late Government of a Free-trade policy; their tariff was 17½ per cent. for revenue, which gave enough protection and encouragement to any legitimate business. The manufacturers had come to Ottawa, however, from various parts of the Dominion, with selfish motives, and created a hue-and-cry about the slaughter of goods in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite complained that goods were manufactured in the United States 50 per cent. cheaper than could be here. Why should Canadians be deprived of obtaining them so much cheaper than the home manufactured articles? Were not cheap goods a benefit to those who purchased? With regard to the complaints of their market being glutted with American goods, he thought that much of the goods exhibited in one part of the country as American, came from some other part of the country where there was over-production. A large quantity of furniture, manufactured in Guelph, had been sold in Toronto as American, because it had a good name. He had no faith in the policy of the present Administration, nor had he any faith that it would work well or prove beneficial. Ministers evidently had no faith in it themselves, as they were making changes in the tariff continually. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) had said that if it did not work well, not "he," but "we" would abandon it in a year. Some 30 or 40 changes had been already made since it was brought down. A deputation from Huron, representing the salt interests, were told they would be protected, but had discovered, after returning home, that 8c. a bushel did not suit their interests, they having expected that all foreign salt would be prohibited, and that they could supply our fishermen with 3,000,000, or 4,000,000 bushels which we now principally brought out in ballast and sold much cheaper than the Goderich salt could possibly be supplied. The deputation anticipated that the

30,000 or 40,000 fishermen of the Maritime Provinces would be compelled to buy from them. They imagined that vessels would bring coal to the West from Nova Scotia and return to it and New Brunswick with cargoes of salt. But they found themselves entirely mistaken, and that all the salt excluded by the present tariff was but 5,000 to 6,000 bushels that entered Ontario from the States. He understood, from a member of the deputation that the salt interest was seriously injured by the new tariff, at least 10c. per barrel, by the tax put upon coal. The coal tax was very objectionable, and would be severely felt by the poor in all the towns and cities in Ontario—a direct tax of \$350,000 per annum, and it is doubtful if one ton more will be brought from Nova Scotia. The geographical position of Ontario prevented that, unless under a tariff of \$1.50 per ton. The milling interest had also been injured. He had received a letter a few days ago from one of his constituents, a miller, who could manufacture 2,800 bushels of oats per day. During last year he purchased 550,000 bushels of oats, and shipped to Glasgow and Liverpool 52,000 barrels of oatmeal. All that he could purchase in the various little towns and districts adjacent during the year was 90,000 bushels of oats, and he was under the necessity of purchasing 460,000 bushels from the United States. This miller employed a certain number of men; the railways were also employed, and the shipping interests must have made a profit. Were they to do away with that business and carrying trade merely to gratify a few selfish individuals, who thought a change in the fiscal policy of the Government would be to their interest? He wrote him (Mr. Trow) that he had shut down his mill, as it was utterly impossible to purchase enough oats, within any reasonable distance, to keep his mill at work. He found that it would be better to remove his mill to the other side of the line, which he contemplated doing, as he could thence ship direct to Liverpool. It seemed to him (Mr. Trow) very unreasonable that hon. gentlemen opposite should strike thus at the carrying trade, after the country had spent millions to secure it, in improving the canal and river navigation. When these millions were expended, and the

MR. TROW.

works almost ready to tap this western trade, a check was suddenly put upon the enterprise; for no one could pretend that we would now be able to compete with American lines for the carrying trade. Let hon. gentlemen remember that, in obstructing the prosperity of the Grand Trunk, Great Western and other public thoroughfares, and debarring them from the foreign carrying trade—and consequently our freight charges would be increased—they were also robbing the widows and orphans of Great Britain, who contributed towards their construction, thousands of whom had their capital invested in these great thoroughfares, and were depending upon their dividends for their means of support. It was not supposed, during the late contest, even by Conservatives, that the Government would undertake any radical change in the fiscal policy of this country. Some supposed there would be some change, but no one expected the sweeping changes the Government proposed. We had an illustration of the effects of Protection in the United States. It was well-known that manufacturing rings were formed in that country, which controlled legislation to their own ends and selfish purposes, and the result was that a false stimulus was given manufacturing industries, which tended to attract the inhabitants from other avocations into manufacturing enterprises. Hundreds and thousands of young men were attracted from the farms into towns and cities, the result of which was over-production, and wrought great ruin to the country. The tariff of the United States was pretty well-known. He would read from a speech made by Mr. S. S. Cox, in the United States Congress, which would give an idea of how the farmer in the United States enjoyed the benefit of Protection:—

“The farmer starting to his work has a shoe put on his horse with nails taxed at 67 per cent., driven with a hammer taxed 54 per cent., cuts a stick with a knife taxed 50 per cent., hitches his horses to a plough taxed 50 per cent., with chains taxed 67 per cent. He returns to his home at night and lays his weary limbs on a sheet taxed 58 per cent., and covers himself with a blanket that has paid a tax of 250 per cent. He rises in the morning, puts on his humble flannel shirt taxed 80 per cent., his coat taxed 50 per cent., his shoes taxed 35 per cent., and hat taxed 70 per cent., opens family worship with a Bible taxed 36

per cent., and kneels to his God on a carpet taxed 250 per cent., sits down to take his humble meal from a plate taxed 40 per cent., with a knife and fork taxed 35 per cent.; drinks his cup of coffee with sugar taxed 70 per cent.; seasons his food with salt taxed 130 per cent.; pepper 297 per cent., and spice 397 per cent.; he looks around on his wife and children all taxed in the same way, takes a chew of tobacco taxed 100 per cent., and leans back in his chair and thanks his stars that he lives in the freest and best Government under heaven."

If taxation was a benefit, why not put on more? Why not put $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on corn, instead of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If the Americans were going to pay these \$2,000,000 of increased revenue, why not make them pay \$4,000,000? Our object was, according to the hon. Finance Minister's statement, to make money. If they had made millions out of us, why not retaliate and endeavour to get a few millions out of them? His own impression was that the consumer under almost all, and every circumstance, would pay the duty under this tariff. For illustration, he would mention a gentleman in his Riding, a Conservative, engaged in the milling business, and who was in the habit of getting two car-loads of corn each week, amounting to 600 or 700 bushels. That gentleman was strongly in favour of Protection during the last election. He stated now that he had not the slightest conception, when the tariff was increased on corn, that he would have to pay the duty. He found now that it made a difference of from \$50 to \$60 per week on his transactions. He now condemned the policy of the Administration, and if he had another chance to vote, he would cheerfully vote for him (Mr. Trow). In the United States the result of the Protective policy had been wide-spread ruin, and tens of thousands of working-men were out of employment. Canada suffered from this state of things in the United States, in the great number of tramps that came over to this country. Some hon. gentlemen said the tramp nuisance was owing to the indiscretion of our emigration agents. It was nothing of the kind. During the last five years not a single emigrant had been induced to come out here who was not able and willing to work. He regretted exceedingly that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture had not seen his way to do something this

year to promote immigration. That hon. gentleman had done much in years past in this direction, and the Mennonite settlement in Manitoba was a monument to his efforts in this respect. Thousands more of the same class were now anxious to come from Southern Russia, if the Government would do anything to encourage them. It was bad policy on the part of the Government to put any obstacle in the way of immigration. When he was urging upon the late Government to be more liberal in emigration matters, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture was the only one of the then Opposition that gave him any assistance in his efforts. Now was the proper time to "attract emigrants to our shores, in order to fill up our fertile western plains. Thousands of the best class of settlers were anxious to leave Russia now, on account of political troubles. Other nations were endeavouring to attract emigration to their shores. Australia had over a hundred emigration agents in the old country. The Australian Government gave emigrants \$100 per head, while our Government only gave them \$5. He had no doubt the tariff would stimulate manufacturing interests for a time, but its ultimate results would be the same here as in the United States. He believed the Finance Minister had been so pestered and troubled by the demands of the manufacturers, that he had finally become desperate, and forgot all about the great class of consumers in this country. We found, already, in this country that many branches of business were suffering from home competition, and the new tariff would only make matters worse. In reference to the furniture business it was hard on the poor man to make him pay 35 per cent. on his furniture, for the sake of benefitting a few individuals. Very little furniture was imported from the United States, and there was no kind of reason in putting on this duty.

MR. PLUMB: How much do we import, \$200,000 worth?

MR. TROW asked the hon. gentleman if he knew. That hon. gentleman professed to be so well informed that he had earned for himself the title of "general purpose individual." He was a jack-in-the-box, who jumped up on all conceiv-

able occasions, no matter what subject was under discussion. He (Mr. Trow) regretted to see that the hon. the Minister of Finance had been driven to such desperation by the manufacturers, that he had overlooked his own Province. Although that hon. gentleman had been honoured with high positions in that Province, he had apparently neglected its interest, and placed heavy burdens on its people, according to the testimony of nearly all the members from that Province. He (Mr. Trow) had intended to give some figures with reference to the imports and exports of the different cereals, but that subject had already been so well treated that he would defer that portion of his remarks for another occasion.

MR. COUGHLIN said he would not have spoken on this question were it not that an attack had been made upon his constituency, North Middlesex. The hon. member (Mr. Trow) who had just taken his seat, had referred to the small majority by which the last election was carried in that Riding. But when he (Mr. Coughlin) stated that he now represented a constituency that had been accustomed to give 800 majority to the Reform party, this House would understand the change that had taken place in that Riding in favour of Protection. This question had been fully discussed in the western part of Ontario, and the people understood what they were voting for. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House had tried to make it appear that this tariff meant Protection to the manufacturers, and heavier taxes to the farmers. As a farmer, representing an agricultural constituency, he felt it to be his duty to say that he believed this tariff would benefit the agriculturists more than it would the manufacturers. He (Mr. Coughlin) thought he had got figures before him, taken from last year's returns compiled under the late Mackenzie Administration, which would prove it, and would show the necessity that had existed for agricultural protection. For instance, we imported 302,147 bushels of barley, value \$137,243—American duty, at the rate of 15c. per bushel, \$45,322, was an advantage to the American farmers, on barley alone. According to the present

proposed tariff the Canadian farmer would now enjoy the same protection. He found that we imported 2,162,229 bushels of oats of the value of \$651,441—American duty at 10c. per bushel, \$216,222; our farmers will now be protected to an equal extent. The amount of corn imported was \$7,387,507 bushels, at a value of \$3,535,619—American duty, \$738,750; under the Mackenzie tariff the duty on this staple product of the soil was nil; while under the proposed tariff the duty of 7½c. per bushel would produce a revenue of \$554,063, and would furnish so much additional protection and encouragement to the farmers of Canada. He would now call the attention of the House to the question of wheat, on which a good deal had been said. The impression on the other side of the House was that we had exported more wheat than we had imported. He wanted to tell the House and country that such was not the case, and he defied contradiction. We imported \$5,635,411 bushels of wheat, at a value of \$6,510,148—a 20 per cent. duty on that, which was the American duty, gave them \$1,127,082; under the proposed tariff, with a duty of 15c. a bushel, the Canadian farmer will receive \$45,311, by way of protection on wheat against his American rival. Then we imported 146,823 bushels of rye, at a value of \$77,398—American duty at 15c. a bushel, \$22,023; proposed duty at 10c. a bushel, \$14,682. Pease and beans, imported, 9,589 bushels, at a value of \$18,729—American duty, \$958; under proposed tariff, \$958. From this it will be seen that the total importation of grain was 15,643,706 bushels, of the value of \$10,630,578. The American duty on that amount would be \$2,150,367; under the proposed tariff a duty of \$1,676,628 would be imposed on these grains, and our farmers would receive a protection to that amount against American grains, where the Mackenzie tariff left them at the mercy of the American farmers, who competed with them on equal terms in our own market, and, at the same time, enjoyed a high degree of protection at home. Turning to the article of flour, about which so much had been said, he (Mr. Coughlin) found that we had last year imported 314,520 barrels, valued at \$1,866,101.

American duty, at 20 per cent., would amount on this article to \$373,220; under our proposed tariff of 50c. per barrel, the duty would be \$157,260. Of rye flour, we had imported 1,883 barrels, valued at \$3,655—American duty of 10 per cent., \$865; proposed duty, at 50c. per barrel, \$941. Indian meal, imported, 226,850 barrels, of the value of \$619,380, on which 10 per cent. to American duty would amount to \$61,938, while the proposed duty of 40c. a barrel would amount to \$90,742. Of oatmeal, we had imported 2,949 barrels, of the value of \$22,226, on which the American duty amounted to \$2,949; this would be the same under the new tariff. Of ground grains, flour, meal, etc., as would be seen from the foregoing figures, we imported 546,202 barrels, of the value of \$2,516,362, on which, under the Mackenzie Government, there was no duty, though the American duty was \$438,972; the proposed tariff would give us on ground grains, a protection of \$251,892. And now, coming to meats, of which there is a large importation, we find that of pork alone we imported last year 10,248,020 pounds, at a value of \$640,696—the American duty of 1c. per pound, amounted to \$102,480; the increased duty, under this tariff was scarcely worth noting, except for the purpose of urging that it should be further increased. Of hams and bacon, we imported 2,825,169 pounds, valued at \$220,945—the American duty, at 2c. a pound, would be \$56,503, and our proposed duty the same; while the duty, under the Mackenzie Administration, was only half that amount. In regard to the article of beef, we had imported 513,782 pounds, valued at \$31,792—American duty of 1c. a pound \$5,137, and proposed duty the same. Lard, imported, 2,345,807 pounds, valued at \$213,603—American duty of 2c. a pound, \$46,916; proposed duty the same, but only half that amount under the late Government. We had imported mutton from the Americans to the extent of 5,473 pounds, of the value of \$339—American duty, \$54; proposed duty the same. The total amount of meats imported from the Americans was 15,938,251 pounds, valued at \$1,107,375—American duty, \$211,090; proposed Canadian duty, \$211,090, and under the late Government, \$159,380.

He (Mr. Coughlin) would now take up the stock importations. We imported 1,587 horses, valued at \$60,458—American duty, at 20 per cent., \$12,091; proposed Canadian duty, at the same rate, \$12,091; Mackenzie duty, at 10 per cent., \$6,045. Of cattle, we had imported 5,120 head, valued at \$83,471—American duty, at 20 per cent., \$16,691; new Canadian duty the same; under the Mackenzie Administration the duty, at 10 per cent., would be \$8,347. Of sheep, we imported 10,506, of the value of \$20,444—American duty of 20 per cent., \$4,088; new Canadian tariff the same; but under the Mackenzie Government only half that amount. Of swine, we had imported 14,704 head, valued at \$116,922—American duty, at 20 per cent., \$23,384; under our proposed duty, \$23,384; while under the late Government only half that amount was imposed. The total value of stock imported was \$211,295—the American duty being \$56,257; the proposed duty under the new tariff, \$56,257; under the late Government the duty would be \$28,128, or only half the amount now proposed. He (Mr. Coughlin) thought that the farmers had reason to congratulate themselves on the change of Government, and on the realisation of the promises made to them by the Conservative leaders during the late political campaign. He found that the total value of the grain, flour, meal, pork, beef, animals, etc., imported from the Americans during the preceding year, to compete in our home market with our Canadian farmers, amounted to \$14,835,610, upon which, before entering the American market, the Canadian farmers would have to pay duty to the amount of \$2,856,686. Under the new tariff our farmers would be protected to the extent of \$2,195,867, where, under the late Administration, they only had a protection of \$187,508, while the late Government gave the farmers a protection of a fraction over one per cent. The proposed duty would, on the foregoing farm products, give about 15 per cent. protection, the American protection on the same amounting to about 18 per cent. The farmers were now protected by the present tariff about twelve times more than they were under that of the late Administration. Manufacturers had twice the protection they had under the

late Administration, and yet gentlemen opposite said, "this was a Protection in the interests of the manufacturers only." He (Mr. Coughlin) thought the subject had been pretty well discussed, both before and since the elections. As far as the western part of Ontario was concerned, he was happy to say that they were pretty well satisfied with this tariff. There were several items he would like to see changed. He would like to see the duty on pork increased to two cents a pound. That was the wish of his constituents, and it was his wish. He would also like to see a duty on wool. There was a large amount of wool imported into this country. He would also like to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to the value of stock imported into this country, and the value of stock exported. He found that, in regard to horses, that the average value per head imported was \$38, and that the average value per head exported was \$90; and cattle imported, valued at \$16 per head, while our exported cattle were valued at an average of \$38 per head. Knowing practically something of the value of the stock imported, he (Mr. Coughlin) believed that they were entered for Customs duty at less than one-half their actual value, and he was of opinion that the same scale of valuation had been practised upon many of our other imports. He thought there was something wrong here, and he begged to again call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Customs to the fact. Taking the tariff as a whole, he (Mr. Coughlin) felt that the people of the country, especially the practical farmers, had reason to congratulate themselves on the change of Government. While desirous that increased duties should have been imposed on pork and wool, to which he had just referred, he (Mr. Coughlin) intended to support the tariff as a whole, in the hope that the Finance Minister would see his way, next year, to give further encouragement to the farmers in this respect, and felt that he was discharging his duty to the intelligent electors who had honoured him with their confidence, by endorsing the National Policy.

MR. GUNN said the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) had alluded to the

MR. COUGHLIN.

China trade, and congratulated the House on the service that cry had rendered gentlemen opposite. He regretted that he could not congratulate the merchants in that trade, as they suffered heavy losses. Tea costing 40c. and 50c. had to be sold at 25c. and 30c., leaving losses of 40 per cent. It was an unfair cry raised against the late Government that the differential duty of 10 per cent. against tea imported from the United States would have protected direct importations from loss. Not only in Canada but in England and the United States immense losses were made. The largest and oldest firms there, as well as in the East, in the China trade, had to succumb during the last four years. It was well known that the losses had been enormous. Wealthy bankers and merchants of long standing had lost all they possessed in the trade. The only people who could be congratulated upon the results of the China trade were the consumers of this country; they had been benefitted by getting cheap tea. Canada's proportion of the whole tea trade was not more than about 4 per cent.—a very small fraction indeed. London headed the list, and New York came second. These markets very largely supplied the tea used in this country, and often at a less rate even than it could be purchased in China. His hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) had said he received a letter from a gentleman in New York, who had gone there because the late Government had cancelled the ten per cent. differential duty. He (Mr. Gunn) could tell that hon. gentleman that the 10 per cent. duty was not the cause of his correspondent's leaving for New York, but it was because he imported too largely, and brought disaster upon himself, and was forced to seek new fields for his labour. If that fact was not known to the hon. gentleman, it ought to have been known to him before he came to this House with such information as he gave. He (Mr. Gunn) maintained that no Government could have averted the distress that had overtaken the commercial world, as that was impossible, and he very much feared that the policy of the present Administration would have very bad effects. The taxation that the people had already to bear was as heavy as they could stand, and

yet the hon. the Finance Minister had thought proper to impose additional taxation almost equal to a war tax.

AN HON. GENTLEMAN: It is a war tax.

MR. GUNN said it was equal to a war tax on the people beyond any doubt. Sugar, one of the most important articles in our trade, was proposed to be subjected to a most enormous Protective duty. During fifteen years prior to Confederation, we had no less than nine different tariffs, a tariff for nearly every year and a half. They all knew how distressing it was to everybody to have these continual changes in the tariff. During the last eleven years they had a permanent tariff, as far as sugar was concerned, with the exception of 1875, when a quarter of a cent a pound was deducted off refining grades, and one quarter of a cent was a large protection to the refiners. Taking into account the then consumption, it was equal to \$250,000. Surely that was sufficient protection for any industry. Prior to 1868, the refiners had a monopoly of this trade, and it had given great dissatisfaction throughout the country. That dissatisfaction became so great that, when the House met in 1868, it was considered of sufficient importance to receive the serious attention of the Government, and he believed prominent men engaged in the trade were called upon by the then Administration, and consulted. He (Mr. Gunn) was not in the country at the time, but understood the question was considered with a good deal of care and thought; they found the existing tariff too one-sided, it was all in favour of the refiner, and against the consumer, and against the importers. After a good deal of discussion, an arrangement of the tariff was effected, which was supposed to be satisfactory to the refiners and to the importers. It was considered the fairest settlement that could be arrived at. The tariff, as then readjusted, lasted seven years, and gave satisfaction to everybody, as far as he could understand. In 1875, the refiners insisted on getting more protection, and the result was the imposition of the additional one-quarter of a cent per pound he had already mentioned. The trade in 1868 was only

57,000,000 pounds of sugar, with 9,000,000 pounds cane juice, on which a duty of \$1,280,000 was paid; but last year it rose to 109,000,000 pounds, with a duty of \$2,600,000, which showed that the trade had nearly doubled in eleven years, under a permanent tariff. He believed that the tariff under the late Government, with all its faults, if left alone, would yield sufficient means for the requirements of the country. He thought it was a most serious thing to interfere with a tariff that had doubled the sugar trade in eleven years. The effect of that tariff had been, not only to double the quantity of sugar brought into the country, but to double the revenue besides, and the people had been supplied with cheaper and purer sugar than ever before. Any head of a family, or any housekeeper in the country, could tell the House that they never had cheaper or better sugar than when the late tariff was in operation. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said that less sugar was used than was consumed during that year the refinery closed. It was in 1876 when 114,000,000 pounds were entered, with a duty of \$2,250,000. The difference was owing to the lower grade that came that year, with a lower duty, against the higher grades that came last year, as the 109,000,000 pounds of 1878 was equivalent in saccharine to more weight than the 114,000,000 pounds of 1876, and paid \$320,000 more duty. So far he had given figures in round numbers, but he would now state actual figures taken from the Trade and Navigation tables for the two years: 1876, quantity 114,051,176, duty, \$2,217,878; 1878, quantity, 108,951,920, duty 2,567,803. This showed that the higher grades paid more duty than the lower grades. The hon. member for Cardwell told the House, by reading an extract from Wells, and he (Mr. Gunn) believed he was correct, that it would cost a cent per pound to refine sugar; and on that cent the duty had to be paid on the refined article coming into the country. This duty, under the late tariff, averaged 45 per cent., equal to 45c. per 100 pounds. There was surely alone protection enough, amounting to, on last year's importations, \$199,500, at the rate under the late tariff. How many business men in the country would be

glad to get one-tenth of that protection? Why should any one firm try to get so much protection on an item of so much necessity to the people? Sugar was indispensable, and must be had by every family, rich or poor. The right hon. leader of the Government said he was in favour of free sugar, and he (Mr. Gunn) had always hoped to see it free, but it could not come in free so long as it was necessary to assist in raising revenue from it; but if sugar had to be taxed it should be taxed equitably, so as to draw, if possible, every cent of the duty into the Treasury; it should not be taxed to divert that tax, or any part of it, into the hands of a few refiners at a loss to the taxpayers. It really required very few men to refine the whole quantity required. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had given statistics from all parts of the world in reference to the refining of sugar, and has shown that 269 men, with new and improved machinery, would be sufficient to refine a full supply for this Dominion. The highest estimate he had before was 500 men. There was no time lost in producing the refined from the raw. It could be brought in to-day and within another day or two it was ready for market. It did not lock up capital like other industries that employed so many more men. Take the tanner, waiting six months before he could get returns from his hides, and then a long credit on his leather. He had no objection to a small protection—if they must protect the refiner, say $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—and many firms doing a large business would be satisfied with that. As the tariff was proposed on sugar now, it appeared difficult to tell what protection was given; but, taking the estimate of the hon. the Finance Minister at 120,000,000lb. on low grade sugars for the coming year's consumption, and he did not think it would be any less, that quantity, at the present, free on board, value of raw, would pay only \$1,560,000 duty. This tariff appeared to be framed so as to give the whole benefit to the refiners, and a loss of over \$1,000,000 to the revenue, compared with the yield from the old tariff, at a lower rate of duty, and estimating by the new tariff only 105,000,000lb. of high grade sugar at current prices of white and bright yellow, the duty would amount to

\$2,693,250, while, as already stated, 120,000,000lb. of raw would yield a less revenue by \$1,133,250. He had the figures to prove these statements to any person who desired to look into this matter. While the raw paid duty on this basis of 40 per cent, refined paid a duty of 57 per cent. This certainly showed too much protection on an article like that. The duty on raw was for *ad valorem* 30 per cent., but, after deducting the charges and packages, it became reduced to 25 per cent., with $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound on No. 9, which made it equal to 40 per cent. Then the tariff of 1863 was continued under the financial administration of Sir John Rose, then of Sir Francis Hincks, of Mr. Tulley, the present Finance Minister, and Mr. Cartwright, the late Finance Minister. If there had been a good reason for changing that tariff, they would have done so. Why was it changed now? The Government should take information from whom they could get it. They could get the best information from records in Washington, London, and cities on the continent of Europe. The British Government were not afraid to take advice. They were so annoyed and perplexed by refiners' statements about sugar, that to put themselves right they decided to test the question by chartering a refinery away from the country altogether, worked this refinery, and practised in it until they found out what they were doing. Why should not our Government make enquiry before they arrived at conclusions that must lead to disastrous results to our revenue and our taxpaying people. The whole cry seemed to be about tea and sugar, to the neglect of the more extensive portion of our commerce. Ninety-two per cent. of our commerce, import and export, was with Great Britain and the United States, and our tariff was to be arranged largely against those countries. What would be the result if they turned round and said: "Here, you are discriminating against us"? What would the hon. member for Frontenac say, and hon. members from adjoining counties round the Bay of Quinté say to their constituents, if anything happened to their barley trade with the United States? This trade, with them, was one of great importance. They had, from this item alone, received,

every fall, large sums of money. and it has been a near by, and by far their best market. He would not detain the House longer, but would simply reiterate his protest against the adoption of the injurious policy proposed by the Government.

MR. DREW moved the adjournment of the debate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he hoped that to-morrow night they would be able to go into Committee of Ways and Means. Opportunity had been given, and properly given, to hon. members to express their views, but this was the sixth or seventh day of the debate, and, to prevent an absolute obstruction of the Government business, and prevent the Session going into the summer, they must draw the debate to a close.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

MR. TILLEY moved that the said debate be the first Order of the Day, immediately after routine business, at the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No 77) To make the first day of July a public holiday by the name of Dominion Day.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa Loan and Investment Company and to change the name to "The Manitoba and North-West Loan Company, limited."—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

PRIVATE BILLS.

SENATE AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

The amendments made by the Senate to the following Bill, were read the second time and agreed to:—

Bill (No 24) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

House adjourned at

Twenty minutes past

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 9th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree to resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th), and Mr. Mackenzie's proposed motion in amendment thereto (April 4th.)

MR. DREW said that at this late stage of the debate, he rose simply to put on record his reasons for supporting the tariff before the House. He had always been a Protectionist. This question had been for many years before the country, and he had always been on the side of those who advocated a National or Protective policy. Holding such views, he was astonished when he heard it stated in the House that the electors did not understand this question, when called upon to vote on the 17th September last. He thought that if there ever was a question which the people understood perfectly, it was the present. He was willing to give credit to the gentlemen on the Opposition benches for not having attempted to sail under false colours, so far as this question was concerned; they had taken the side of Free-trade clearly and distinctly, as the Conservatives did that of Protection. Holding, as he did, that the real question before the country at the last election was that of Free-trade or Protection, and that the people by their votes, demanded Protection, all that they had to do in this House was to consider whether this tariff was the carrying out of the pledge given the people when their votes were being solicited. He believed it was a complete fulfilment of that promise, and that he could go back to his constituents and test their opinion of it, safely, although the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), pointing to the Ministerial side, had asked what gentleman from Ontario could go to his constituents and support

the tariff. He could reply that gentlemen on his side were perfectly prepared to support this Protective policy before their constituents, and he thought they could throw out this challenge to the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side. In the course of a very short time there would be an appeal to the electors of Ontario, and he would like those gentlemen to make the question for the electors, Free-trade or Protection. But they would hear, on that occasion, no doubt, from hon. gentlemen opposite, that those were not the questions to submit—that Ontario had nothing to do with the trade policy of the country. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) had told them, in a very decided tone, and with violent gesticulation, that this was not the tariff policy the country had been led to expect, and in support of that statement he read a letter from a carriage manufacturer in Guelph (Mr. Chase). But it was strange that from that city where, for its population, there were more manufactories and, as he supposed, as much wealth engaged in manufacturing, as in any other city or town in Canada, that he could produce but one letter from that city in that sense. In answer to his hon. friend he would read the opinions of some parties in Guelph, showing that the people were perfectly satisfied with the tariff; and if he should misrepresent their views, that hon. gentleman, now in Guelph, could correct him on his return. As it was in a county from which he (Mr. Drew) hailed himself, he thought that he had a right to refer to the names of the gentlemen in question. He would just refer to Mr. J. B. Armstrong, President of the Guelph Carriage Goods Company, whose manufactory turns out over \$100,000 worth of steel and iron carriage hardware per year. That gentleman said:

“That the effect of the new tariff on the labour market was somewhat prospective. In his opinion, the tariff would raise up more manufacturing establishments, and, therefore, more labour would have to be employed. If there was an increased demand for the goods of the manufactures now in existence in Canada, wages would undoubtedly rise. But he was inclined to think that the real effect of the tariff would not be felt for two or three years, and then it would undoubtedly result in fostering Canadian industries. He believed that

considerable dissatisfaction existed in some branches of trade, but he was confident that, as soon as the novelty wore off, that that would, to a certain extent, cease. With respect to their own business, he said they were now making goods heretofore manufactured exclusively in the United States, and he had no doubt that this would continue, and that these goods would hereafter be made in Canada by themselves or some one else. Since the tariff had been brought down, they had been running night and day, and had about fifty hands constantly employed. Their present prospects for immediate trade would keep up this satisfactory condition of affairs for at least three months. And, in the ordinary course of business, the demand might continue at this rate for the entire year. With respect to the price paid by consumers of their goods, his impression was that the goods would not in three years be more costly than they are at present. He was satisfied that Mr. Tilley had striven to do his duty to every interest.”

This certainly did not show that dissatisfaction existed in Guelph. Again, he would read what Mr. Wm. Bell, who had excellent facilities for turning out 1,200 to 1,500 organs yearly, said. It was that:

“Although some of the raw material used in their manufactures was affected somewhat by the new tariff, they were in a much better condition now to compete with any American manufacturer than they were during the continuance of the 17½ per cent. tariff. The new tariff would prevent the slaughtering they had felt for years, and, in fact, their increased foreign trade was pushing them very much in fulfilling home orders. The tariff was certainly in the right direction, and as far as a man could be expected to do, Mr. Tilley had dealt as fairly as was possible with respect to all the industries of the country. He was particularly well pleased that the Government had given Canadian manufacturers a drawback on foreign orders, equal to the amount of duty paid on raw material used in their goods. He was of opinion that the tariff would bring general prosperity, and that all men in Canada were infinitely better off than under the reign of the one-sided Free-trade tariff of the Mackenzie-Cartwright Administration. He believed that the new tariff would bring in its wake abundant labour. Instead of men working only eight and a-half hours per day, they would be enabled to work profitably for ten hours each day. So far as he could ascertain, there was a more confident feeling in business circles.”

Then came Mr. John Anderson, of Messrs. McCrae & Co., woollen manufacturers, who were strong Reformers. Their objection was this: they anticipated they would get an increased market in time, but thought that the tariff would raise up

so many woollen manufactories as to create unfair competition, and cut down prices below a living profit; that the building up of manufactures at home would create such a competition as to keep down prices was one of the things promised the people as the result of Protection. Then, Mr. Andrew Tolton, of the firm of Tolton Bros., who, last year, manufactured harvesters ploughs, etc., to the extent of from \$12,000 to \$15,000, said:

"That eventually the new tariff would affect them in the fostering of their industry. He believed, too, that it would result in a general encouragement of Canadian manufactures, and put a stop to the importation of Yankee-made machines and ploughs. They would not raise the price to farmers, as they would have an increased home market, and, consequently could afford to sell as low, if not lower, than present prices. He was strongly of opinion that wages would rise, and that more labour would be employed. As far as his firm was concerned they had already added plough-making to their manufactures, and anticipated going into other new branches of agricultural implement making."

Mr. Stewart, a manufacturer of sashes, doors, blinds, etc., found fault with the tariff, as he kept a number of horses, and complained that it would raise the price of oats, but hon. gentlemen opposite held a theory in opposition to this, and contended that the price of oats would not be advanced, and that farmers would receive no benefit. He (Mr. Drew) then referred to Mr. George Sleeman, Reeve of Guelph, and proprietor of the Silver Creek Brewery, who believed the changes would be favourable to his business. Mr. Sleeman was of the opinion that the rise which had already taken place in grain, was due to the protection afforded cereals by the tariff, and was thoroughly satisfied with it. Mr. Wilkie, of Wilkie & Osborne, sewing machine manufacturers, said:

"We believe that the tariff will be very beneficial to us in our business—directly and indirectly. The extra duty on raw materials will make very little difference in the cost, and as the greater part of the value of the finished machine is in labour, the extra duty will be perceptible. The larger home market, without the unfair competition with foreign manufacturers, will enable us to do a larger and more legitimate business, consequently more profitable, on account of which we anticipate being able to sell at least at as low prices, and pay as good wages, as we have ever hitherto done. We will be benefitted under the new tariff arrange-

ment in our export trade, as under the old tariff we had to pay duty on raw materials, put labour on them here, and got no drawback when exporting the finished articles. Now we will, under the drawback system, have raw materials for the export trade duty free, consequently putting us in a better position to compete in foreign markets."

Messrs. Burr & Skinner, furniture manufacturers, spoke highly of the changes, and stated that workingmen would now get a steady year's work, whereas, under the old tariff they only got about eight months' work out of the twelve. He quoted the opinion of Mr. James Wiley, of Worsfold & Wiley, furniture dealers, who was also favorable to the new tariff, and said that he recognised a more confident feeling in business circles than that which prevailed before the Budget speech was made. Mr. McConnell, of McConnell & Thornton, carriage-builders, said:

"The tariff will assist us in building up a larger home market. They had already increased their export trade, and this week shipped to Australia. He was confident that wages would in due time rise; there could be no question about it. He considered the tariff would benefit every man in Canada, as confidence had been restored in business. Prices to the consumer would not raise perceptibly."

The hon. member for South Wellington had quoted the opinion of Mr. Chase, but this was contradicted by the opinions of Mr. Armstrong and Mr. McConnell, the two largest carriage-manufacturers in Guelph. Then came Mr. John Hogg, of the firm of John Hogg & Son. Mr. Hogg was a member of the Guelph Lumber Co., of which also the member for South Wellington was a member. That hon. gentleman, speaking on this question, lately, wished to know what advantage was given the lumbermen in return for the alleged higher taxes on him, though aware that, after the tariff was announced, the firm of which he was president had received an order to ship 6,000,000 feet of lumber to Manitoba, which Province formerly procured it from the Western States. Mr. Hogg said:

"The new tariff would be of general benefit for at least six years, but after that he thought the increase of manufacturers would result in over-production. The bringing down of this new tariff had resulted in increased public confidence, and, however it

turned out in the end, it could not be worse than the condition of business before the tariff was brought down. He had a stock in store worth \$95,000, which he would sell at the old prices, and by the time this and other merchants' stocks required replenishing, our own manufacturers would be able to supply us. He was of opinion that people would be wise if they did not push forward in manufacturing at too great a rate."

It would take too much time to read the published opinion of all the Guelph business men, and he would simply state that the following gentlemen expressed themselves as satisfied with the tariff: Messrs. E. Radford, of J. D. Williamson & Co.; Thomas A. Hefferman, of Hefferman & Co.; John A. Wood; J. Hallett, of Jackson & Hallett; J. E. McElderry; Hugh Walker; John Horsman; J. M. Bond; James A. Thorp; A. B. Petrie; J. H. Moore, of Herod & Co.; W. H. Marcon, and George Lees. These were the names of leading business men of the flourishing city of Guelph, some of whom were still Reformers; but, notwithstanding their politics, they were in favour of the tariff. He merely mentioned their names in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington, who would be in his place to notice them if he desired, before the tariff was disposed of. From all the information that he (Mr. Drew) had received from his Riding, and the surrounding section, he believed that this tariff was acceptable to the people, and was all that the inhabitants of of the other sections looked for, which left him no other course than to support it. The next question to consider was was the tariff framed in the way to give the farmers the Protection they expected? He represented a farming constituency, and believed the tariff afforded ample protection to the farmers, as well as the manufacturers. At all events, both classes, and the members representing them, in his (Mr. Drew's) section had expressed themselves satisfied with it, as he also was, with the figures as they stood. But there was one thing he was not so well satisfied with, and he wished to call attention to it. If the tariff, as it stood, was carried out, and the farmers got the protection they were led to expect, it would be an advantage to them. There was a duty of 15c. a bushel on wheat, but this cereal would be allowed, as he understood, to enter Canada from

the States in bond, in the interest of the miller, who might thus bring in 10,000 or 20,000 bushels, on giving his bond that he would pay the duty, unless he showed to the satisfaction of the Customs Department, that he had shipped out of the country flour or wheat corresponding with that quantity. If the flour that he shipped out of the country was the product of that wheat, or the wheat he shipped was the identical grain, then the farmers would have the protection they expected. But if the millers were allowed to bring in 20,000, 50,000, or 100,000 bushels of wheat, grind and use it in the country, and send out Canadian wheat or flour made from Canadian wheat, then he maintained the tariff would not protect the Canadian farmer. Representing, as he did, a farming constituency, and advocating Protection as he had done, he must put on record his views in reference to this binding system. In answer, it might be said they could not shackle the millers; that if they did, a certain number must close up their establishments. All he could say was this: If it was necessary to close up some of the mills in order to give the farmers the protection promised them, let them close them. It was better a few should be closed than the farmers injured. He then came to the 5th resolution, which empowered the Government to admit into the country, duty free, from the United States, articles now paying duty, on being satisfied the same articles were admitted free into the States from Canada. He had no objection to that resolution; but he wished to mention that, if the Americans threw the duty off corn, from Canada, an article we did not export, the Government might have to say, under the tariff, at present, that they would admit corn free from the United States, which would give the Americans all the advantage. But he believed that the Canadian Government would exercise careful watch over this matter, and would see that, in admitting articles into Canada free, there was a corresponding advantage to the Canadian farmer and producer. Having thus given his reasons for supporting the tariff, and stated wherein he feared difficulties would arise, he would no longer occupy the time of the House.

When the tariff came to be considered in detail, he might have some further remarks to make. He would, in conclusion, again urge upon the Government the necessity of giving their serious attention to the bonding system, as he was satisfied it was one which very deeply interested the farming community.

MR. ARKELL said he did not intend to make any lengthy remarks on the tariff question, as he was satisfied the members of the House were all anxious to see the debate closed, and the business of the Session expedited. The supporters of the financial policy of the Government were, moreover, anxious to return to their constituencies to receive the ovations awaiting them, on their return home. He believed the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition would prefer to remain here two or three months longer, until the excitement on this great question had settled down in the minds of the people. He regretted the hon. member from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) was not now in his seat, as he took a particular interest in that gentleman who represented the other half of his county. In a speech made the other day, he made use of this expression :

"It was rather unfortunate for everybody concerned that the late Government should have come into office in the face of the financial storm, which was long foreseen."

Now, he must say that he agreed with the hon. gentleman. It was a very unfortunate day for the country when they came into power. Our Canada Pacific Railway would, to-day, have been in a fair way of progress had it not been for those gentlemen who were now in Opposition. He was inclined to think his hon. friend from West Elgin had become a Protectionist, as he observed that he stated in his speech that the farmers were not protected under this tariff. He (Mr. Arkell) might say that he believed the farmers had not got sufficient Protection. He would like to have seen a duty on corn of 10c. a bushel, and \$4 duty on every barrel of pork brought into this country, because he was satisfied we could raise all the corn and pork we required, and a large quantity for export. His hon. friend from West Elgin said that he was

afraid that, under this tariff, we should raise up a shoddy aristocracy in this country. He (Mr. Arkell) would only say that, under this tariff, we should keep out one kind of shoddy at any rate, which had been imported into this country from England in the past—that is the shoddy cloth. If, as the hon. gentleman had stated, no one else in this country would make money under this tariff but the manufacturers, it would not be an unmixed evil, for he was satisfied that the more monied aristocracy we had in the country the better, provided they made a proper use of their money. The hon. gentleman had said that the farmers were not protected; the promises made to them had not been fulfilled. He (Mr. Arkell) believed, however, that, under this tariff, their interests had been pretty well looked after; that they were very well satisfied with it. He was receiving, daily, letters from the farmers in both Ridings of Elgin, who, with scarcely an exception, expressed themselves perfectly satisfied. The hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) speaking of the duty on malt, said the Government had reduced it to 1c. per pound, instead of 2c. If there was anything in the legislation of the late Government he condemned, it was raising the duty on malt to 2c. per pound. One bushel of barley would make 36 lbs. of malt. In his part of the country they used to get 70c. to 75c. per bushel for barley, but when the Government raised the duty on malt to 2c., they collected 72c. duty on every bushel of barley the farmer raised, and the farmer was only getting from 45c. to 50c. per bushel for his barley, before being malted. That was the kind of protection the late Government gave to the farmers of this country. He would rather see the malt duty abolished and the American plan adopted of placing the duty on beer, as it could be much more easily collected than when placed on malt. He knew the brewers of this country were subject to a great deal of inconvenience from the action of the excise officers. In the town where he resided, there were two breweries, and the brewers were constantly complaining of the inconvenience to which they were put by the rules of the excise officers. The hon. member (Mr. Casey) said that

the oatmeal mills were not considered, but he believed they were in as good a condition now as before. Under the bonding system they would be allowed to import all the oats they required. They were given, he believed, a period of four months, during which they would not have to pay one dollar into the revenue. All that they would have to do was to give a bond for all the oats they imported into the Dominion of Canada, and if the oatmeal was exported within four months the bond would be cancelled. It was the same with wheat. In reference to corn, he would like to have seen the duty raised to 10c. They had a territory in his section of thousands of acres, where just as good corn could be raised as in the United States. A few days ago he received a letter from a gentleman in East Elgin, stating that the farmers under Protection were going to plant a large quantity of corn this spring, as they were satisfied it would be remunerative. There was no duty on wool. He would like the Finance Minister to put a small duty on wool, but at the same time he must say that the duty on coarse wool would not interfere with the wool we raised in this country. The only wools we imported were fine wools, which we could not raise. He was curious to see the hon. gentleman from West Elgin record his vote on this question, because if he voted in favor of this tariff he would then represent the other half of the county, which he (Mr. Arkell) represented, but if he voted against it, he would not represent the views of the electors of West Elgin. The hon. gentleman complained that professional men were not protected. He had no doubt but they required Protection. He supposed medical men were a necessary evil in this country, and as to the legal profession, he thought that if the lawyers would take Horace Greely's advice and go west, it would be all the better for the interests of this country. (The hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) said the farmers were promised a duty to raise the prices of their products. He did not think any member of this House, in addressing his constituents, ever dwelt much on that point, although they may have been told that Protection would secure to them the home market.

The hon. member for South Brant asked if we would dare to go to the country with this tariff, or with this "thing," as he called it, holding it up. He thought that if the hon. member for South Brant went to his constituents, the chances were that he would not come back here for five years. He (Mr. Arkell) was satisfied we should not go back to our constituents, and that the people of this country had perfect confidence in the present Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite had told us that this tariff would cause an alienation between us and the Mother Country. He hoped this was not true, as there was something more than dollars and cents binding Canada to Great Britain. He believed that if this country progressed, as he expected it would under this tariff, increasing in population and wealth, the volume of trade with the Mother Country would increase in proportion. It had also been stated that this tariff would produce bad feelings with the United States. But the United States had been prospering for years under a similar tariff, and he was satisfied that the intelligent part of the American community would admit that in following their example we had acted wisely. It had been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite that our manufacturers would ruin each other by competition; others advanced that, under the new tariff, consumers would have to pay higher prices for manufactured goods. He could not see how those hon. gentlemen could reconcile these opposite statements. He was afraid they did not take very good care to have their speeches correspond with each other. Our farmers were fully entitled to the home market. Under this tariff this market would be secured to them, and they would still have a surplus for exportation to other countries. He was satisfied our manufacturers would produce nearly everything we needed, and anything they could not manufacture it should be the policy of the Government to admit under as low a duty as possible. It would also increase the population of the country. For the last ten years the population had not increased much, and most of the people who came here from other countries very soon went to the Western States. But under the new policy the mechanics, the artisans and

the labouring classes would find employment in this country, and remain here. Another advantage would be the building up of an intercolonial trade between Eastern and Western Provinces, and thus tend to promote a feeling of unity. It was stated by the hon. member for North Norfolk that the balance of trade being in favour of the nation, was an evidence of distress, and that when the balance was against the nation, it was an evidence of prosperity. Now, they had had a balance of trade against them for years, ever since the late Government came into power. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he could reconcile that statement? We had no prosperity in this country. For the last five years everything had been in a depressed condition. The farmers had been complaining of the disadvantages under which they laboured, and, he maintained, the fact that they had a balance of trade against them was an evidence of poverty. It was an evidence they were labouring under great disadvantages. It was all very well for hon. gentlemen to talk about Great Britain. He supposed she was the only country in the world that understood Free-trade, and he believed, from the reaction which had taken place there within the last few years, that they would probably see a Protective policy established yet in that country. The hon. member had spoken of him as a Protectionist. He might say that he had been a Protectionist for years, and, in conversation with the people of his Riding, and with people wherever he had met them, he had heard this National Policy brought forward, and, on all occasions, the farmers complained of the injustice done to them. The manufacturers also complained of the injustice that was done to them. On the 17th September a verdict upon the subject was given by the people. It had been stated that the right hon. the leader of the Government had started this question for political purposes. He was willing to concede that the right hon. gentleman did advance this as part of the platform, because the people of this country had made up their minds that a change must take place, and that change was in favour of a Protective policy. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), the

night previously, made a non-Protective speech, in which he wound up by referring to emigration. He gave the hon. gentleman credit for taking a very active interest in furthering the scheme. He believed he had been chairman of the Emigration Committee. He (Mr Arkell) maintained that if there was one single act of the late Government which should be condemned, it was its emigration policy. He found that nearly \$1,200,000 had been taken out of the revenues of the country - for what? He would ask the hon. member for South Perth to say for what that money was paid out. That money was expended at a time when we were labouring under a depression. We had been labouring under a depression for the past five years, and that \$1,200,000, he maintained, had been paid out for the purpose of bringing more poverty into the country—for the purpose of bringing people from all parts of the world, when there was no employment for them. They had thousands of people in this country looking for employment, and obliged to go to the other side of the line in order to obtain it. Especially in the winter season of the year we had an overplus of population completely out of employment. Notwithstanding this, the late Government, during the past five years, had expended \$1,200,000 for emigration purposes. It would have been far better if this money had been employed in helping the people who were already in the country, instead of sending it to England to bring out emigrants when we had nothing for them to do. He wished to call the attention of the Government of the day to the fact that, five years ago, the hon. the leader of the late Government was elected by an overwhelming majority in 1874. On the strength of that majority he supposed he could carry the country with him, but he found that, on the 17th of September, the people of this country could think for themselves. They were not satisfied with the legislation they had had, and in consequence, they were condemned to the cold shades of Opposition, and he thought they would remain there for a long time to come. He would impress upon the Government of the day that they were elected on this National Policy; they were elected by a majority of about the same as his hon.

friend the leader of the Opposition had been five years ago, and if the hon. gentleman controlling the affairs of the country did not give the people proper legislation, the people would turn them out of office as readily as they had turned out the leader of the Opposition. The Government should exercise, in every Department, economy, and he believed that if they did exercise that proper economy, and if they gave to the country good legislation—and this tariff he was satisfied was the right kind of legislation—he was certain the Government would have the country at their back. But after that was carried, there were other measures to come before the country, which would demand from the Government wise administration. He hoped the hon. the Minister of Finance would not be led away by any taunts that might be thrown at him from hon. gentlemen opposite. He hoped that when the details of this tariff were being considered, that if he discovered any class of the community were labouring under any injustice, that he would make any alteration he might deem necessary, notwithstanding the taunts of hon. gentlemen opposite. They were not legislating for gentlemen on the other side of the House. They were legislating for the people of this country, and they did not care a fig for any remarks they might make. He hoped that the Minister of Finance would exercise his own judgment, and he, for one, was quite willing to leave the matter in his hands. He would give him his support as far as he could, because he had every confidence in his ability, and he believed the country at large had confidence in his ability. The hon. leader of the Opposition had brought forward the name of Richard Cobden. He (Mr. Arkell) could only say that Richard Cobden was a very good man in his day. There was no doubt he left a very good reputation behind him, but he was satisfied that had Mr. Cobden lived at the present day that his views would not have met with the approbation of the people of Great Britain. And if the hon. member leading the Opposition constituted himself the Richard Cobden of Canada, which he thought he did from the remarks he made the other night, he was satisfied that that gentleman's reputation,

in days to follow, would not be equal to that of the Richard Cobden of England. He could only say, in conclusion, that he was elected to come to this House purely on the National Policy.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : Right or wrong.

MR. ARKILL said he was satisfied this tariff was going to build up this country. He was satisfied it was going to increase the population of the country, and he was satisfied it was going to make Canada the place for Canadians to live in, and that under this tariff we should prosper.

MR. MASSUE said that, at this stage of the discussion, he desired to offer only a few remarks, in order to make known the grounds upon which he intended to base the vote he was going to give, and in order to do justice to his constituents, who had placed their interests in his hands, and expressed the desire of seeing a change brought about in the fiscal policy of the country. He had observed, with pleasure, that the hon. the Finance Minister was resolved to earnestly adopt the Protective system; he had found the true means of responding to the wants of the hour by giving to the country that which had been promised during the elections. The system now proposed was nearly the same as that to which the Americans had had recourse in 1824 and in 1828. At that time their commercial situation was on a level with the present situation in Canada—the Protective system had saved the Americans. In 1871 France was obliged to pay her war debt, and was thrown ten years behind England by this same war. By the Protective system she had been able to retrieve her commercial position, and, to-day, she was competing seriously with England. Germany, tired with struggling against the surrounding nations, had declared, by the mouth of Bismarck, that she was going to have recourse to Protection, and Bismarck, in making this declaration, had added that Germany was for the Germans, and that the Germans were for Germany. That, indeed, was the aim of all Protective systems which they had never failed to attain. Like causes produced like effects, when the circum-

stances were identical. A glance at the situation of Canada would show that commerce was ruined, that no capital was to be found, that confidence was gone, that individual and public credit had fallen; home products, the fruit of hard labour, undergoing competition that was calculated to dishearten the producer, and prevent the growth of the mining, manufacturing and agricultural industries of the country. The ports of Canada were open to all, whilst the ports of all countries were closed against Canada. For a young country like Canada, whose capital was far from considerable, if its policy were to remain in a passive state, it would have to follow the good or the bad fortune of the nation that made a slaughter market of it. Speaking in a general way, it might be truthfully said, if like causes produce like effects when the circumstances are the same, that the position of Canada was identical with that of other countries that had been commercially ruined, and that what had saved the latter could not reasonably be supposed to ruin Canada. The facts that he stated were a matter of history, and, for proof of what he said, he would merely refer the House to the history of the countries of which he had spoken. The Canadian people, by a majority of their representatives, had accepted this system after having heard it discussed. Members had not the right to shirk from fulfilling the conditions upon which they had been elected, and, as a representative of one of the agricultural counties of his Province, he was happy to say that he was satisfied with the present tariff. It was true that, looked upon from a sectional point of view, it seemed contrary to certain local interests; but, when mutual concessions established an equilibrium between the sacrifices and the profits of each part of the Dominion, it would be unreasonable to ask for more. This was why he supported the Government in this reform, and why he would vote for the tariff.

Mr. RICHEY said he had noticed in the course of this debate, amid the discordance of sentiment by which it had been characterised, that there was one point on which all were in perfect harmony, namely, the commanding import-

ance of the question itself; and it was encouraging to feel that they did not approach it without due preparation, both of their own thoughts and of the public mind. The members of this House were fresh from their constituencies—from those on behalf of whom they are deputed to speak and act, and in reference to the great principle at issue, a verdict had already been rendered by the country. There was no argument that could now be advanced; no objection that could be urged upon which the country had not already pronounced. He spoke, of course, of the general principle of the measure, not of its details, which were open to be canvassed, as to how far they were, or were not, subservient to the general principle. But this much might be said, both as regarded the principle of the measure and its details, the public expectation was fully prepared; there had been evinced a common desire that some measure, having in view the object of the one before the House, should be presented and adopted. What were those objects? First, sufficiency of revenue, and, secondly, adequacy of Protection. In reference to the first of these, he presumed there could be no question whatever that it was indispensable. The hon. gentleman here dwelt upon the deficits of the past five years, and the fact that we were now face to face with the necessity of restoring the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. With regard to the second object, there could exist no doubt that it was desirable to lighten the burden of taxation by strengthening the shoulders that were to bear it, and necessary to import a fresh impulse to the development of our resources, which were magnificent, and the revival of our industries and trade, which were in a languishing condition. They were told, however, that the depression under which we laboured was above the power, and beyond the province, of legislation; that it was common to all nations. He did not deny the interdependence of the great commercial countries, and that there came at times grave crises which overshadowed them all. His contention was, that, under wiser fiscal regulations, Canada might, even in a time of extremity for older nations, have possessed a better opportunity. They were told that the United

States had suffered. But the United States had been disorganised by civil war; their commerce crippled, their currency disordered, their shipping largely swept away. If Germany was cited, they knew that Germany, from military ambition, had become a military camp. If they were pointed to France, they remembered that she had felt the force of foreign war, the tramp of hostile armies; that her resources were drained to indemnify her invaders. If they looked at England, it was true he had no similar explanation to make; but England was a Free-trade country, and he would leave the explanation of her depression to hon. gentlemen opposite. Why was it, he might ask, that young and vigorous Canada, unharmed by war, unvisited by pestilence, must take up the dirge of those old nations, merely consoling herself with the reflection that she suffered in common with them? But let it be conceded that the depression was common to all nations. There was then no argument against Protection that did not equally affect Free-trade. There was no argument whatever to be drawn from the effect of a depression, which compassed all nations alike, whether following a policy of Free-trade or a policy of Protection. But it was just here that the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches refused to be consistent. They never tired of alleging that Protection ruined, and that Free-trade built up. "You are assuming a policy," exclaimed the hon., the leader of the Opposition, "that has ruined other nations, and rejecting a policy which has made the Mother Country great, glorious and prosperous, beyond all precedent"—though the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) had just invited them to "consider the unfortunate position of England." Now, he might be allowed to ask, in connection with this assertion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, how could they be accused of rejecting that which had never been proffered to them? How could they be said to have rejected the principles of Free-trade, when, according to his own showing, they had never been asked to adopt them? He found, on referring back a year, in the columns of the *Globe*, which he pre-

Mr. RICHEY.

sumed might be relied on for an accurate report of the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, that

"Mr. MACKENZIE, in a brief but vigorous speech, pointed out that Canada was neither a Free-trade nor a Protection country. Personally he was a Free-trader, but he was convinced that the circumstances of the country were such that it was impossible to give practical effect to Free-trade doctrines. The Administration had, on all occasions, sought to promote the best interests of the Dominion, and they had adopted a revenue tariff which afforded a large measure of Protection to everyone engaged in manufacturing pursuits."

When the hon. gentleman, the other night, introduced the amendment which was now before the House, he (Mr. Richey) noticed that the hon. gentleman reiterated the remark, to the effect that he had always contended that the adoption of Free-trade doctrines in the circumstances of the country was impossible. He (Mr. Richey) found such language as this: "The incidental Protection afforded by the present tariff is very great; so it is absurd and untruthful to assume that the fiscal policies of Canada and England are identical, or that the Liberal party here makes no distinction between the condition of things in this country, and the condition of things in the Mother Country." Again, he found the same paper, in July last, rebuking the organ of the Conservative party for stating that the then Government regarded a home market for agricultural produce as "a positive calamity," in the following terms:—

"This is on a par with the assertion that a Government which levies a higher duty on imported manufactures than any colonial administration save one in the British Dominions, and a higher tariff than Great Britain herself possessed before she inaugurated her present fiscal policy, is bent on the establishment of absolute Free-trade in Canada."

But he would ask: Could both propositions be true? If England, France, Germany and the United States were all suffering under a common depression, arising from a common cause, could it be said that the United States were being ruined by Protection, and that Great Britain was "prosperous beyond all precedent" through Free-trade? With regard to the second of these propositions, he would venture to assert it was not true. That England, during the last five-and-

thirty years, under Free-trade, had taken rapid strides, and had achieved unprecedented success, he rejoiced to believe; but France and the United States, both protected countries, had accompanied her with equal steps. Circumstances had arisen, at the same time, which gave a wonderful impetus to mercantile and industrial pursuits all over the world. They had discovered gold in California and Australia, and that led to a great increase of inter-communication. They had the opening up of trade with China; India had been more fully brought under British domination. The barriers to intercourse with Japan had been taken down. They had an immense increase of carrying power in the perfected application of steam conveyance on sea and land. They had the wonderfully augmented facilities for communication afforded by the electric telegraph, and they had the introduction of those international exhibitions, which had given a vast impulse to industrial enterprise. All these in themselves were calculated to produce effects which could not be lost in a single generation. As he had said before, the United States and France had accompanied England in this race, and had not lagged behind. An hon. gentleman opposite, he thought it was the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), had given figures respecting England, which covered the period from 1842 to 1872; but, in presenting figures in regard to the United States, he had contrasted separate series of years. Had he taken figures for the same period from the United States and France, he would have seen that the development of trade and industry in those countries was not so inferior to that of Great Britain. He was pleased to be able to refer as frequently as he did to a paper which spoke on behalf of the Opposition of this House, and he would now read the following sentences, which he had taken from an editorial article in that paper:—

"France," it said, "before the revolution, had a starving peasantry, an impoverished soil, and an intolerable aristocracy. Since that time, amidst all the commotions arising from civil disturbances and external wars, she has always gone forward, her people have become more comfortable, and her soil is always more and more skillfully cultivated. * * * Within the last twenty-five years the annual

value of French agricultural produce has increased to the extent of £100,000,000. In England farms are now seeking tenants."

Now, during the last week, it had been suggested in the House of Lords that enquiry had been made in regard to the depression of commerce and agriculture in England. Lord Beaconsfield stated that the depression was unprecedented, and that the public wealth had decreased £80,000,000. He (Mr. Riehey) did not think that went to confirm the proposition laid down by his hon. friend opposite that Free-trade induced prosperity, and that Protection destroyed it. He need not repeat what had been so often said, that even the abolition of the Corn Laws might be looked upon rather as a measure of Protection to manufacturers, while withdrawing it from agriculture, because the result of the abolition of the Corn Laws was to cheapen labour, in order that the manufacturing enterprises of that country might be profited; and it was in order to seek the development of the manufacturing enterprises of this country and furnish variety of occupation, that they had to resort to the principle of Protection in the present circumstances of this country. So he felt that, whether Free-trade and Protection were alike indifferent in their operation, or Protection as a policy was superior to Free-trade, or Free-trade, as a principle was to be preferred to Protection; with Canada, Protection was the duty of the hour. There was nothing in our circumstances or the relations of this country to show that a Protective policy in the present stage of our development would not be beneficial to us, while there was much to show that the kind of freedom in trade which we had permitted was injurious. He would ask the House to contemplate, for a moment, the magnificence of this country, vast in its extent, rich in its resources, free in its institutions; peopled with races full of vigour, both of body and mind. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), it was true, had decried this country as "the worst half of the continent." If it were so, it furnished a greater reason why we should bring judgment and energy to bear in such a way as to enable us the more successfully to compete with our more favoured rivals

But that country was not inevitably best which had the fairest clime ; where the earth yielded her fruits most readily, and the conditions of life demanded the least of toil. Better might be the country and longer her prosperity, where nature yielded her treasures only after conflict ; where the spirit of her sons was stimulated by the somewhat of difficulty with which they had to contend. Turkey might not have been so poor to-day had she been less fair, and Britain might not have had her present towering influence had she exacted less at the hands of her inhabitants. Let us not repine if such a country was ours ; one in which the conditions of prosperity lay in the labour of the hands, and the labour of the brains of its people, the one to devise and the other to carry into execution the means which gave success. It was a country large enough and fair enough to become the peer of the proudest nation of the globe ; long enough, and broad enough, and deep enough—with its depths of soil traversed by valuable mineral deposits, and with its depths of water, swarming with the treasures of the sea, and river, and lake. And yet, with all its capabilities, with all its inherent vigour, this country, which started so successfully twelve years ago, and grew rapidly in prosperity, had, for the last five years, become more and more depressed. The reason was largely to be found in the different policies pursued by the bordering country, and by ourselves. We had been shut out from our natural market whilst we had given the free run of our country to those who chose to take it. If he might resort to a figure, he would say that we had foolishly supposed we could run a race with a stronger competitor, leaving him unweighted on the course, with every muscle free and well trained by art, whilst we, with muscular energy, it was true, but all untrained and undeveloped, were borne down by the conditions which he imposed. It was for us now to say whether we should have a fair field and grant no favour. If he carried with him, as he knew he did, the sense of this House in the views which he espoused, regarding the necessity for a readjustment of the tariff in the direction of rendering the revenue more adequate to the demands upon it, and of fostering and pro-

moting our native industries in place of crippling and repressing them, the main question to consider was whether the tariff now submitted would meet the demands of our position. He thought it would ; he saw displayed in this tariff great sagacity in the application of a two-fold principle. He might think, as an individual, that, in some cases, that principle might have been carried further, and in others had been carried too far ; that in some cases the methods were cumbrous and inconvenient. He might seek, perhaps, unless convinced of the contrary by the explanations of the Finance Minister when they came to discuss the items, for some amendments or modifications in some particulars ; but it was an able measure as a whole, and it was impossible to say otherwise than that the Minister of Finance had nobly redeemed the promises made to the people, and had nobly repelled, by practical performance, the assertions made before and since the elections by hon. gentlemen opposite. Those hon. gentlemen seemed to have been unable to conceive of a tariff which could give sufficient revenue and confer Protection, or furnish the necessary amount of Protection, and yet afford a revenue. Here was a measure, expanded in its fair proportions before them, in which our mining, agricultural, manufacturing and shipping interests were all carefully guarded. He might enter into a review of many of the particulars in which the Finance Minister had so well succeeded, but so many had gone before him in this direction that it was unnecessary to do so. He would refer to the fact that, in the adjustment of duties on teas, he had pursued a course which, he thought, ought to have received the thanks of the hon. member for North Norfolk upon the principle he had himself laid down. If it were true that duties were cumulative to the consumer, according to the number of intervening parties through whose hands they must pass until they reached the consumer, then the Finance Minister was entitled to their thanks that he so levied these duties as to induce direct trade with the countries of growth. The same principle was applied to sugar, thus aiding to develop our West Indian trade and yet

producing the requisite revenue, the duties being imposed so as to encourage the importation of the raw rather than the refined article. With respect to coal, the Finance Minister expected to derive revenue from the coal imported, and yet to aid in the development of our mines to the extent of three or four hundred thousand tons beyond the present output. Whilst he hoped this object would be attained, he believed it would be much better attained by a still higher duty. He was yet unable to see why 75c. a ton should not have been imposed upon all foreign coal imported into this country, when he considered that that was the precise amount levied on our coal by the United States; that, by the tariff, duties were imposed on every article which entered into the use of coal-miners, and that no drawback was granted, as was wisely done in the case of shipping and other industries; and that the tariff was accompanied by a resolution in the direction of reciprocity. The hon. member for Lambton, it was true, assailed this duty as cruel in the extreme, because it was imposed on a necessary of life. It was a fallacy to assert that coal was a necessary of life. Air and food and fuel might be necessities of life, but it was a fallacy to say of any particular article that it was an absolute necessity. It was a fallacy bordering upon an absurdity to say of coal that it was a necessary of life, and to treat tea as not being so, in a country teeming with forests, where there were hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, who never used a pound of coal, while not one of them would be content without his pound of tea, on which hon. gentlemen opposite had replaced the duty which their predecessors had removed. He did not profess to be able to satisfy himself entirely, regarding the application of the principle of *ad valorem* and specific duties in regard to cotton and woollen goods, but this could be fully discussed when they entered on these questions in detail. He did not wonder, when he considered the general approval which attended this tariff, at the dismay which had spread among the members of the Opposition. He desired for a few minutes to devote himself to the task of examining some of the objections which these hon. gentle-

men had presented to this House. He would first ask where were the objections from the masses throughout the country, against this tariff? If all these hon. gentlemen said was true, the table should have groaned under the weight of petitions presented from the different constituencies against it. But what were the objections with which they had to cope, and whence did they come? They came from gentlemen who last year expressed themselves as eager to hear the voice of the country on this matter, and had heard it but seemed to heed it not. Last Session the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) had said: "It will be for the country to decide what particular fiscal policy it may please to adopt, and it will be for the House or for their successors to decide how that particular policy will be enforced." It would now appear that the last word should have read "obstructed," and not "enforced." But to turn to the arguments. The hon. member for Lambton said it was a humiliating spectacle which this country presented in taking up the cast-off clothes of older nations. There were worse things for the young country of to-day to do than to take up the cast-off clothes of its parent, it adapted to its particular period of growth. It were better to give this exhibition of thrift than to attempt to begin where the parent left off. But beginning our national life, we were not in a position to act like the Mother Country, with accumulated capital and resources. Everyone in the country ought to be, in some sense, among the producing class; few could be counted solely among the consumers, for whom alone, the hon. gentlemen opposite had any consideration. It was asked how could a country become great by simply imposing taxes upon the people. He thought the late Government, while in power five years, had given a very complete answer to that question. They had shown that a country could not become richer by merely raising the amount of taxation to meet the increased expenditure. This tariff was framed on the combined principle of raising sufficient revenue and giving Protection to develop our resources and enable us to meet better the difficulties which were imposed. They were referred to the contrast of the depression in the United

States with the condition of England, and were pointed to the communistic movements in the United States, to the riots at Pittsburg, as if there had been none at Blackburn, as if the English papers were not filled with accounts of riots and distress among thousands of workmen. They were asked again if, at a time when labour and money were scarce, it was not the best policy to make everything as cheap as possible. It was not necessary, the depression would take care of that. Our great object should be to make money and labour more plentiful. But he might be able to show that, while pursuing the policy of Protection with the higher object of promoting and benefitting industry, the effect might be at the same time to cheapen the price of many commodities. The hon. member for Lambton was solicitous for the poor man because of the "cruel tax" upon coal. Let him mark how that great statesman, Daniel Webster, treated this subject thirty years ago, and what he then said upon it. When it was desired to do away with the highly Protective tariff then in existence in the United States, and to introduce one which would impose a general *ad valorem* charge of 20 per cent., he vehemently opposed that measure in the interest of his country and the coal-miners. It was then deemed necessary, in order to compete successfully with Nova Scotia coal, to have the American tariff on coal \$1.75 per ton; but they had been able to reduce it to \$1.25, and, since, to 75c., its present figure. The Americans had gone on developing their mining industries until they were able to meet foreign competition. Webster said: "The increase of the product of the Schuylkill region, under the Compromise Act, from 1837 to 1842, was only 32,000 tons. In the succeeding three years, that is to say, from 1842 to 1845, that increase amounted to no less than 560,000. The price of labour, of course, became greatly advanced; but the price of coal fell from \$5.50 per ton, to \$3.27. A pretty good proof, this, that prices may fall in consequence of Protection." That showed that, if the object of the Government was to make things cheap, there was a better way of doing it than by leaving the industries of the country in a depressed condition. Then they had

MR. RICHEY.

the hon. member for Centre Huron reiterating his argument, with which the country had grown familiar, in favour of a do-nothing policy, according to which the Government was to fold its hands and admonish the industrial population to get rich through frugality and hard work. But he was, as member for Halifax, particularly concerned with the fact that the member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) had had one kindly thought, one word of cordial commendation and well-feigned congratulation for the Finance Minister, while frankly owning that he had lacked courage himself to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity to his country; for he confessed that he was forced to become responsible for an expenditure of \$125,000, to his ineffable disgust, by men who had a political hold upon him. If the hon. member for Centre Huron thought that his congratulations to the Minister of Finance for having omitted from the Estimates the grants formerly made to the Allan steamers and the *George Shallock* were timely, they might take leave to extend to him (Mr. Cartwright) their condolences, first, for his want of ability to be true to his own convictions, and, secondly, for his weakness for want of information in supposing that, in granting the usual subsidies to the steamers plying to Halifax, he was guilty of wrong. He (Mr. Richey) suspected that the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman arose, not so much from his admiration of the Finance Minister, as from the thought that in this very omission would be found a ground for charging the Government with inconsistency, and another apology for that wild cry of disloyalty and discrimination against England, of which they had heard so much from the Opposition. That hon. gentleman felt, no doubt, that, whilst it might be said, with some degree of consistency, by a Finance Minister coming down with a deficit, and no provision to meet it, that there was no money for a certain service, it could not be alleged quite so well by one who presented a policy that should provide a revenue to meet every demand upon it; and, whilst it might be perfectly conformable to the policy of an Administration which seemed to be throwing their trade more and more towards the United States, and taking it

more and more from England to withdraw those subsidies, it could hardly be contended to be equally in agreement with a policy which pointed rather to the encouragement of Canadian trade with the Mother Country, that one of the first acts under it should be to imperil the connection by steam, that had for 40 years existed between Great Britain and her nearest North American port. The member for Centre Huron might have been actuated to some extent by some such feeling, and he feared that there were in the offices filled last year by that hon. gentleman, and the member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) certain traditions that had been accepted by their successors without sufficient scrutiny. He hoped that the present Minister of Finance and his colleagues would feel that they were not yielding up their own convictions, or surrendering themselves to such influences the member for Centre Huron depicted, but that, under a conviction of the actual necessity and propriety of those grants, they would yet be introduced into the Supplementary Estimates. The Halifax fortnightly mail service was very important, when they considered not only the inconvenience that must result to a large portion of the inhabitants of all those Maritime Provinces from its discontinuance, but that Halifax was, at least, as near as Rimouski, and reflected that England garrisoned Halifax with her troops and made it the headquarters of her fleet on the North American station, and that it was a point of connection for travel and traffic for a great part of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Bermuda, and portions of the West Indies, and, by the *George Shattuck*, with St. Pierre. From all those considerations, he felt they had a case in which they could appeal, not simply to such consideration as was spoken of by the member for Centre Huron, but, upon the ground of consistency with their own policy, to the Government, for the continuance of that service. The member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had denounced the tariff at first as prohibitory; then he said it was an attenuated, shrivelled copy of the American tariff. He (Mr. Richey) was unable to reconcile those statements. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr.

Charlton) had called it a servile copy, and other members a half-and-half measure, and then asked them why they were not bold enough to take the American tariff, pure and simple. Then, taking up the *Hansard* of last year, and going over the votes given on the principle of Protection, they had one division after another presented for the two-fold purpose, no doubt, of charging hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side with inconsistency, and convincing the House how evil would be the effects of the acceptance of that tariff. Well, there was nothing inconsistent in members who were able to vote for one general all-comprehensive measure not voting for certain separate details. Those able to vote for this measure might not feel themselves at liberty to vote simply for a duty on coal, for Nova Scotia, or on grain for Ontario. He was sorry to see such arguments introduced, as they led simply and solely to sectionalism. He believed that the voice of sectionalism should be hushed in the presence of a great national question, such as they were now engaged on, in regard to which it had been thought to silence them by quotations from political economists, whose writing served sometimes to perplex rather than illuminate the way of their too rigid devotees. Much as we were indebted to them, he thought they had not yet reached the position entitling their dicta to be accepted unquestioningly by those engaged in the practical work of legislation and administration. They might be very good servants, but bad masters to those on whom devolved the responsibility of moulding the destinies of the country, and deftly adapting their processes to the necessities of the times. They had listened to two arguments, by which they were to be completely overwhelmed, one being that Tupperisms had been introduced into that debate. He had no doubt that those home-thrusts, those arrows shot by the forceful arm of an hon. gentleman on the Ministerial side, and barbed by facts, had pierced the armour of hon. gentlemen opposite, who would find there was no shield that could be constructed on that side, that would be fitted to repel those arrows. But the irresistible argument against adopting the tariff was the alleged

change of views of the hon. member for Lincoln, many years ago, of whom the hon. member for South Brant was told that another member had heard that it was understood that he had attended the caucus of one party in the forenoon, and that of the other in the afternoon, and the inference was that, therefore, this tariff ought not to be accepted. He (Mr. Richey) was glad that that hon. gentleman (Mr. Rykert) had triumphantly exonerated himself from that imputation, and that the tariff, whose fate seemed trembling in the balance, might now be considered safe. The hon. members for South and Centre Huron appeared in conflict on this question, for, by the former the Finance Minister was told that he knew he might have provided the additional two millions wanted, without grinding the toiling masses, by reducing salaries and cutting down the general expenditure. Well, doubtless, the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had been in office five years, had tried that experiment in a time of deep depression, and, after finding it impossible, then, could very clearly see how that process might be adopted now. But they had on record the language of the member for Centre Huron, who, when bringing down his Budget last year, said that "any further reductions of expenditure would be undesirable and inexpedient, unless they were prepared for a very radical change in their constitution." There was another hon. gentleman on the opposite side, whose speeches had furnished him with sufficient arguments in favour of Protection. Now, he did not refer to speeches delivered two or three years ago, but to speeches delivered during the last Session, or delivered in addressing the people last year by the hon. member for North Norfolk. He would not follow that hon. gentleman through his remarks upon the balance of trade; he acknowledged the validity of a great many of the arguments he used. It might be perfectly true that, where the balance of trade was against the country having a large accumulated capital, and receiving a large amount of interest, especially a country drawing wealth from the sea, and prosecuting a great carrying trade, it did not indicate so bad a state of things as where these conditions were absent. One

MR. RICHEY.

hon. gentleman referred to the fact of parties going on a whaling voyage and bringing in the products of their industry and increasing the wealth of the country. That only showed that it was necessary, at times, to take many things into consideration in order to come to a sound conclusion, but all these things put together did not prove that it was in itself a better state of things for a country to have the balance of trade against her than in her favour. The hon. gentleman undertook to detail to them the evils which would result from the operation of this tariff, and he must confess that he could not help thinking of the time when George Stephenson was pushing his railway scheme, which had since proved so successful. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk enumerated the evils which would follow from the introduction of this tariff; in the first place, he said, it would rob the farmers; in the second place, it would rob the lumbermen; in the third place, it would rob the fishermen; in the fourth place, it would rob the labourer; in the fifth place, it would rob the shipbuilder; in the sixth place, it would rob every man who received a salary; in the seventh place, it would enable the manufacturers to rob all classes, and, for diversion, to prey upon each other; here were seven tremendous evils which were to result from this tariff. When George Stephenson was battling the railway question in England, what kind of opposition did he have to encounter? It was said, in the first place, that horses would become useless and unsaleable; in the second place, there would be no market for oats; in the third place, the hounds would cease running; in the fourth place, the hens would cease laying; in the fifth place, the stacks of hay would be burned up by cinders from the locomotive; in the sixth place, the boiler would burst and blow everything to atoms, and, in the seventh place, it was impossible to conceive of anything going at such a rate, and the wheels would only revolve on their axles, and the cars would stand stock still; and yet the railway system had been a great success, and he held that similar results would attend the predictions of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk. Coming now to the Maritime Provinces, it had been argued

that this tariff was a violation of the compact entered into at Confederation; that this question had never been in issue before the people of those Provinces; that their fishermen were not protected; and that their lumbermen were ignored. The hon. member for Richmond, (Mr. Flynn) had made these complaints. As he listened to the speech of that hon. gentleman, he marked the elegance of his diction, but it fell upon his ears like the song of the dying swan, because it seemed to him as the expiring note of anti-Confederation prejudice. It was asserted that this tariff was a violation of the compact. They had been so long accustomed to hear, in Nova Scotia, that connection with Canada was the result of conquest, and not a compact, that he was glad at last to have the concession that it was based upon agreement. They were told that the violation of the compact consisted in raising the tariff above what it was at the time of Confederation, which was 15 per cent. When did the violation take place? It took place when that tariff was raised to 17½ per cent., and, if the hon. gentleman was in this House and voted for that tariff, he condoned the violation. Every hon. gentleman on the Opposition benches who voted for that tariff condoned it, as did every constituency which returned one of those gentlemen. But they had all returned to this House on the understanding that this tariff was to be readjusted, and increased, and, therefore, by this very act, they disposed of the question of a violation of the compact. But they were told that the question was not in issue before the people. That had been well disposed of by the hon. member for Cardwell the other day, when he read, from a speech of the ex-Finance Minister, that the reason why he would not bring down any provision to meet the deficiency, was that the question was to go before the country. This question came also before the country, in the resolution moved on the floor of the House by the present Premier, every line of which was receiving its justification in the tariff now produced. Moreover, the press of those Provinces took good care that issue should be squarely placed before the people. One might take up the papers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, supporting the Gov-

ernment of that day, for weeks before the elections, and find, in large capital letters, the question placed before the people, in a manner to intimidate them, by the idea that they were to be subjected to extreme taxation. If, as his hon. friend said, the people of the country did not vote upon this issue, it was because they had no confidence in the newspapers representing the party of which he (Mr. Flynn) was a member. He might quote from the *Freeman*, of St. John. The editor of that paper told the people that a readjustment of the tariff, such as the Conservatives contemplated, meant a tax upon wheat and flour, a tax upon corn and meal, a tax upon coal, upon live animals and meat, upon agricultural implements, and so on, going through the list, and thus presented to the people of that Province, in the most exaggerated terms, the very issue which it was now denied was placed before them. The very evening before the election, one of the papers printed in the city from which he came, published a card with the heading "REMEMBER!" in which it was declared that those who voted for any of the "taxationist" candidates voted in direct approval of, among other things, a duty on cotton yarn of from 46 to 60 per cent.; woollen goods, 70 per cent.; flannels and blankets, 85 per cent.; alpaca goods, 85 per cent.; carpets, 84 per cent.; light cottons, 70 per cent.; and the lowest duty was 35 per cent. This allegation corresponded to the telegram that was sent to Sir John A. Macdonald, inquiring whether it was true that the duties were to be raised to 35 per cent. And yet they were told that the question of increased taxation was not in issue. It had been said that the tariff would be destructive to the shipbuilding interest, as though the very fact that they were encouraging direct trade with foreign countries, and the conveyance of those articles of raw material which were of greater bulk than the manufactured, would not tend rather in the direction of increasing and promoting the shipping of our country, than of destroying it, as the hon. gentlemen would have them believe. And it would result, not only in this, but in the employment that was given to many classes. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) he thought laid down the proposition that 263 men would

be all that would be benefitted by the encouragement given to the sugar industries. The hon. gentleman might have put two noughts to that, and he would come short of the number it would directly profit. Then they were told the tariff was inimical to immigration, and this came from the gentlemen whose policy had produced but little benefit to immigration—except to the emigration agents. It was a policy in which hundreds of thousands of dollars had been taken out of the Treasury of this country, and expended upon pets. They found that last year—according to the report of the *Globe*—the hon. the Minister of Agriculture declared that of 7,742 immigrants by the St. Lawrence route, only 420 settled in Canada, and that all the remainder went to the United States. They were next told this tariff was disloyal to Great Britain. He would ask, from whom did this charge come? He would not go back and search into the history of the country, or the history of the several Provinces, to enquire among what classes, or what parties, there had been any exhibitions of disloyalty in the past—whether the party they represented, containing within it a large portion of the Liberal party throughout the country, in union with the old Conservative party, whether this party had ever been chargeable with disloyalty to the British Crown. But he would ask when an intimation in the direction of the severance of the relations of these colonies with the British Empire was made, whence did it come? Did it not come from those whose political and commercial principles hon. gentlemen opposite were in full accord with? Was it not the Cobden and Bright school, whose utterances had ever pointed in that direction? No; they were introducing a policy which would bring increased prosperity and wealth to this country, and which must tend to perpetuate our relations with the Mother Country. As the hour for the recess was approaching, he would not deal with the question of our policy being unsatisfactory to the United States. It ill became the dignity of the House that such an argument as this should be adduced. In the next place, they were told that the lumbermen were to have no protection, and that the labourer was to receive

no advantage. As though the very fact of helping the manufacturers, opening up the mines, developing the agricultural resources of the country, stimulating the shipping interest, and affording variety of occupation in every respect, would not conduce to the improvement of the condition of the labourer and an increased prosperity to the industrial pursuits of the country. He would again refer to that wise statesman, whose words he had quoted a short time previously, in order to show the benefits which accrued from a diversity of occupations, and how they were affected by the application of wise legislation. He said:

“The interest of every labouring community requires diversity of occupations and objects of industry. The more that diversity is multiplied or extended, the better. To diversify employment is to increase employment, and to enhance wages. And, Sir, take this great truth, place it on the title page of every book of political economy intended for the use of the United States; put it in every farmers’ almanac; let it be the heading of every column in every mechanics’ magazine; proclaim it everywhere, and make it a proverb, that where there is work for the hands of men there will be work for their teeth. Where there is employment there will be bread. It is a great blessing to the poor to have cheap food, but greater than that, prior to that, and of still higher value, is the blessing of being able to buy food by honest and respectable employment. Employment feeds, and clothes, and instructs. Employment gives health, sobriety, and morals. Constant employment and well paid labour produce, in a country like ours, general prosperity, content, and cheerfulness. Thus happy have we seen the country. Thus happy may we long continue to see it.”

These words were used by that great statesman in a retrospect of the past, when speaking of a Protective tariff. He (Mr. Richey) used them as a prediction of the future in connection with the measure before the House. It was because he believed this tariff had been framed in the true interests of this country, that it would meet the views and expectations of the people of this country; that it had been framed with a sagacity that had enabled the hon. the Minister of Finance to bring within the scope of his vision, and properly estimate the varied requirements of this wide Dominion, from Vancouver to Cape Breton; that there was now placed before the people of the country, its capitalists, and its energetic business

men, a fair field for their several legitimate enterprises; because he saw opening before the merchant, so lately poring despondingly over his ledger, the mechanic so lately sitting idly at his bench, the labourer so lately labouring laboriously, but in vain, to procure some labour; because he thought he could see for these an opening out once more into the sunshine of prosperity, and believed that we should hear resounding, more cheerily than ever, the ring of the woodman's axe, the stroke of the mechanic's hammer, the hum and rattle of busy machinery, and see the workman receiving the due reward of his toil; because he believed that every word contained in the amendment submitted to the House might be safely reversed, that he would record his vote, with satisfaction and with hope, in favour of the resolutions.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 45) To authorise the construction of a bridge over the Ottawa River for the use of the Quebec, Ottawa, and Occidental Railway, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Holton*.)

Bill (No. 65) To incorporate the Geographical Society of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fortin*.)

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 68) To incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Burpee*, Sunbury.)

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa Loan and Investment Company, and to change the name to "The Manitoba and North-West Loan Company (Limited)."—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*.)

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the adjourned debate on resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, and Mr. Mackenzie's motion in amendment thereto.

MR. RICHEY.

MR. PLUMB said this debate had now taken a new aspect. To that aspect he proposed to address himself, in the remarks which he would have the honour to make to-night. After a long and extensive discussion on both sides of the House, the leader of the Opposition, representing the opinion, not only of the hon. gentlemen who followed him in this House, but of the great party of which he was the leader, of whose principles he was the exponent, had introduced a resolution which, without doubt, embodied fully, though concisely, the principles of the Opposition upon this floor, and the principles of the great party which that Opposition represented, for, although beaten at the polls, although represented here by a very small minority, they could not but accord to that great party a power in the country which it were useless to ignore, which it were rash in any way to reflect upon, and which must always be treated in any discussion in this House, or elsewhere, as a power in the Dominion of Canada. The resolution introduced by the hon. the leader of the Opposition was a resolution which, as he had said before, embodied briefly what might be considered the gist of the argument against the policy of the Government. He (Mr. Plumb) would read it, as the commencement of his remarks. It read as follows:—

"That, while this House is prepared to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service, and the maintenance of the public credit, it regards the scheme now under consideration as calculated to distribute unequally, and, therefore, unjustly, the burdens of taxation; to divert capital from its natural and most profitable employment; to benefit special classes at the expense of the whole community; tends towards rendering futile the costly and persistent efforts of the country to secure a share of the immense and growing carrying trade of this continent; and to create an antagonism between the commercial policy of the Empire and that of Canada that might lead to consequences deeply to be deplored."

He might say that he would not want any better text upon which to speak, on this occasion, than that short, comprehensive resolution. He had said to his hon. friend who had brought in the tariff resolutions that the speech with which that resolution was accompanied was the very best commentary upon the propositions which he had submitted to the

House, and the very best evidence that those propositions were acceptable to the country. But, before commencing to address himself specially to that resolution, he hoped he might be permitted to review briefly, as briefly as the case would admit, the circumstances in which we were placed by the condition of the country, which had conduced very largely to the adoption of the policy now brought forward by his hon. friend the Finance Minister. He (Mr. Plumb) became a member of Parliament at the time of the great political revolution which removed from this body a large number of the gentlemen who had before led its legislation in this House. He came here a stranger to the usages of the House, comparatively a stranger to the grave questions then under discussion; and almost the first important debate in the House, in that Session, was upon the fiscal condition of the country, opened by the Budget speech of the gentleman who succeeded his hon. friend the present Finance Minister, and had been succeeded by him. Those of them who then, for the first time, were brought face to face here with the arrogant representatives of the triumphant party, which had swept the country as by a deluge from Prince Edward Island to Manitoba, were somewhat astounded at the propositions and arguments of the hon. gentleman who then held the purse-strings. They had supposed, in their ignorance and innocence, perhaps, that the country had been, for many years, under Conservative rule, in a state of great prosperity; that the gentlemen who formed the Confederation of the Provinces, who had laid broad and deep its foundations, who had made it one of the powers of the earth, and one of the principal appanages of the great Crown upon which we were proud to be dependent, had done something towards advancing the interests of the country; but they learned, from the hon. member for Centre Huron, that they had been recreant to all the best interests of Canada, had squandered her resources, had made reckless bargains with the different Provinces in order to sustain their waning popularity, that they had heaped burdens upon Canada which she never could sustain; they were told all this by one who was lauded by the party then in power as

a great financial authority, and who spoke as the mouthpiece of that party. They were told constantly at every great meeting held for the purpose of influencing electors, as well as upon the floor of this House, that their friends, when in power, increased the public expenditure from \$13,500,000 in 1867, to \$23,316,316 in 1873-74. They were told that this was something so reprehensible, that those who were responsible for it should be for ever thereafter shut out from the management of public affairs; that they deserved to be ostracised because they had met the necessities of the growing Dominion with a statesmanlike and generous liberality. Increasing in population, wealth, and commerce with unparalleled rapidity, demanding outlays for perfecting the machinery of the new Confederation, for legislation, for the militia, for the collection of revenue, for the protection of the shipping trade, for the opening and peaceful occupation of the North-West, for public buildings adapted to the needs and the dignity of the Dominion, for the administration of justice, with ample and constantly augmenting revenues to meet such demands, the Conservative leaders would have been recreant to the trust confided to them, if they had adopted a niggardly or short-sighted method in dealing with the public expenditure. No one who sat on the Opposition benches in those days—and many of those gentlemen were here now before him in the same position—had opposed that policy to which he had just referred. The general principle upon which the expenditure was based was fully conceded on all sides; but little discussion arose upon the Budget during successive years from 1867 until 1873. Sir John Rose, during his financial Administration, finding the expenditure growing more rapidly than the revenue seemed to warrant, set a memorable example to those who came after him by cutting down his Estimates to meet the necessity. His able successors in the administration of the finances, prior to 1874, found no such need. They might be well assured that they would have met it had it occurred in a way to preserve the public credit from the damaging effect of yearly increasing deficits. The Opposition of the day contented themselves with a few unimportant criticisms

of the Estimates, and, in almost in every instance, heartily congratulated the Finance Minister upon his statements. The estimated receipts were in every instance, from 1868 to 1874, inclusive, exceeded by the actual revenue. There was ample justification for the expenditure, and he (Mr. Plumb) would venture to say that, from all he had seen of the course of the late Finance Minister and his colleagues, if they had had surplus revenues to deal with, instead of deficits, their financial record would have been very different from that of their predecessors. He (Mr. Plumb) would now justify his defence of the Government of 1867-1873, by referring to the increase of expenditure, item by item, in order that the House might see how far the late Finance Minister and his colleagues, and backers, and the public press that sustained them, were justified in their virulent criticism. Under the heading of ordinary expenditure, the increases, comparing 1867-68 with 1873-74, were as follows:—

	1867-68	1873-74	Increase.
	\$	\$	\$
Civil Government..	594,441	883,655	289,214
Administration of			
Justice....	291,242	459,037	167,795
Police	49,176	56,387	7,211
Penitentiaries....	209,369	395,551	186,192
Legislation	595,810	784,048	188,238
Geological Survey..	57,814	28,600	69,214
Arts, Agriculture, and Statistics....	5,850	19,091	13,241
Immigration and			
Quarantine	60,396	318,572	258,176
Marine Hospitals..	21,048	66,462	45,414
Pensions	56,421	56,453	32
Public Works....	126,269	1,826,001	1,699,732
Ocean and River			
Steam Service....	296,511	407,760	110,189
Light House and			
Coast Service....	174,982	537,057	362,075
Fisheries	30,572	76,247	45,675
Miscellaneous Items	93,451	102,160	8,709

\$3,451,107

These were all the items of accounts opened in 1867-68, under the heading of "Ordinary Expenditure," on which there was an increased outlay up to 1873-74. Upon the item of steamboat inspection there was a decrease of \$115, and upon that of Militia and Defence of \$35,639. These, deducted from \$3,451,107, left the increase \$3,415,468. The following items, also under the heading of "Ordinary Expenditure," represented outlays in accounts not open until after 1867-68:—

Census.....	\$ 39,470
Superannuation	6,442
Indian Grants.....	146,068
Dominion Lands.....	283,163
Dominion Forces, Manitoba.....	209,169
Mounted Police.....	199,599
North-West Territory Organization.	12,262
Boundary Surveys.....	81,723
Military Stores.....	144,906
Customs Refunds.....	69,330

Total.....\$1,250,132

CHARGES ON REVENUE*

	1867-68	1873-74	Increase.
Customs.....	\$457,503	\$658,299	\$200,796
Excise.....	78,939	206,935	127,996
Culling Timber..	69,430	82,286	12,856
Post-Office.....	616,802	1,387,270	770,468
Public Works... ..	626,286	2,389,679	1,763,393

Increase.....\$2,875,509

There was a decrease in the item of Minor Revenues from \$16,841 to \$11,371..... 5,470

Total increase..... \$2,870,039

DEBT AND SUBSIDIES.

Interest on Public Debt....	\$4,501,568	\$5,724,436	\$1,222,868
Sinking Fund..	355,266	513,920	158,564
Subsidies to Provinces.....	2,753,966	3,752,757	998,791
Increase			2,380,313

There was a decrease in the item of Charges of Management from \$285,512 to \$238,003, or 47,519 And in premium, discount and exchange from \$73,676 to \$26,680, or .. 46,996 94,515

Total increase.....\$2,285,798

These aggregated, summed up as follows: Increase in ordinary expenditure, in accounts open in 1867-68, \$3,414,353. In accounts not opened until after that date, \$1,250,132. In charges on Revenue, \$2,870,039. Interest on Public Debt (less decrease on Charges of Management and premium, discount, and exchange), \$1,128,365. In Sinking Fund, \$158,654. In Subsidies, \$998,791. All these formed a sum total of increases from 1867-68 to 1873-74, when the hon. member for Lambton and his friends took the management of affairs, of \$9,820,322. The supporters of the Government claimed, however, that in the increased expenditure of 1873-44, there were items amounting to nearly one

million dollars, which had been often pointed out, that were improperly added by the late Finance Minister to the accounts of that year, and properly belonged to the succeeding year. This contention, he thought, his hon. friend before him (Mr. Tilley) was prepared to justify. They had insisted upon it in his defence while he was absent from the House, and while he held a position which prevented him from entering into the discussion and vindicating, as he had now vindicated, his position. It might be safely asserted, that in, round numbers, at least \$950,000, improperly added by his successors to the expenditure of 1873-74, should be deducted from the total increase before stated, bringing it down to \$8,870,322, from the total expenditure of 1873-74, reducing it to \$22,466,316, and added to the expenditure of 1874-75, making the total of that fiscal year, the first clear year of Reform rule, \$24,663,071. The correctness of this statement was virtually proved by comparing the figures with those of the second fiscal year of the rule of their economical friends, the loud-mouthed advocates of retrenchment. That year, 1875-76, presented the startling aggregate of \$24,488,372, and that of the two succeeding years, which completed their record, was only kept down by a device which could not rebound to their credit. While other items of administrative expenditure were increasing in a startling ratio, although the revenue was constantly shrinking, by the expenditure of 1876-77, when the great depression was fairly upon us, paralysing trade and carrying disaster into every branch of industry, the reckless policy of the late Government entailed upon the country an outlay, chargeable upon revenue, of \$23,519,301, which was only kept down to those frightful figures by striking out \$428,079 from the Militia items, and \$682,128 from that of Public Works chargeable to revenue. As compared with the outlay in those Departments the year previous, a reduction of \$1,110,207 was thus obtained, but for which the total for 1876-77 would have been \$24,629,508. The same plan was adopted in 1877-78. The Militia item was \$360,404 less, and the Public Works item \$950,347 less than in 1875-76. The total expenditure

of the year, notwithstanding these abnormal reductions, was \$23,503,158, and, but for them, would have reached \$24,813,909. There could be no merit in bringing about a reduction by the contrivances now exposed. If Public Works, chargeable to revenue, had been completed, as they had been led to believe they would be, the expenditure, of course, would cease. As to the Militia, they knew who presided over that Department, and his antecedents would lead them to believe that he would not resist any reduction of our power to defend the flag. In every case, it would be found that the expenditure of the Liberal-Conservative Government, upon which such fierce denunciations had been poured out by hon. gentlemen opposite, especially by the late Premier and the late Finance Minister, had been exceeded under their Administration. It would be an easy task to justify, item by item, every figure for which his hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) and his old colleagues and predecessors were in any way responsible. In the spring Session of 1873, the late Finance Minister, who had been virulently opposed by the *Globe* and its party at his election, in August, 1872, made his prophetic speech which he had often quoted, but of which, unfortunately, no extended record remained in the public archives. He claimed, however, on the strength of that vaticination, credit for foreseeing the commercial crisis which was impending, and which burst upon the country like a tornado, in the autumn of 1873. It had already spread panic and dismay over the United States, when the hon. gentleman and his colleagues took the seals of office, and it had extended to Great Britain and the Continent before the hon. gentlemen met Parliament, at the end of March, 1874. He (Mr. Plumb), in common with many others who heard the Budget speech of 1874, was not aware of the mental peculiarities of the hon. gentleman who uttered it—they did not know the depth of the immedicable wound which had been inflicted upon his ambition, and his self-love, nor the bitterness and persistency of his hatred. His speech was violent beyond any precedent, and it might have been considered unfair, and, perhaps, not over courageous or chivalrous, to attack

a man who could not stand up here and defend himself and his policy, as he had shown himself fully able to do, since the country has welcomed him back to these halls. Every utterance of the late Finance Minister betrayed the anguish of his wound, and the rage into which it threw him. They were charged with a venom, however, which fortunately had only had the effect of politically destroying himself. Upon that memorable occasion, the Finance Minister bitterly attacked the former Government for the terms it had given to Prince Edward Island, and no one of the representatives of that Island, all of whom, for reasons which he should not characterise, had crossed over to the support of the then incoming Administration, ventured to rebuke him for his covert insinuations as to sharp bargains. But his voice rose into a scream of denunciation when he said that his predecessors had done quickly what they had to do, namely, to wreck the public credit, and that they had left upon him "A sum total of what I call liabilities capable of being ascertained, amounting to one hundred and thirty-one millions three hundred thousand dollars in addition to our debt. Now the House will see the magnitude of the task imposed on us, by observing that this sum is, as nearly as possible, equal to the total indebtedness of the Dominion." In various pic-nic speeches during the past two or three years, this statement had been made with even more directness and force of assertion. Now, this, if it meant anything, meant that one hundred and thirty-one millions of dollars of liabilities, either immediate or prospective, in addition to the existing debt of a like amount, had been imposed upon the Dominion by reckless and improvident legislation prior to 1874. This was a truly alarming statement; one well calculated to startle the people of Canada, and to shake its credit with the capitalists of the world. Let them examine it, and endeavour, by it, to test the accuracy and fairness of the hon. gentleman's arguments. At the Aylmer pic-nic in 1877, they were told, according to the *Globe* report of the late Finance Minister's speech:

"That he must prepare to borrow within three, six or seven years, not less than

\$120,000,000 of money; that was the extent of the engagements and commitments which the late Government had left us as their dying legacy. It is hard to realise what this means. For us, \$120,000,000 is a tremendous sum. It equals our net existing national debt. It is more for us than 2,000 millions for the United States, or 2,500 millions for Great Britain."

Fancy the wonder of the crowd at hearing these sums glibly stated, honest Grits fumbling in their pockets, instinctively, under the idea that a hat would be passed round at the close of the performance, and that they would be called upon to contribute their share of the trifling amount in order to recoup the Treasury, which had been depleted by the rascally extravagance of the Tories. The Budget speech of 1878, told them.

"We had other liabilities definitely fixed—mark, definitely fixed, amounting to 131 millions, namely:

For Canals.....	\$ 43,800,000
Intercolonial Railway.....	10,000,000
Pacific Railway.....	30,000,000
Debts Maturing.....	35,000,000
In ercolonial Railway repairs in	
New Brunswick & Nova Scotia	2,000,000
P. E. I. Railway and Land Grants	2,500,000
Minor Works.....	4,500,000
St. Lawrence Improvements below Montreal.....	2,500,000
Certain advances then contemplated.....	1,000,000
<hr/>	
Total.....	\$131,300,000"

The nature of this shocking bug-bear, which, exhibited by so responsible an authority as the Finance Minister of Canada, was well calculated to cause a capitalist in England to button his pockets, might be inferred. The fairness of these statements might be inferred from the actual fact that, out of the amount of \$131,300,000, \$30,000,000 was the sum intended as a subsidy to the Pacific Railway, under a charter which had been abandoned, and an Act which had been instantly repealed by the hon. gentleman and his majority. \$35,000,000 were for removal of debt, which was considerably increased, nominally, by negotiating a four per cent. loan at a discount. But who ever heard before that such renewals could be fairly counted, or counted at all, among items which were to double the amount of the existing debt of which they formed a part? Such, however, was the inference that was adroitly suggested. When it suited the Finance Minister to

do so, as on a recent occasion, he made light of the task of borrowing money in England for renewal of debt, even in the face of difficulties brought about by his own *laches*, and at a crisis of unparalleled severity in the money market of Lombard street. They must strike off the \$35,000,000 under this head. Thus they relieved him very easily of one half of his load. \$30,000,000 for the Pacific Railway and \$35,000,000 for renewal—\$65,000,000 in all. They had not cost him many sleepless nights. Then there were in his list, \$43,800,000 for the enlargement and construction of Canals, and among these the Baie Verte figured for \$8,500,000. The other items were nearly as illusory and misleading. The whole presentation was more than unfair. Except the repeal of the Pacific Railway Act, no legislation that he (Mr. Plumb) could remember had relieved the country of any liability; and the fidelity of the atrabilious statements of the late Finance Minister might be tested by ascertaining what amounts he stated in his last Budget speech would be required to complete the works in hand except the Pacific Railway, for all the expenditure on which, except \$1,391,618, incurred prior to 1874, the late Government must be held wholly and rigidly responsible. These amounts, estimated as of the 1st. July, 1878, were: For completion of Weland and Lachine Canals, \$5,500,000; Miscellaneous Works, \$5,000,000, or ten millions and a half altogether; and it might be said, in passing, that with much of this sum the late Government should also be charged. The net increase of debt from July 1st, 1873, to July 1st, 1878, was \$40,513,607. From this amount must be deducted discount on renewals, \$3,901,444, and amount expended on Pacific Railway, \$8,812,233, leaving the increase for all expenditure on capital account for every other purpose, \$27,799,930. Add to this the ten millions and a half still required for the completion of the canals, and the frightful \$131,300,000 shrank to \$38,300,000—a decrease of a mere trifle of ninety-three millions, or 71 per cent., which might gauge, with tolerable accuracy, the allowance that must be made for the Finance Minister's calculations. But it was by no means to be admitted that the hon. gentleman's

predecessors were responsible for the \$38,300,000. He (Mr. Plumb) ventured to assert that his hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Tilley) and his colleagues would have curtailed expenditure in every possible way, having proper regard to the public interest, if they had continued in power. Their Estimates were based upon a condition of things which was totally changed when Parliament met in 1874. The late Government, with a vast majority at its back, had full power to reverse the policy of its predecessors. Whatever, in their judgment, had been improperly or unwisely done, should have been promptly undone. It was their duty to apply the knife and to cut down outlay whenever the knife was needed. They had command of the ship. It was their duty, when they saw a financial storm lowering in the horizon, to shorten sail and economise. Could it be supposed for a moment that his hon. friend who sat in front of him (Mr. Tilley) would not have had sufficient intelligence, honesty, and courage to meet the exigencies of the time, if he found there was a decreasing revenue? The late Finance Minister and his friends made the enormously exaggerated statement which he (Mr. Plumb) had dissected, in order to bewilder the public, in order to show that his own enormous expenditure was no falsification of the promises his colleagues had made when in Opposition. They sought to cover up their tracks. The most efficient way to do that was for the Finance Minister to largely overestimate the burdens thrown upon him. And how had the inherited obligations been discharged, and how had the new ones undertaken been fulfilled, on July 1st, 1878? The Pacific Railway construction had swallowed up \$8,812,833, and there were enormous sums since paid, and yet due. They had a glimpse, and as yet a glimpse only, of the reckless haste, and waste, and jobbery which had characterised that work. Not a section of the line from Fort William to Red River could be brought into use for at least three years, because the connecting link between English River and Keewatin had been left untouched, and a large annual charge of interest would be totally lost, until the road could be made available for traffic. In regard to the Wel-

land Canal, \$7,846,145 had been expended up to July 1st, 1878, on the enlargement, at each end, which is nearly completed; the middle section and the aqueduct over the River Welland were only put under contract a few months ago, and could not be completed in less than three years. Until then, the new work was utterly useless, and was falling frightfully out of repair, and an interest account was heavily accumulating on the outlay. In such a state of things, it would be natural that they should feel great alarm for the public credit, strained, as it had been, to the utmost by the prodigality and incapacity of those to whom it was entrusted. He (Mr. Plumb) and his friends had been accused, time after time, of having taken a gloomy view of the position of Canada in their public utterances, but if ever any gentleman on the present Government side had taken so gloomy a view as that taken by the late Finance Minister in his Budget speech of 1874, and in many subsequent speeches, he (Mr. Plumb) could only say he had never heard of it. It was notorious that the Finance Minister, on that occasion, struck a heavy blow at the credit of Canada. But Canada, he trusted, would survive that, as she had already survived five years of the misrule of the gentlemen now in Opposition. In 1873, as he Mr. Plumb had before remarked, about the time that the so-called Reform party came into power, it happened that there was a great revulsion throughout the commercial world; it happened that the constantly increasing revenues of Canada began to diminish; it happened that, in September, 1873, the crash which had been so long foreseen in the United States, and which the late Finance Minister especially claimed to have foreseen, fell upon that country. Canada did not feel it at first; but it was the duty of the men who were at the helm, to look out for the storm, alter the course of the ship, if necessary, take in sail, and prepare for the worst. Up to that time they had been going on with constantly increasing revenues, but his hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) had indicated to the House in the first Session of 1873 that he intended to deal with the fiscal policy of the country, in the direction of an increase in the taxation. He had

predicted that, owing to the legislation of 1873, there would be a necessity for a further increase of revenue, and he indicated clearly that he would deal with the necessities of the case in the direction of Protection, he would so gauge his revenue tariff as to foster the various industries of the country. It must be borne in mind that up to that time there had been no necessity for any Protective tariff in this country; that the condition of things with our neighbours was such that they could sell Canada nothing, whilst we could sell them, at fair prices, everything we produced. The 15 per cent. tariff, then in force, was all that was then required for the protection of our industries. There had been a constant increase of revenue, and a constant surplus—a surplus acknowledged by the late Finance Minister to have been expended upon the public works of the country, and in the redemption of debt, not including the sinking fund payments of £700,000 sterling—of no less than \$11,849,000. This statement was emblazoned on the silver side of that double-faced shield, of which the people of Ontario saw the brass, when the late Finance Minister appeared at their Reform picnics. He (Mr. Plumb) repeated that Canada did not require an increased tariff up to 1874, the industries of this country were protected by the condition of things in the United States, which created inflation prices there. As far as England was concerned, he was well aware, and every gentleman in this House, who was candid enough, would admit, that there was never any disposition on the part of Conservatives to discriminate against the Mother Country, to which they all owned the truest allegiance. Therefore, up to 1873 or 1874, whenever it was found necessary to deal with questions of revenue, it was not necessary to do so with Protective views, because the industries of the Dominion were not affected by competition on the other side of the border. A sudden change took place—so sudden, that very few in this country were prepared to acknowledge its far-reaching consequences. During the first year of its progress elsewhere, it was scarcely felt here, but in the second year it was felt in the increased imports to Canada, from the

United States, in the decreased exports from Canada to that country, until the balance of trade against us reached the alarming sum of twenty-five million dollars. That was the balance of trade against Canada in 1877, and it was almost the same sum in 1878. The hon. gentlemen opposite seemed powerless to deal with this question. They would probably begin by laying down the proposition that a balance of trade is not a balance of trade, for that was the convenient way in which they always cleared away the difficulty. The late Minister of the Interior had advanced views on that subject which, if held and acted upon by an individual, would soon send him to the Insolvent Court, if that Court had not in the meantime been abolished. And it would almost appear, from the manner in which they quoted authorities in the United States, in order to justify their position, that they were rather in league with and supporting those financial authorities than attempting to assert themselves and their own position. He did not say that that was the case, or that that was always and absolutely the line taken by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, although it was quite the fashion for them, in those days, to impute disloyalty to the members on the Ministerial side, to the men who had stood by the British flag from the time they were first able to take upon themselves the responsibilities of manhood. Well, because it was necessary for the late Government to deal with the question of the expenditure, there had been no increase by his (Mr. Plumb's) friends, or through their policy, which was not justifiable under the circumstances, and requisite to meet the legitimate wants of the country. It was usual for hon. gentlemen on the opposite side to assert that their extravagant expenditure was made necessary by the action of their predecessors. Why were those gentlemen put in power? To reverse the action of their predecessors, if it appeared to them to be unwise; they were not bound by the legislation of their predecessors. They were bound to take the other tack. They had denounced their predecessors on every platform from British Columbia to the shores of Prince Edward Island. Everywhere they had declared that they

MR. PLUMB.

had superseded a reckless and improvident Administration, but they excused themselves, when charged with extravagance, by saying that they had only spent a little more than had been spent by that reckless and improvident Administration. He could not remember a single instance in which they had fulfilled their promise to put a stop to the golden flow from the public Treasury, and bring about a state of things which should accord with the diminishing revenues and the declining business of the country. He ventured to say that if his hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) had been Finance Minister during the last five years—and he (Mr. Plumb) deeply regretted the political overthrow which left him unable to finish his financial policy—they would not have had to witness such a state of things as the present. What was it? Why, the ex-Finance Minister, in order to meet what he was pleased to call the burdens which were thrown on him by his predecessors, proposed to do so by adding to the tariff an increase of the taxes that would produce \$3,000,000. How did he proceed? After labouring from the 12th November, 1873, when the late Government came into power, until the 13th or 14th of April, 1874, that hon. gentleman brought in the tariff, with his Budget speech, the principal changes in which imposed $1\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. additional duty on the 15 per cent. list, from which he said he expected to receive \$3,000,000. In some other directions, also, he attempted to deal with the great financial interests of the country. But he so befogged and bemuddled the whole question, that he brought down upon himself the indignation of the whole business community. He had disturbed every industry of the country. He was forced to recede, and content himself with simply adding $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to the 15 per cent. list, making what our neighbours of the United States called a mechanical or horizontal instead of a scientific tariff; and now the hon. gentleman said that the $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was a sacred thing, and that if any rash man touched it, he would sever the golden chain of our connection with Britain forever. He (Mr. Plumb) would like to know why those cabalistic figures were so sacred, or so much better than any other number. The number nine

had peculiar properties in multiplication, addition and division, and many persons explained prophecy by the elastic use of the number seven, but he was not aware that even Zadkiel, who was quite as good a soothsayer as the late Finance Minister, had ever adopted seventeen-and-a-half as a term to conjure with. He could not discover that there was anything in the old tariff that could not be altered or meddled with without meeting the denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite; but yet they seemed to think that there must be something almost holy in the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. evolved by the ex-Finance Minister out of the depths of his own rather confused—consciousness, should it be called? The previous figures, however, $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., he had desired to adopt for no apparent reason but that it made the calculation of duties easy. What did the tariff of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) effect? In the fond belief that it would produce \$3,000,000, he said that he could not be expected to reduce the expenditures of his friend, the then Minister of Public Works. There were too many contractors in the purlieus of the capital waiting for their wages. The financial storm was then raging, but there was no retrenchment. He (Mr. Plumb) remembered perfectly well the language of the member for Centre Huron in 1874, when, turning to the First Minister (Mr. Mackenzie), he said that they must go on with the expenditure for the works which were under his charge. From whom did the House and the country expect economy? From whom had they a right to expect it? From a life-long Reformer; from a man whose instincts were supposed to be in the direction of close management of the expenditure in the Department over which he presided especially, who was supposed to possess a peculiar fitness, from personal training and experience, for that Department? The late Government could not cut down the Estimates, because there were certain powers behind the Grit throne greater than the Grit throne itself, that had to be placated after the elections. He (Mr. Plumb) believed that he should be borne out in that assertion. The tariff proved a failure, and a deficit arose the next

year, as well as each of the two following years, with which the Government of the day confessed themselves utterly powerless to deal. They acknowledged that they were utterly powerless to propose a policy suitable for meeting the crying needs of the hour. They declared that a Government had no power to deal with questions affecting the vital interests of the country. They, on the Conservative side, however, held the contrary. They always had said that if they should be entrusted with the solution of those questions, they would not sit with their hands folded, but would try, at least, to do something for the country, and he thought that the people had taken the late Government at their word, and the Conservatives at their word; and it was not far to seek, or difficult to know, why the great revolution had occurred, which placed hon. gentlemen opposite in even a smaller minority than the Conservatives appeared in 1874. Deficits, to the amount of nearly seven millions of dollars, had accrued since hon. gentlemen opposite assumed charge of public affairs. His hon. friend the present Finance Minister, on returning to power, had to deal with that grave condition of the finances, and, after this cursory review of events, leading up to the present situation, it was somewhat refreshing to refer back to the patriotic resolutions put upon the table of the House by the present able Finance Minister, and to compare their breadth and fullness with the lifeless and meagre amendment with which the leader of the Opposition proposed to supersede them. He declared, "That, while we are willing to do anything to sustain the public credit, to meet the necessities of the hour, we cannot consent to any legislation which shall disturb the present condition of the country," as if that condition was so very satisfactory that it ought not to be disturbed. He held that they ought to disturb it—that they were here exactly for that purpose, and he, for one, would lift up his voice in every way which might be calculated to disturb it. Whatever the leader of the Opposition might think of the necessity of his amendment, he (Mr. Plumb) differed with him, *totò cœlo*, in the proposition he had made. What the hon. gentleman proposed, he had had ample opportunity to carry out

during the last three years. He had failed to submit any proposition to that effect, or make any move in the direction in which he said he was bound to go, in the event of a deficit occurring. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had said, on the floor of the House, that a decrease of revenue should be met by reduced expenditure. But Sir John Rose had said the same thing, and acted accordingly, and it had been laid down as an axiom, by sound practical statesmen—not political prigs—that it would be suicidal, for a Government like that of Canada, to allow increasing deficits to accrue. It was all very well to talk, as the late Finance Minister talked at Fergus, in July, 1877, of deficits of 20 years ago, under the old Provincial system, and cite them in the stale *tu quoque* argument as a justification of the course of the late Government. Hon. gentlemen understood perfectly, that it was necessary, if they wished to maintain the credit of the country when there was, unfortunately, as sometimes there would be, a disturbance of the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, so to increase the one, or decrease the other, as to maintain the public credit uninjured, and he charged hon. gentlemen on the opposite side with having neglected that which was one of the very first, one of the most fundamental principles of public economy and political science. Look at the amendment before the House, which affirmed that they “were prepared to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service and the maintenance of the public credit.” He had sat there for the last ten days, listening to the outpourings of hon. gentlemen opposite, and had failed to hear from them the slightest indication of any policy suited to the present exigencies of the country. He had heard them travelling over the record, arguing upon every possible subject—he had heard, from one bench to the other, the echoes of the same stale old stories, but he had never heard a single scintilla, or seen a glimpse of anything like a financial policy to substitute for the policy brought down by his hon. friend the Finance Minister. Until hon. gentlemen opposite could offer a proper substitute for it, he (Mr. Plumb) thought that they might fairly say they would stand by the scheme of his hon. friend. He would

like to have from the Opposition a kernel of common sense, instead of the worthless chaff which they had been winnowing out by the cartload, while fancying they were discussing the question in hand. He was astounded when the late First Minister, on bringing down his amendment, made the accompanying speech, introducing it. He (Mr. Plumb) saw nothing in it which was not probably within the legitimate right of the leader of an Opposition, although it fell very far short of what might have been expected from him. It exhibited only a policy of grumbling and fault-finding; but there was good reason why that party should grumble and find fault, for he thought they had received a castigation which made them feel a little sore towards gentlemen on the Ministerial side. But they, on his side, did not intend to aggravate the discomforts of their position; they were willing to leave gentlemen in Opposition to accept for themselves a solution which they were intelligent enough to understand, or find out. Hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side had to deal with the question of the credit of this country, which the ex-Finance Minister, he (Mr. Plumb) had almost said, had culpably neglected. His hon. friend, the present Finance Minister, came into office at a critical moment—when Parliament must be called together within a very few months—when the depression which had kept the country down had lasted nearly five years—when they were constantly accumulating deficits, and when he had to infuse life into the dead body of the public credit. He entered office when, for a large amount of the public debt falling due in England on the 1st January, 1879, arrangements had instantly to be made, and when, at the same time, it was necessary to inaugurate a fiscal policy, the details of which demanded all his time and attention. The late Finance Minister had neglected to provide for the renewal of the debt at the proper time. It demanded his personal attention in London, immediately upon the accession of the present Finance Minister to office. That hon. gentleman was compelled to go to England at a moment the most disastrous in the history of English commerce for the last 25 or 30 years; upon the failure of one of

the great banks, upon the shareholders of which a call of £2,250 had just been made for every £100 share. The unprecedented and utterly ruinous magnitude of the call would mark the extent of the disaster, a calamity that had been followed by the failure of another important bank, on the very day the Finance Minister had advertised for tenders. The hon. gentleman had been forced to take action at that time, by the neglect of the ex-Finance Minister. It had been constantly stated, after the late election, that there would be no redemption of the pledges of the Conservative party. The great organ of the Reform party in Ontario, which was inspired by him who was called by the hon. member for Lambton the Grand Old Reformer—who dictated the policy of the Reform party, and without whom the leaders on the opposite benches could have no following in Ontario, at least—of whom it could be said, in regard to the public men of that Province, who were almost his puppets: "A breath unmakes them, as a breath hath made"—it seemed good to that great party leader and dictator to assure the readers of his newspaper that the Conservatives had no intention of fulfilling their promises. The hon. member for Lambton, in fact, who was Mr. Brown's henchman, had stated that Sir John A. Macdonald would as soon establish a Republic as a Protective policy. The *Globe* and its echoes were filled daily after the election with editorial articles so childish and contradictory that it did not seem possible that they could affect the minds even of the most benighted and bigoted Grits. After the overthrow of the party, which was largely due to that gentleman's want of political instinct, and to the utter incapacity to understand the direction of public opinion exhibited by the late Finance Minister and his colleagues throughout their short ascendancy, the *Globe* threw upon the Conservative party the responsibility of the decline in the price of wheat, which had fallen in consequence of a close of the European war, and the unprecedented large harvest in the United States. The stentorian voice of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) echoed the same strain, in thundering forth a long row of figures in respect to the decline in

prices of bank stocks since the elections. He held the present Government responsible for the bear movements in Montreal, and the effect of the great bank failure in Scotland and Wales upon the minds of sensitive shareholders. They were quite as responsible for the fall, if any had occurred, in the prices of confectionery and cigars. The *Globe* also demanded an immediate exposition of the National Policy. It could not even wait until the funeral of its departing friends in Ottawa had taken place. A few extracts would illustrate the manner in which the great organ of the defeated party dealt with the question after the battle. On the 9th of October they read in the leading columns:

"Some one has said, 'Blessed are they who expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed,' and, evidently, the friends of the National Policy, as well as its advocates are preparing and being prepared for receiving another illustration of this time-hallowed maxim. For it is not yet a year since Sir John assured the faithful that what might be adequate protection for one industry would not be sufficient for another, and that, consequently, it would be desirable for those engaged in each, to meet and consider what they might need, so that all wishes should be met by the rulers, who were to be, and who will speedily be, installed. It was intimated distinctly that those engaged in the different industries were the best able to say what Customs dues they needed, in order to be adequately protected, and what they said should certainly be done. * * * Now, there is a strong desire to hark back upon what was said and what was promised.

"What is there to wait for? Does not Sir John know what to do? * * * Why wait over Christmas? Why lose January? * * * There is some shuffling here—some design to postpone, indefinitely, this boon of Protection. We shall not, it seems, get the first instalment of the things we want, but we shall have the first instalment of a treacherous betrayal of our trust instead."

They were next told, on the 10th of October, the new Government having not yet formed:

"Conservatives are, with one accord, attempting to back down from their unpleasant position on the Protection question. Having secured a lease of power, they are already proposing to throw over everybody and everything they made use of in the contest. * * * That utterance [*Gazette's*], was probably a feeler, put out to break the news gently to the Canadian manufacturers, that they had been swindled into making themselves ridiculous, in order that Sir John might get his truly clean hands into the public chest again. * * *

We have long ago given up expecting consistency from any Conservative as to this National Policy. It is a disgraceful thing that the hard times still hang on, when Sir John Macdonald expressly promised that they should be banished as soon as the Conservatives gained a majority."

On the 21st October they found this precious *morceau* :

"It is too bad that the leaders should be squabbling while the people are starving, capital idle, manufactures perishing, and workmen on half time."

Again on the 28th :

"In many parts of Canada the crop is, thus far, not so good as was expected. The weather was against its being well harvested. In many cases it is damp and sprung. The price is low and falling. In the face of such things, is this a time to palter and delay?"

On the 1st November, they read :

"Our farmers, with a falling market, and no prospect of immediate revival, have time to meditate over the vanity of human wishes, and the unsubstantial character of National Policy promises."

They were further assured that the right hon. leader of the Government and his friends were trying to get rid of the National Policy :

"We must congratulate our Tory friends upon the multitude and ingenuity of their attempts to drop off the Protectionist platform, without exciting an unpleasant amount of attention from their dupes.

"The Finance Minister, when he attempts to frame his new tariff, will have a lively time of it.

"There are delays in forming a National Policy Government; there is an evident desire to delay the advent of the National Policy itself; excuses are being offered; time is demanded; there is a shuffling attempt to induce others than the half-fledged Administration to assume a share in the responsibility of incubating the National Policy. We can see no reason for delay; no need for excuses, if all is fair and honest; no justification for, but much to reprehend in, shuffling."

The Finance Minister was, at this time, endeavouring to repair his predecessor's shuffling, as to which there was no justification, but much to reprehend. It would be instructive to follow the *Globe* through brake and through brier, on its will-o'-the-wisp wanderings since the election. At one moment it assured them that we were to consume all we produced, and produce all we consumed; at another, we were to erect the Chinese wall along our borders; at

another, we were to make no change whatever. Its veracious correspondent in Ottawa, who had attained a first magnitude in the practice which made Mendez Pinto proverbial, reported that a general scale of thirty-five per cent. and upwards had been agreed upon between Mr. Tilley and those cormorant manufacturers who had made such bloated fortunes during the past five years. A few days afterwards, in the leading article of the paper, the truth of this wildly absurd, and maliciously false report was gravely assumed, and an argument was based upon it, intended, as it seemed, to create discontent in England against a loyal dependency, and in the United States against peaceful neighbours, who claimed simply the right to attend to their own business. The whole chorus yelped to the same tune, and they demanded, almost the day after the election, that the National Policy should be brought down. They said it required no ingenuity, that it could be brought down by any clerk in public offices; and they demanded that his hon. friend, before he was sworn, and before he had time to assume the duties of his office, should bring down his Budget. They all cried out that the Government and their supporters were insincere. Well, he thought the fact of the opposition made to the resolutions of his hon. friend showed, at least, that he had fulfilled his side of the bargain. He might say that every criticism that he had heard from the other side, had only tended, in his judgment, to strengthen the public confidence in the resolutions of his hon. friend. This showed that they were willing to take the responsibility of a policy which gentlemen in Opposition said they never intended to undertake. There had been a great deal said about the promises made by his hon. friend the leader of the Government, and he should not notice some of the criticisms, were it not that the late First Minister had condescended, in his last address to the House upon this matter, to allude to the poor, the played-out, exploded canard circulated in New Brunswick before the election, that Sir John promised a 35 per cent. tariff. It was first stated that he said so at Parkhill, in North Middlesex,

when he rendered the signal service which resulted in the overthrow of the Reform ascendancy in that Riding and the election of Mr. Coughlin in the place of Mr. Scatcherd. If his hon. friend from Centre Huron were here, he would comfort him by telling him it was a majority of 800 on the one side, which was reversed by a considerable majority on the other, as an answer to his argument about the majorities by which gentlemen on the right had been returned to this House. Sir John never said anything of the kind at Parkhill. He (Mr. Plumb) was present and heard every word he said. Then he was charged with having said, at Strathroy, the same thing. He (Mr. Plumb) was present there, and no such statement was made. The real foundation of the rumour was a casual conversation at an informal meeting in London, where some eavesdropper heard and reported to that veracious paper, the *London Advertiser*, a statement of Sir John's, partly true and partly intentionally misrepresented. What Sir John said on that occasion was this :

"In noticing the argument advanced, that the United States would be offended if Canada raised her tariff, he pointed out that Mr Fernando Wood's proposal to increase the United States tariff on certain articles to 35 per cent. as a maximum, was regretted on the ground that it was a Free-trade tariff, and he (Sir John) argued that Canada could not therefore offend the United States, even if the tariff here was raised to 35 per cent., because the Americans had pronounced that rate to belong to a Free-trade tariff."

That was exactly what he said, and nothing more ; and he knew, and every hon. gentleman knew, that if any man holding the responsible position of Sir John Macdonald, understanding and valuing, as he did, the obligations that rested upon him as the leader of a great party and as the more than probable Premier who would hold office after the 17th of September, should indicate any particulars of the tariff, he would be doing an injustice to himself as a statesman, and betraying the trust of his party, and the interests of his country. But, said the *Globe*, "If Sir John did not suggest 35 per cent., what did he suggest?" That was the answer, and that was the whole case. Now, he (Mr. Plumb) wished to say that he thought, in every respect, the tariff which had been

brought down by his hon. friend had fulfilled the expectation of the country. He had not found anything in it which could, in the slightest degree, be considered as disloyal to the great country of which we were a part, and of which, he trusted, we were a part that could not be separated. He failed to see anything in it which, as was said by an hon. gentleman on the other side, could sever the golden link which bound us to the Mother Country. He failed to see anything in it except an attempt—it might be successful and might be unsuccessful—to check the constant encroachments from the opposite side of the border upon the trade that legitimately belonged to England, and to Canada itself. He had looked over the items in the tariff. He knew that, in two or three particulars, the tariff would enhance the imposts levied upon British imports ; these, together, were estimated by the Finance Minister to amount to about \$550,000 out of the whole \$2,700,000. There would be reductions also, leaving him \$2,150,000, as net increase. It had been said that, in respect to the woollen trade under the new tariff, there would be an additional burden laid upon English imports. The Finance Minister thought it was necessary, in dealing with the tariff, to provide that coarse woollens should be protected for the benefit of the woollen manufacturers of this country. Also, we had in Canada a very large supply of a kind of wool which we ought rather to use in this country than to be compelled to sell to the Americans, and to pay them upon it 10c. per pound duty, and an *ad valorem* duty also, which amounted to three cents more. We should encourage that manufacture here, and it was proper that, in discriminating, we should discriminate in favour of the finer kinds of cloth which were especially manufactured in England. If there had been any partiality shown in adjusting the tariff, it had been with the especial intention of giving advantage to England, and the burden would fall where it belonged. When we used those cloths, finer woollen fabrics, which could only be furnished by England, it would be found that we had not increased the tariff on them, because it would not benefit our home production, and it was

perfectly right to adopt this policy. We had heard so much about loyalty, so much that this legislation would be received unfavourably in England, that one would almost be led to suppose that the only bond between this country and England was the bond of pounds, shillings, and pence; that the only bond between the two countries was one that existed between our consumers and the manufacturing interest of England. He did not say that the English manufacturing interest was not a great one, and that it should not be considered by Colonial legislation, but he did not at all agree with his hon. friend from Lambton, in the statement he made the other night, that we were retrograding, while the other Colonies were going on hand-in-hand in accord with the English system which was inaugurated by Cobden, Bright, Mill, and gentlemen of that school. There was already a Protective tariff to a certain extent, in certain particulars, in almost every one of the Colonies of Great Britain. In the Australian Colonies, in regard to their farming interests, there was a Protective tariff. That policy had been adopted deliberately, it had been much discussed, and there had been changes of Government in those Colonies upon that very policy. He was disposed to think that there were strong reasons for the adoption of a Protective policy, ultimately, in England. He could see marked evidences that her present policy would be changed. He could not see how the iron interests in England, for instance, could otherwise sustain themselves. He ventured to say that the English ironmasters, and their workmen, who were out of employment, would not look with favour upon the fact that Belgium could send to England iron girders and other heavy kinds of work in competition with her own iron manufactures of the same class. Even locomotives of Belgian manufacture had undersold those of England for her own railways. He ventured to say that the discontented population in England would, by-and-bye, ask the reason why, and call for protection from that kind of competition, and from the philosophers who had made it possible. He believed that common sense would prevail against the theories of Mill, Cobden, Bright, Bastiat or any other

man whose nostrums had been forced upon us *ad nauseam* during the late five years. A grain of common sense was worth more than a pound of theory. He saw indications everywhere that it was coming to be considered to be the first duty of every country to take care of itself. He saw indications everywhere that it would, ere long, be recognised as an axiom that the business of a country belonged to the people who paid the taxes, who sustained the Government, who employed the labor, and who formed the basis of the wealth of the country. He could only say this: that, if we did not desire to be handed over, bound hand and foot, to the people on the other side of the line, we must acknowledge that Canada belonged to the Canadians, however much that statement might be denied by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Why, where was the loyalty, where was the super-loyalty of that Grand Old Reformer who absolutely controlled that party in Ontario, when, in 1874, he constituted himself an ambassador to the United States to procure a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty? What would have been the result of the proposition he made to the United States in 1874? He (Mr. Plumb) had made a calculation upon the bases of the revenue in 1874 as to what we would have lost if that treaty had gone into operation. Mr. Brown proposed to receive largely the manufactures of the United States, and every manufacturer in Canada rose up with the remonstrance that that treaty, if it went into operation, would absolutely crush out our infant manufactures, and leave us nothing in the world, except agriculture, upon which to sustain ourselves. Under that treaty, all our skilled labour would have gone to the United States; and, not only that, but finding, in the first place, that the United States would not accept an exchange of natural products, he enlarged the bases of his negotiations. He added Schedules B and C. Schedule B consisted of all kinds of agricultural implements; Schedule C, of manufactures of cotton, cabinet ware, boots and shoes, machinery, leather manufactures, iron of all kinds, and other items. These were to come in duty free. Taking into consideration duties previously collected on

MR. PLUMB.

these articles, which he agreed to receive from the United States on the free list, it would have reduced our revenue that very year \$2,300,000. And what did he provide instead of that? Nothing whatever. They were constantly asked what they would do for revenue, if they brought in this Protection tariff proposed by his hon. friend. What did Mr. Brown propose, in order to make up the deficits in the revenue, when he made this proposition in the face of the greatest depression that had ever fallen upon this country? He proposed to reduce the revenue, by one stroke, \$2,300,000, according to the imports received that year; while his friends in the Ministry here were trying, with an assiduity worthy of a better cause, to deplete the failing Treasury, and the jobbers were intruding into the very fastnesses of the House of Commons itself. Mr. Brown offered, also, to enlarge our main canals within a period which would have made it necessary largely to increase our expenditure. He agreed to build the Caughnawaga Canal, with fourteen feet of water on the mitre sills of its locks, for the accommodation of vessels which were to go to New York without transshipment; but he never secured the corresponding enlargement of the Charplain Canal, leading from Lake Champlain to the Hudson River, a canal which was not five feet in depth, and not navigable for boats of more than forty-five tons burden. Nor did he stipulate that the channel of the Hudson, between Albany and New Baltimore, should be deepened—where an immense outlay, and forty years of effort, has failed to obtain more than five feet of water at low tide,—and which would have had to be deepened to 14 feet for the passage of vessels from the St. Lawrence. He was going into a reckless expenditure of ten or twelve million dollars for the purpose of buying from the United States that which they were unwilling to sell. And, after he had made proposition after proposition, when we were to give them everything except ourselves and our nationality, they received the propositions and coolly put them aside in a pigeon-hole, saying: We don't intend to grant reciprocity just now, but we will think of it some day, and then we will have your offer before us. What was the policy of the Hon.

Mr. Brown then? Was that not striking at the connection between England and Canada? Was that not an attempt at severing the golden link, of which they heard so much? Well, he had heard the argument upon the floor of this House, and he had heard arguments in other quarters, but they did not prove to him that there was an enormously sensitive loyalty on the part of gentlemen on the other side of the House. He could not see that there was so great a contrast between the loyalty of those gentlemen and that of the gentlemen who sat to the right of the Speaker, in favour of the former. He remembered hearing, year after year, from the late Finance Minister, the late Minister of the Interior, and occasionally from the late First Minister himself, quotations from an eminent fiscal authority, a great American publicist, Mr. David A. Wells. That gentleman had been brought forward here and elsewhere, upon all occasions, as an authority for the policy which the hon. gentlemen, who then sat on the Treasury benches, wished to persuade them should be adopted by Canada. Well, Mr. Wells was an advanced Free-trader; he was one of the few gentlemen in the United States who advocated that doctrine. He was prominent at every Board of Trade meeting and every general meeting where fiscal affairs were discussed; he was, without doubt, a very intelligent, very eloquent, very able writer upon his side of the question. They might not agree with him, but they all acknowledged that he was in earnest; but this gentleman had only a forlorn hope in the United States. The people in the United States understood these questions thoroughly, and, if they found that Protection was injurious to their interests, they had the remedy in their own hands in universal suffrage. Every two years they voted for members of Congress, and, certainly, if they desired to change their trade policy, it was very easy for them to do so. His hon. friend the late First Minister made a very eloquent appeal to the workingmen of Canada, at the Rink in Toronto, in the furtherance of the interests of his party—as he had a perfect right to do. He lamented the sufferings of the workingmen under the Pharaohs, at the time of building the

pyramids, and he compared the sufferings of workmen, under Tory rule, as he was pleased to call it, to the poor fellows who were forced, under their Egyptian taskmasters, to make bricks without straw. He alluded to the policy of the United States, to the ruin that it had already brought upon that country, and said they were committing financial suicide, as rapidly as possible, by adhering to it. He told them that a certain exception was made in respect to trade with Venezuela. He (Mr. Plumb) noticed that, because it was a little out of the way, and he wondered what had made him take the case of Venezuela as an illustration. The puzzle was finally solved by a pamphlet published by Mr. David A. Wells, the authority constantly quoted by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues. He (Mr. Plumb) found at the end of that pamphlet the very quotation, or something very near it, that had been made by the First Minister. He did not undertake to say the First Minister endorsed the views of Mr. Wells, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) introduced him to the people of Canada as an authority, and quoted from his writings. The pamphlet which the late First Minister quoted from, and which he must have read, contained the following paragraph, which would show what Mr. Wells intended by the policy which these gentlemen were so anxious we should adopt, and which he was so desirous to press upon the people of the United States. In a pamphlet published by Mr. Wells, entitled, "Why we trade, and how we trade," they found the following significant paragraphs, on pages 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 :

"It is desired to annex the British North American Provinces, and make them a part of the American Union. We have, as a nation, for long years past, in our dealings with Canada, been playing the part of the wind, in the contest between the wind and the sun in the fable, to see which could make the traveller soonest take off his coat. Suppose, as a nation, we now, for a while, put aside the rôle of the wind, and assume the part of the sun. With the balance of advantage in any amicable contest between the two countries for industrial and commercial betterment so transcendently on the side of the richer, most populous, and most powerful nation, it must be a very low order of statesmanship on the part of the United States which could not devise and carry out a policy that, in less than a decade of years, would make the British Provinces ap-

MR. PLUMB.

plicants of their own accord for incorporation as States in the American Union, or would enable the United States, if it was deemed expedient, to force them to become such, by the threat, not of armed compulsion, but of simply clouding the sun.

"Thus, to illustrate, let us imagine what might be. North of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and the River St. Lawrence, east of Lake Huron, south of the forty-fifth parallel, and included mainly within the present Dominion Province of Ontario, there is as fair a country as exists on the North American continent; nearly as large in area as New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio combined, and equal, if not superior, as a whole, to these States in its agricultural capacity. It is the natural habitat on this continent of the combing-wool sheep, without a full, cheap and reliable supply of the wool of which species the great worsted manufacturing interests of the country cannot prosper, or, we should rather say, exist. It is the land where grows the finest barley, which the brewing interest of the United States must have if it ever expects to rival Great Britain in its present annual export of over eleven million of dollars' worth of malt products. It raises and grazes the finest of cattle, with qualities especially desirable to make good the deterioration of stock in other sections; and its climatic conditions, created by an almost encirclement of the great lakes, especially fit it to grow men.

"Such a country is one of the greatest gifts of Providence to the human race, better than bonanzas of silver, or rivers whose sands contain gold."

Between the late Finance Minister and Mr. Wells and the *Chicago Tribune*, a trio of enthusiastic Free-traders, a mutual admiration society existed. Mr. Wells quoted Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. Cartwright quoted Mr. Wells, and the *Chicago Tribune* quoted both, and patted them lovingly on the back. Under the paragraphs just quoted, from the pamphlet of Mr. Wells, in a foot note, he said :

"The extent to which Canada is necessarily dependent upon the United States for prosperity, is well illustrated by the following extract from the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance, the Hon. Richard Cartwright, before the Canadian House of Commons, February, 1875."

Then followed a sample of the late Finance Minister's eloquence, with which they were all tolerably familiar. And the late Finance Minister addressed a great Reform demonstration in Norfolk, held at Simcoe, on the 21st of September, 1877. Speeches, they were told, were also made there by Mr. Charlton, Mr. Mackenzie,

Mr. Mowat, Mr. Huntington and Mr. Rymal. Mr. Oliver, Mr. Irving, Mr. Thompson, of Haldimand, Col. Skinner, Mr. Clark, and Dr. Baxter were there; but as far as could be learned, those eloquent expounders of Reform principles were speechless on that occasion. The Finance Minister was reported to have said, *vide Globe*, October 16—he was speaking of the ruin of the United States, of course :

“The lessons which have been taught cannot have been wholly lost on the American people. They are setting about in real earnest to find, as David Wells puts it, the way to regain true national prosperity, on a true and stable basis. Mr. David Wells, one of the ablest and most scientific thinkers in the United States, we find proving to his countrymen most conclusively that, had they had Free-trade with the people of Canada, it is more than probable their trade with Canada alone would have excelled their whole volume of foreign exports at present. And, proceeding to point out to them the extreme folly they had committed, and bearing also high testimony to the great natural resources we possess—a testimony which it would be well for every Canadian to bear in mind—even at the risk of tiring some of you, I cannot refrain from reading his remarks on the condition of the Province of Ontario.”

The hon. gentleman then read or recited part of the foregoing extract from Mr. Wells, beginning carefully at “North of Lakes Erie and Ontario,” and ending with, “Such a country is one of the greatest gifts of Providence to the human race, better than bonanzas of silver, or rivers whose sands contain gold.” At Teeswater, where the late President of the Council, *vice* Cauchon promoted, uttered his swan song, the late Finance Minister also improved the occasion, and said, if the *Globe's* report of November 5th could be depended upon :

“I cannot resist the temptation of reading to you a few words written by an American economist, who was once a Protectionist, but who has been converted, and is now known as a very earnest Free-trader. You will not think any the worse of him, when I say that his name is Wells, and Mr. Wells, referring to the Province of Ontario, speaks as follows.”

Then followed the same extract, with the same cunning and careful avoidance of the beginning and the end of the argument. This, then, was the high authority whose policy had been persistently recommended by the gentlemen on the other side of

the House, and it came with bad grace from them now to charge his hon. friends with doing anything that would be likely to sever the golden bond that existed between us and England. He (Mr. Plumb) thought that very extract showed what the ulterior motive of American Free-traders was. They wished to force Canada into a position which would enable them to take possession of this country. He believed that every man in the House who had studied the question was satisfied that the union which existed between Canada and England could not be severed without violence. He had never heard of England parting voluntarily with but one of her colonies, and that was one she held as a quasi-trust—the Ionian Islands. He believed that we had a right to self-government under the responsible system, and he believed that England wished to concede to us the largest liberty consistent with that system and principle. He did not believe any estrangement between England and Canada would result from this proposition of his hon. friend in the direction of bringing Canada out of the slough of despond in which she had been plunged by the incompetency of the gentlemen who preceded the present Ministry. Anything that increased our prosperity increased our ability to purchase from England. The trade followed the flag, and, therefore, the paltry addition of \$550,000 to tariff items, which might possibly fall upon English manufactures, for the benefit of Canada, could not be denounced as anything disloyal. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House never should have made that charge, and it never should have been reiterated in the newspapers. He (Mr. Plumb) hurled the charge back with indignation and scorn on those who had been pleased to bring it forward as a political argument. This tariff had been made for the purpose of preventing \$25,000,000 or \$26,000,000 of gold going from us to the United States yearly. Our imports from the United States were \$23,510,846 worth of dutiable, and \$27,801,823 worth of free articles, for the fiscal year 1877, and \$23,438,053 worth of dutiable, and \$25,163,686 worth of free articles for the year 1878. Nearly two-thirds of the free goods came into direct competi-

tion with our agricultural products. Goods valued at some fourteen and a quarter millions of dollars came in each year under the $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. list. Many of the articles we could and ought to manufacture here in Canada; nearly all of them represented skilled labour and capital profitably employed. In return, the United States took from us products valued at twenty-five millions, one half of which was farm product, and a fifth was the product of the forest. It all represented the least remunerative form of labour, and the smallest return for capital. For the privilege of paying for half of our annual imports in this costly way, we paid an average duty on the American frontier of at least twenty-five per cent., and the resulting balance of twenty-three millions or more, we must pay in hard cash. It was estimated that on the articles imported from the United States, paying $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and over *ad valorem*, the invoices and valuations actually reduced the duty to 10 per cent. or less; but most of the kind of products we sent across the border could not be so undervalued. The great shrinkage in values also, on the general list of manufactures, rendered it certain that, in quantity, our imports from the United States had constantly and largely increased to an extent far beyond the figures in our annual returns. Now, from Great Britain, our free imports had declined from \$5,287,217, in 1874, to \$5,291,397 in 1878, while the $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. list had fallen from \$39,572,596, in 1874, to the startling figure of \$24,245,295 in 1878; and upon this list, except in two or three leading articles, our neighbours across the line had been steadily supplanting their trade under the policy so vehemently persisted in by the hon. gentlemen opposite. If they questioned this state of things, forsooth, the loyalty cry was raised among gentlemen, many of whom subscribed to a certain party platform in Quebec, a few years ago, having annexation as one of the planks; gentlemen who did not hesitate to place in a most responsible position in the Ministry one who had threatened to tear down the British flag from the citadel of Halifax, and who instilled into the ears of the people of Canada everywhere the insidious teachings of David A. Wells and his school,

the tendency of which had been clearly shown, and was frankly and openly acknowledged by those earnest Free-traders. He (Mr. Plumb) was not speaking in hostility to those gentlemen, or to the people of the United States generally. They were shrewd enough to know the advantages of their legislation. He had no idea that this tariff would be received as hostile. It was unworthy of our statesmen to say they were afraid that our legislation might be met with opposition by our American neighbours. There were gentlemen in the House who were too blind to see the benefits that accrued from Protection. There were others who did see it, but wilfully hoodwinked themselves.

"They know the right, and they approve it too;

They see the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue."

Hon. gentlemen, by the course they pursued last Session, sealed their death-warrants. They disregarded the plainly-expressed wishes of the people, and the result was shown on the 17th of September. It was not by false promises, as hon. gentlemen had been pleased to assert, that the present Government had succeeded at the late elections. The people had had experience of the value of the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they measured them on September 17th at their true value. Hon. gentlemen need not lay the flattering unction to their souls that there was likely to be any reaction in their favour, or that the National Policy was unpopular with the masses. They need not try to believe, for a moment, that what they said about the pending ruin to the manufacturer and the labourer, and the other interests, was going to be accepted by the people. The people had declared that they would sustain this policy. The argument had been exhausted during the campaign. The issue was a direct one. The people fully understood what this policy meant. It meant that they were not only to have cheap food, but something to buy it with; not only cheap clothing, but the wherewith to procure it. The legislation here to-day was for the poor man, and not for the rich man. The idea of the Grit party, that his hon. friends were blind to their interest, and that they

were legislating for privileged classes, was absurd. Hon. gentlemen opposite knew very well the policy the Government had adopted was the policy the country would endorse. They knew perfectly well that they had taken the downward track, not, perhaps, with deliberation; but they blindly followed a blind leader, lacking political prescience, and who never could comprehend anything beyond his own prejudiced opinion that the whole people of this country could be hoodwinked day after day by the publications in the press of his party. The agriculturists had been forced to raise nothing, by the policy of that dictator, but cereals. They were prevented from having a profitable rotation of crops. The dictator, who had sometimes been called the wrecker, and his followers, professed to have the farming interests under their especial charge. How did they foster them? By placing a tax of 72c. a bushel on malt. That killed the barley crop. On our wheat a duty of 20c. per bushel was levied on the other side of the line; no duty was put on American wheat, and we were compelled to export ours when we had no surplus. Oats were interfered with by the vast production of the Western States, and he knew a case where two vessels, from Michigan or Wisconsin, came into the harbour of Sarnia, where the late First Minister resided, and, placing a large quantity of oats on the market, lowered the price five or six cents a bushel on market day, to the great disappointment and loss of the farmers who had oats for sale there. The late Finance Minister often said that he desired that our people should return to agricultural pursuits. He vehemently denounced the gathering together of communities in cities and towns. Agriculture, he (Mr. Plumb) acknowledged, was the basis of our wealth, but everybody knew that it paid a lower return for the capital and for the manual labour employed, than any other pursuit. Every man could not, or might not, wish to be a farmer, and no country was prosperous that did not possess a diversity of interests. The Government proposed that Canada should have all the benefits which the most favoured countries enjoyed. They did not believe that the Americans, as the *Globe* asserted, monop-

olised all the ingenuity, and perseverance, and inventive genius on this continent, but that Canada could successfully challenge them to friendly competition in all these respects. It was the duty of every Government to endeavour to give diversified employment to its people, to keep its intelligent, active young men at home by giving them plenty of work, and he believed that the policy that his hon. friend proposed would have this effect. Mr. Steinway, the manufacturer of pianos, on being told that this tariff would shut out his pianos from Canada, said he would set 400 men at work here, and thus try to keep possession of our market in a way that we desired. The people who wanted our market must come here and manufacture for it, pay their portion of our taxes, support our Government, employ our labour, and buy our farmers' produce. It mattered very little to the farmers whether there was a duty more or less on the articles which they consumed, provided they could have a home market. If manufacturing centres were built up in their midst, the rise in the value of their lands and their crops would more than compensate for any trifling tax that might be put on them, and, after all, the only alternative to this tariff was to resort to direct taxation, as the late Finance Minister shadowed forth when he said that if there was any convenient way of levying an income tax after the manner of England, he would feel inclined to resort to it. Any man would have been recreant, as a member of the Government, representing the Liberal Conservative party, if, in making that scheme of taxation, he had not special regard to the struggling industries of Canada. The hon. gentlemen opposite had made their tomb. They stated there might be a reaction in their favour, but they caught at a very little gleam of hope. He could tell them, in the words of the hackneyed quotation:

"Facilis decensus Averni,
Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad
auras,
Hic labor, hoc opus est."

Which he would venture to translate very freely:

"The engine may rush its down grade to
Avernus;
The steam may give out when it tries to
return us."

And he prayed, in the best interests of Canada, that it might be many a long year before the hon. gentlemen opposite got back to the upper world from the political Avernus into which they had descended.

MR. KILLAM said he deemed it his duty to enter his protest, as a member of this House, against the policy of the Government, a policy which seemed to him to have been conceived without due intelligence of the subject, and to have been brought forth without a proper disinterested regard for the wants of the country. There was no reason why, while the members of the Opposition did not think of being able to defeat this policy on the next division, they should not criticise that policy, at least in a moderate degree, and suggest amendments or improvements which might commend themselves to hon. gentlemen opposite in such a way as to lead to modifications of that portion which might be found most injurious to the country. In was in that view that he rose the other evening to ask a few questions of the hon. the Finance Minister, and he thought the hon. the Finance Minister was not altogether fair when he spoke of his acting rather from a spirit of factious opposition than a desire to gain information. He had risen on that occasion purely to gain information on points on which the people of this country, more especially those of the constituency he had the honour to represent, were greatly interested, and concerning which his hon. friend must, he was sure, have been approached from time to time by very powerful delegations. He would refer to those points later on, but must say that, in referring to them, he was actuated by no desire to offer any factious opposition to the hon. gentleman. He had listened with great attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey) that evening. Having known of the hon. gentleman for many years, he was quite prepared to hear from him a brilliant oratorical display. His speech, as a display of rhetoric, was something to be proud of, and reflected credit on his Province. His acquaintance with the works of Daniel Webster brought forth great applause, but still, though proud of the

hon. gentleman's oratory, he felt bound to say, with regard to his speech, that, instead of dealing with the practical question, it was full of the most crude generalities, and showed too little practical acquaintance with the subject for a gentleman representing a constituency such as his. The hon. gentleman could not resist the temptation of telling the House a little about his election. He wanted to call their attention to some remarks which appeared in some local paper on the opposite side of politics, and the only reason he gave for referring to them, was that some newspaper stated, the night before the election, that electors had better not vote for the Conservative candidate, because if the Conservative Government got into power, they would impose duties varying from 55 to 100 per cent. on certain articles. That paper was right, but the people that deserved reprobation were those who said that no such duties would be imposed. When the telegram was sent by the hon. the leader of the Government, stating that there would be no increase of taxation, but simply a readjustment of the tariff, who was right on that occasion, the newspaper that condemned him, or the hon. gentleman who said this additional taxation would not be imposed? He would like to refer to some matters of practical import, which, he thought would be useful. He had always been a strong advocate of improving our channels of inter-communication, and he looked with the deepest regret upon the policy which tended to prevent traffic and throw obstacles in the way of trade. He was surprised when the hon. the Finance Minister proposed a duty of 15c. on wheat, for which not a single reason was advanced. It would prove an injury to the millers, many of whom had informed him that this tax would ruin their business. It would put an obstruction on the carrying trade. He would like to know what spite the Government had against Kingston, Montreal and Toronto, that it should take away from them their trade with the west? The Government obstructed the traffic in wheat, and put a duty on coal, so that our railways, steamboats and canals would be as little used as possible. This was one of the most important questions in relation to this tariff that could be

raised, and he hoped, before the matter was finally settled, that hon. gentlemen might yet take it upon themselves to make some alteration in this respect. The shipowners of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick could stand it, if the carrying trade were taken away from Canada. If the grains of the west were not to be permitted to be shipped from Montreal and Quebec, no doubt they would find other outlets. Other countries would ship their products, and the Canadian shipping would be engaged in carrying them; still it seemed wrong that we should be prevented from carrying these goods from our own country directly. He was amused at the deep sympathy expressed by the Finance Minister with shipowners, which consisted in doubling their taxes, and then taking off a quarter of them. He proposed, with a self-satisfied look, to build a Chinese wall around this country, to say we should not buy from anybody except ourselves; and if we did not buy from others, we could not sell to them. He was going to adopt a policy which, if it were carried out in every country, would entirely do away with the necessity of ships. What was the trade between China, with 350 millions of inhabitants, and Japan, with 40 millions? To-day there was no international trade between these countries. The hon. gentleman would build up such a wall between us and the United States, that the one would not buy from the other, and, that consequently, neither ships nor other communication would be required between them. The hon. member for Niagara, who, in his long speeches, seldom said anything that was remembered, said, to-day: "Protect us against American commerce." That had been the tone of the tariff from beginning to end. He would give one instance of the effect of this tariff on the trade of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. the Minister of Finance proposed to impose a duty on corn and flour. The absurdity of this proposition—if he might be permitted to use the word, and, of course, he used it from his own point of view—could not be better shown than by the following instance: A vessel left Prince Edward Island in the fall, with a cargo of potatoes for New York; the vessel sold her potatoes at a remunerative price, and the owner wanted to get

freight back. Last fall, he could have had, for return freight, 1,000 barrels of meal, by which he would gain, perhaps, \$150—a small matter, perhaps, when compared with the millions spoken of in this tariff—but, according to this tariff, he would not be able to make even that small amount of profit. He had either to come away from New York in ballast, or else pay the duty on the corn. In the one case, if he brought back 1,000 barrels of cornmeal, he paid \$400 duty; and on the other, he lost \$150 freight. In the case of coal and plaster, carried to the United States: supposing a vessel went from Windsor to an American port with plaster, the captain wanted a return cargo of anthracite coal; but now he could not bring it without paying a duty that, with the freight, would render the coal unsaleable, on account of the price which would have to be demanded for it. The tariff system about being inaugurated was most destructive in every particular, and could not be defended on any reasonable grounds. Then, what was said in favour of the fishermen? A large number of fishermen, owning their own vessels, took their fish to American ports to sell, and brought back flour and different articles used by them, which they desired to purchase where cheapest made; but now they would lose the benefit they had previously of buying in a cheap market, as, with the new duties, they could not have these return cargoes, without, in the end, paying as much, if not more, for these articles than if they bought them in the West, and paid a heavy freight to get them home. That was a benefit that would not be appreciated by the fishermen. The same thing occurred in the West India trade. Vessels went from Nova Scotia to the West Indies with cargoes of fish and lumber, bulky cargoes; and, if unable to get return cargoes, tried to obtain freight to the United States, if possible, and then they looked for return cargoes to Nova Scotia; but under this policy, they would be compelled to return empty from the United States. It would interfere with every branch of trade. A duty had been put upon coal coming from the United States, which would be very detrimental to the manufacturers of this country.

They had in the Maritime Provinces a number of factories which used anthracite coal, and now, of course, they would have to pay more than heretofore for it. They would have to pay more for their iron also. He was amused, the other night, at reading in the *Toronto Mail* an account of interviews with gentlemen belonging to firms doing business in the West in the manufacturing of iron goods. Mr. Gurney, Toronto, said :

"Present indications point to a full year's trade, as the new tariff will give us the outlying markets, such as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, which had heretofore been largely supplied from Baltimore and Massachusetts."

Messrs. Gurney, Hamilton, said :

"That, after paying the increased duty on imported iron, and other materials used in the manufacture of stoves, they would be benefited to the extent of a net protection of nearly 5 per cent. over that afforded by the old tariff. This advantage will be the means of increasing trade with the Maritime Provinces, which is now nearly controlled by Boston manufacturers."

That was something entirely new to him, and if those gentlemen were fair specimens of the manufacturers of Ontario, and if they based their hopes of profits on so small grounds, they would be very sorry they ever talked to hon. gentlemen about Protection. He found that, during the fiscal year ending the 31st June last, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia imported \$108,000 worth of stoves and iron castings from the United States, while the iron-founders of those two Provinces had produced \$1,500,000 more. And these hon. gentlemen were flattering the manufacturers of Toronto and Hamilton with the idea that they were going to make their fortunes, owing to the increased number of stoves they would manufacture, to supply the demand from the Maritime Provinces; increasing their number of hands, and extending their business, and all this to secure the \$108,000 trade of those Provinces, over \$70,000 of which, for that year, was due to the increased trade brought by the St. John fire. The hon. gentleman had been called upon by almost every industry in the country, but he (Mr. Killam) ventured to say that very few of them had asked him to reduce the duties. He was of opinion there should be no duty on iron; but he

supposed that, before the tariff had gone through the House, modifications would be made in it. In his (Mr. Killam's) county an enterprisè had been started for the purpose of manufacturing artificial stone, which was useful for a great many things, for inside and outside work in buildings, for pavements, etc.; but all they got from this tariff was a double duty on cement, their raw material. He was sure the parties were very much obliged to the Government for their kind consideration. Then there was another article which was produced down there, namely, oil-cloth. In his county, and other counties in Nova Scotia, orders were given to certain families, in the fall of the year, to manufacture oil-cloth for the fishermen. There were large manufactories of them in the United States, but they had got into the way of making them in his Province. These were protected by taxing the cotton, thread, buttons, and linseed-oil used in the manufacture. Probably if a delegation came up, the Finance Minister would put a higher duty on oil-cloths from the United States. These were comparatively small matters, but they represented a principle which could be applied to larger transactions. While there had been so much sympathy of all sorts expressed for the manufacturing and producing interests, he had heard very little said about the fishermen. What had been done for them, but to tax them? The hon. gentleman said that these fishermen were quite as willing to be taxed as any other class of the community. So they were, but they were not willing to be taxed out of proportion to other classes. They were taxed for everything that they used. Did hon. gentlemen think that this tariff was going to produce larger markets? They said that there was a balance of trade constantly against Canada; but it was not so much the balance of trade between this country and others, as the balance of trade which existed in this demand, which was caused by compelling them to buy so extensively from Canadians when they could sell nothing in return. They could not help that, however, and had to settle down to this state of affairs; but, when they were becoming reconciled to the condition of things, hon. gentlemen stepped in and taxed the fishermen in

every possible way, and did not help them in the least. The Finance Minister told them that the recompense they got for all this was free salt, which they never had to pay any duty upon. There was nothing about salt duties, except the inconvenience and injury to the shipping trade, by preventing shipowners from bringing salt occasionally in place of ballast, that was the only thing he saw in the salt duties. He was prepared to state that the duties imposed by this tariff, on materials used in ships, would be greater than ever, and with the increase, cost of labour, and materials, which it was impossible to bring in and put in bond, the shipbuilding interest would be very much damaged.

MR. TILLEY: How did they do it in old Canada? They gave the drawback and had no trouble.

MR. KILLAM said he was going to show that there would be a great deal of difficulty. If the builder was obliged to import the costly articles he wanted, and was not allowed to get a drawback on any more than he used in the particular ship for which they were imported, he must be a larger capitalist than at present, to lend the Government so much money, or lay out of it a certain time, to his injury. What was to be done? A foundry man brought, for example, iron from Philadelphia, some from Glasgow, and some from the Londonderry Steel Works, and made a ship's stove. Was there to be a drawback in this case? They were told by those makers that they were to have higher prices for their materials. All those things went to make up the cost of the ship. Well, it was impossible, under the hon. gentleman's system, to get the drawback. A premium was actually given under the system to importers, as against the manufacturers of articles for ship's use in our own country. There was no provision for a drawback to counterbalance the increased cost of many articles wanted, partly home-made and partly foreign. The cost of materials would very much more than counterbalance the proposed drawback. Instead of gaining the sympathy of the shipbuilding interests, he has achieved quite the contrary. They might see occasionally, in some of the newspaper telegrams, such as these:

Effect of the National Policy; ships going to be launched in four months; 60 men to be employed in finishing, &c.; but he fancied, when the shipbuilders came to find out the amount of drawback they were going to get, they would not be so loud in praise of the hon. the Finance Minister. He desired to say, before sitting down, that he believed the tariff was not calculated to serve the interests of the country. While it might be necessary to place the amount of the present taxes on the people, instead of practising economy, this particular tariff was not suited to their interests, because it pressed too heavily on particular localities, interferred with trade and commerce, and would prove injurious to the mass of the people, while benefiting only a few not entitled to that consideration.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said he did not wish to make a speech, but he had a little intelligence to announce to the leader of the Opposition and his friends, who had endeavoured to convince the House and the country that the people of the Maritime Provinces would be injured, and the Province of Prince Edward Island destroyed, by the tariff. The local elections in that Island had just been held, the National Policy being, of course, the greatest question discussed. It was said the country was to be ruined, on account of the heavy taxes imposed by the Conservative Government at Ottawa; however, he was happy to say that the Local Conservative Government, who supported the National Policy, was returned by 25 against 5.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was the first time he ever heard a Cabinet Minister make such an announcement. If the hon. gentleman had no more sense of the dignity of his own position, he might, at least, have some respect for the Cabinet of which he was a member.

MR. BOWELL said he rose to a point of order. The hon member for Lambton rose and commenced addressing the House, while the hon. the Minister of Marine was speaking, and he only yielded the floor in courtesy to that hon. gentleman.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said that he did not think there was anything

more pertinent to the question before the House than the announcement just made, nor did he think it derogatory to his position as a Minister or to the Government. The tariff was the prominent question in the Island.

MR. TILLEY : It had been referred to by the hon. gentleman who spoke last.

MR. POPE said yes, and he had been spoken of in the House as formerly the champion Free-trader. He still entertained those opinions, but he wanted real Free-trade, and not a trade permitting the free entry into Canada of almost all the natural productions of a country that taxed everything exported to it from the Dominion. The whole trade of the Dominion amounted to about \$96,000,000, of which about \$51,000,000 was with the United States. Out of that \$27,000,000 worth entered Canada free, the whole of the free goods from all other countries being only about \$6,000,000. He did not call that Free-trade of a kind useful to this country. The people in Prince Edward Island felt that as long as they gave the Americans nearly the whole of their trade, allowing their products to come here free, while they taxed the Canadian, they should never get reciprocity, and it was reciprocal Free-trade they wanted, and not so much Protection. They wanted the United States market for their oats, barley and other products, and believed that the only possible way of obtaining that natural market, was to let the Americans see that it was their interest to reciprocate with Canadians. So long as they gave the Americans everything and got nothing in return, so long would matters remain as at present. This tariff provided that, so soon as the Americans reciprocated in the exchange of natural productions, so soon would their products be admitted into Canada free. Unless they could get reciprocal Free-trade on fair and honest terms, he was prepared to go for a hostile tariff on American goods, in the hope that they should obtain reciprocity. He had put the matter fairly before his constituents, and stated, with a view to bring about reciprocity, that they were quite prepared to put a duty on flour, corn meal, and other farm products from the States, so

MR. POPE.

that if they did not get reciprocity, they would probably get some revenue out of a tariff like this one. He did not want retaliation upon the Americans, but only fair play. The attack made on him by the hon. member for Lambton, for his announcement of the result of the Island elections, was uncalled for. He thought his statement entirely in place, being also the strongest evidence that the policy of the Government, of which he was a member, was endorsed by the people of whom he had the honour to represent.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had observed that the conduct of the hon. gentleman, as a member of the Cabinet, in getting up during a solemn discussion on the tariff and announcing in a formal way as a Minister, the result of a local political contest in his own Province, was an event unprecedented in that House. Nothing could be more improper than his attempting to bring into that House his local petty politics. That hon. gentleman said that he had alluded to him and to the Island politics. He (Mr Mackenzie) had made no allusion to them ; but the course pursued by the hon. gentleman and some others towards himself, as the advocate of a revenue tariff, and, as far as possible, to Free-trade on the Island, he had alluded simply to the hon. gentleman in that capacity, but never made the slightest allusion to the domestic politics of that Province or any other. But the hon. gentleman said he was not threatening the United States. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was delighted to hear it, and was sure it would be a great relief to the United States to know that he did not intend to threaten them. They must have felt appalled by the tariff introduced for the purpose of crushing them. No doubt the 45,000,000 in the United States had been trembling in their boots for fear of the consequences of the tariff of this formidable Government. It might be well if the hon. gentleman could assure the people of Great Britain that there was no harm intended them. Why did he quiet the apprehensions of the United States, and not those of Great Britain also, which admitted all Canadian goods free, although there was an amount levied against her exceeding

that of any foreign nation, regardless of all considerations of fair play and gratitude? The hon. gentleman, looking down from his exalted position on the nations of the earth scattered around his feet, ought surely to have a kind word for that great country to which Canada belonged. Was that the course to be pursued by this wonderful and powerful Government? The hon. gentleman who introduced his Budget did not appear, from the discussion, to understand it himself. No speech that had been made on the opposite side but consisted, as to nine-tenths of it, of abuse of the previous Government. The hon. gentleman who spoke before the hon. member for Yarmouth spent two hours in the most violent and absurd declamation that ever was heard; and that was the method in which the arguments used on the Opposition were to be met by hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side. If such arguments and such statements as these were the means by which they expected to create and maintain public opinion, they had a most contemptible estimate of the intelligence of the country.

Mr. BRECKEN said he had listened with surprise to the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and thought it was exceedingly improper and unbecoming in that hon. member, that he should have spoken in the contemptuous language in which he had just indulged towards the representatives and people of Prince Edward Island. He had respect for that hon. member, who, by his ability, had attained the leadership of his party. He regretted that the first time he (Mr. Brecken) rose, and in discharge of his duty in that House, had to submit to a taunt from the ex-Premier, because he alluded, in his speech, to the valuable services of the First Minister in the matter of the Washington Treaty and the Fishery Award. He was told by Mr. Mackenzie that he had come from a little island in the East, where they were an ignorant lot. Such conduct on the part of the leader of the Opposition, reminded him of a certain definition of political gratitude; it was defined as "an utter oblivion of political favours received, and a lively anticipation of favours to come." He remembered the

time, not a decade ago, when the hon. member owed his official position as Prime Minister of the Dominion to the vote of the representatives of the Province of Prince Edward Island—that he now speaks so sneeringly of. Whether his hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was regular in making the announcement of the result of the elections in Prince Edward Island or not, it was not for him to say; but he (Mr. Brecken) was not a Minister of the Cabinet, like his hon. colleague, and was not trammelled with red tape. While, at the same time, he had the most profound respect for the hon. the Speaker and the House, he must again repeat that when he heard the hon. Mr. Mackenzie indulge in the language to which the House had just listened, he thought that the great leader of the Liberal party in this House, the people's representative and friend, would have found, in the echo of the public voice of the people of Prince Edward Island, pronouncing on a great public question, a sound that would be sweet music to his ear. The hon. the leader of the Opposition and the ex-Finance Minister, had the opportunity of making speeches on the National Policy; they had criticised the policy of the Finance Minister, and had, as he (Mr. Brecken) believed, laboured hard to misrepresent it; yet the very free and independent electors of the Island he came from, and who had made him Premier of Canada, had recorded their votes in favour of the Government policy, against the sophistries of the Opposition. The hon. the leader of the Opposition had styled the announcement made by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, of the result of the recent elections in the Island, as outrageous and offensive. The leader of the Opposition reminded him of what was said about Beau Brummel. He was once asked if he liked vegetables, and he said, "No, he had once eaten a pea, and it disagreed with him." The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was almost as fastidious. If the Island verdict had been for the policy of the Opposition, the people would have been spoken of as an intelligent and independent people. They had been deluded for a time, but had seized the first opportunity to shake off the shackles of Criticism. They

had repented, and had publicly read their recantation, and now that the leader of the Opposition had lost their support forsooth, he said, "that the announcement just made was an insult to the House." The electors of Prince Edward Island were as free and intelligent a community as there was to be found from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The leader of the Opposition was terribly disconcerted at this alleged outrage, he was a syberite and it disturbed his rosy bed. It was a shame for the hon. member who called himself a Liberal and the leader of a Liberal party, to stand up in Parliament among the free representatives of a free people, and say that the voice of a free and intelligent community was an insult to his ears and the ears of the House.

MR. ANGLIN said he merely wished to say a few words in regard to the announcement made by the Minister of Marine, for the purpose of removing a wrong impression, but he doubted not that that hon. gentleman believed what he said to be true. He (Mr. Anglin) thought he knew as much of the politics of Prince Edward Island as anybody not a resident. He had watched, with a great deal of interest, the political proceedings in that Province, and knew a great deal of the secret history of those elections. He must, therefore, assure the House that, although the National Policy might have been discussed before some audiences, and, although the present Opposition might have attempted by means of that policy to redeem their desperate case, this was not the influencing motive in the late elections, nor had it any considerable influence on their result. The late Government, headed by Mr. Davis, chose to raise what was essentially a "No Popery" cry, and introduced a School Bill of the most oppressive character—grossly unjust to the Catholics, who formed nearly one-half of the population. The Minister of Marine sympathised with the Catholics in this matter, and he believed honestly strove to prevent the passing of that measure; but a great many of his friends took a different course. In addition to that iniquitous School Act, and because of it, it became necessary to pass a Bill levying a large amount of money on the pro-

Mr. BRECKEN.

perty of the Island by direct taxation. That Act gave great offence, even in districts where the School Law was in favour, and created an intense feeling against the Davis Government, and the Conservatives, although they had at one time a majority in the Government, contrived, very skillfully, to direct the whole public feeling, and the public dislike of the School Act on the one hand, and the land tax on the other, against Mr. Davis and the Liberal party. This accounted for the fall of the Davis Government, as well as for the return of the hon. the Minister of Marine and four supporters, at the last Dominion election. Even in that case, it was not so much a question of Dominion politics as of hostility to the School Act. In the late contest the Opposition chose to raise the school cry again, and ask the people to give them a majority, not because of the National Policy, but because the school system was in danger, and would be sacrificed if they were defeated. They thus forced the opponents of the school system to continue their opposition to them, and the decision to-day was a condemnation of the policy that introduced that school system into the Island, and imposed on it, besides, a heavy land tax. That was essentially the result of that day's election, and in that result he (Mr. Anglin) rejoiced most heartily.

MR. McLENNAN said that he desired to say a few words on the amendment before the close of the debate. He had issued during the election campaign, last summer, a small fly-sheet to his electors, in which he tried to indicate the effect or result to the Canadian farmer of the sale of his produce to the United States. An important item of the exports was barley, and, among other things, he had stated the amount of the import upon the aggregate export of barley to the United States, before it reached a market there, because he conceived that, under the circumstances, that duty went to reduce the amount that the Canadian producer received for his barley, in comparison with the producer in the Republic. That statement had been referred to in this House two or three times, and, like almost every other subject that had been handled by gentlemen on the Opposition side, had been perverted in the discussion of the

actual facts of the case. They had been entertained with a dissertation upon the abstract question, as to whether the producer or consumer paid the duty. He did not believe there was any such question involved, or any law on that subject, any more than upon a great number of questions that had arisen in the course of this whole debate. He believed that the Canadian farmer, producing a very considerable quantity of barley, of a description of which a similar kind was produced in the United States, and finding only there a market for that barley, received, from the circumstances of the case, 15c. a bushel less than the American growers. That was the whole question, a practical one, in which the circumstances created the result that the producer lost the difference of the duty, whoever paid it. A similar thing had happened with their lumber. The producer in the Ottawa Valley, some years ago, had the markets of the United States for a very large production, subject to a duty of \$2 per thousand feet; and whilst the people of the United States were very much engaged in other pursuits this Canadian industry was allowed a very full development. But a change had taken place; men were free to labour in the woods, and Michigan was now a competitor with the Ottawa Valley; and the result was, that the producer of lumber in the Ottawa Valley was reduced at present to starvation by that competition which had robbed him of the only market to which he had access. He wished to forestall an objection that might be made by the imposition that might be made. It might be asked—were Canadians to correct that evil by the imposition of duties on their side? He did not think that they could; but he believed that the virtue of the National Policy would have a much wider range than that. It was said by a great English statesman (Mr. Canning), in the beginning of this century, that he had called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old. He (Mr. McLennan) believed that this Parliament could call new industries into existence, and sustain and give them life, in order to redress that balance that operated so seriously against them. He had listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure to the speech of the hon. member

for Lambton, in introducing his amendment, and had admired the gallant manner in which he entered the breach, in the forlorn hope in which he was fighting; and when he compared himself, as he (Mr. McLennan) understood, to two great English statesmen—Peel and Gladstone—at a long interval, he presumed—he thought the hon. gentleman hardly bore out the comparison, because those statesmen gave way to the influence of public opinion. They changed with the times. The member for Lambton professed himself still a Free-trader, and gloried in making no change. He (Mr. McLennan) maintained that circumstances governed the whole case; it was the simple fact that “circumstances alter cases,” that gave vitality to every theory propounded on this subject. He was not going to indulge in a budget of figures at this late hour, because he did not think that a great mass of figures was always convincing. It was said that figures did not lie; perhaps not, but everybody in this House, accustomed to use figures, was well aware that they might be very misleading. Hon. gentlemen could use the same set of figures, and the same mass of statistics to prove the advantage of Protection and the advantage of Free-trade. This use of figures was very much like the use of an instrument with which children were amused, the kaleidoscope, which was turned about, and by the shifting of little bits of glass all the colours of the rainbow were produced, yet they were the same bits of glass. The other night an attempt had been made to show that they on that side of the House did not represent any considerable majority, and he did not know but an effort was made to prove that they represented a minority. Recollecting the circumstances in his own county, he considered it rather a marvel that he represented any majority. It was not a large majority, only 61; but when hon. gentlemen remembered that he represented a constituency that was held on the other political side for a period of thirty-seven years, and for the greater part of that time, by one family, and a people in whom fidelity to a leader was an instinct of their being, he thought they would agree that there were was, in that case, at least, some change. The

hon. member for Lambton seemed to have a great affection for people who were on the weaker side. He had told us, among other things, that there was a "general revulsion of feeling in the United States people, believing their system to be a departure from a sound system of finance." He believed it was much the same there as here—if there was any such belief, it was the belief of the weaker party. He recollected that, two years ago, some resolutions were introduced into Congress, and an effort was made to secure a reduction of duties. The effort, if it had been successful, would not have been anything to boast of, for it would have been a very high tariff still, much higher than the one we had just introduced, but it was beaten by an overwhelming majority. The hon. gentleman seemed to have a great horror of capitalists, and whilst he had indulged in a fine panegyric upon a class of landlords and capitalists in Great Britain, where their position was hallowed by the growth of years, he seemed to have a great fear lest a similar class of people should arise in this country. He had told us that men should take to agriculture, that the man who made grass and grain to grow, and who produced lumber from the forest, was a creator of wealth. Most gentlemen in this House, however, believed there was a greater power that made the grass and grain to grow, and they believed, at the same time, that men who performed a much humbler act of creation were those who would develop the wealth of the country by turning the productions of nature to account by their ingenuity and their labour. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) told them the other evening, in the course of his strictures upon the tariff, that it was rather singular that a duty was not imposed upon labour or upon immigrants. He did not know whether the hon. gentleman meant it for a joke or not, because the sort of entertainment they had been accustomed to in the House, lately, was of that peculiar kind that a joke almost required to be labelled. That great doctor (Stuart Mill) who had been so frequently quoted by that hon. gentleman, had written learned chapters to prove that the principle element of the production of wealth was labour. Then another question came up. It used to

be a theory with the old political economists that true wealth was money. He believed it had always been held that the importation of money into a country was something that was rather to its advantage. Money had usually been understood to mean coin, bullion, gold. His hon. friend from South Norfolk might controvert this theory, and say that gold was not a good thing—he might rather advocate the importation of paper. But all intelligent writers had agreed that labour constituted the chief wealth of all countries; and then, in imposing a tax upon labour, we should simply be shutting the door in our own faces. The hon. member for Lambton told a story, the other night, of certain manufacturers who came down from Hamilton. He stated that those people wished to obtain a high Protection, in order to be able to continue inflicting upon the public a "wretched article"—those were the terms he used. The House would also remember the story about the mica, but it was wound up by a statement that the hon. gentleman did not know whether it was true or not. Well, the essence of a story he believed was the truth. He would illustrate that. Two or three years ago, when his hon. friend the member for Cardwell was running an election in Montreal, he took the opportunity of mentioning a story one evening that he had heard. It was something about steel rails. A telegram came very promptly and stated that the story was a falsehood. His hon. friend from Cardwell was not a man to be shut up by a telegram, and he followed up the story. If there had been no more of it, it would, doubtless, have been as harmless as the story about the mica. But his hon. friend thought possibly there might be some truth in the story—perhaps he had good reason to believe there was some truth in it. He followed up the story, and all would admit that it had had some effect in placing the hon. member for Lambton where he was to-day—not because it was a good story, but because it had a strong element of truth in it. We had been told repeatedly that the Government had not kept faith with the country, because taxation was going to be increased; he was glad to find that in this amendment, proposed by the hon. member for Lambton, that point was

abandoned. This amendment conceded that this House was prepared to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service and the maintenance of the public credit—which must be taken to mean that such was the hon. gentleman's belief and desire. He never supposed that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would venture, seriously, to go on year after year rolling up deficits. His hon. friend the Minister of Finance had referred to the tax on wheat. We might have some difference of opinion as to the tax on wheat. Last night, an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House described the serious injury which a party would suffer who had imported from Chicago 460,000 bushels of oats, and who had converted it into an equivalent number of barrels of oatmeal for shipment to Great Britain, and the deplorable fact was laid before us that this industry was to be stopped. We were told that the policy of the Government tended towards rendering futile the costly and persistent efforts of the country, to secure a share of the immense and growing carrying trade of this Dominion. He was in a position to state that the Government proposed to give the greatest possible facilities in the bonding system for that trade to go on. He had been assured, by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that the bonding system would put no impediment in the way of that industry. There was a sentence in the amendment to the effect that there was "danger of creating an antagonism between the commercial policy of the Empire and that of Canada, that might lead to consequences deeply to be deplored." Gentlemen would remember the time, perhaps a dozen years ago, when some political philosophers on the other side of the Atlantic were constantly holding up the theory that the Colonies were simply an incumbrance to the parent State, and the sooner they cut their apron strings and stood upon their own bottom, the better. During the existence of that vexed question about the Alabama claims that were a source, a constant source of irritation between the empire and the United States—when there was some fears of friction between us and the Mother Country—when men like the then Chancellor of the Exchequer,

Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Bright and Mr. Cardwell, were telling us, from day to day, that we were an incumbrance to the Empire, there was, then, some danger of this kind. But, from all we could learn of the feeling in England to-day, we had no reason to apprehend that the Mother Country was desirous of getting rid of her Colonies. We had reason to believe that the people of that country were perfecting their education, as we were in this; and he looked for the time, not far distant, when the financial system of Great Britain would be similar to the system we had adopted in this country, and when it would be the financial system of the whole Empire. The great danger to which we had been subjected, and which he believed this policy would protect us from in the future, was the danger arising from bad finance. Now, we had been treated to a great many examples, figures of speech, and apothegms by the hon. members on the other side of the House, illustrating the beauties of Free-trade. We had been told by the hon. member for Lambton, that the true interest of all mankind was that trade should be free. But then it must be admitted that "circumstances alter cases." A gentleman from the Province of Quebec had made some happy allusions, in his own tongue, this evening, to the condition of the country, from which he and his fellow-men in that Province were descended, and to the comparative condition of France and Germany. A writer in one of the late reviews had compressed into a few lines the result of his observations on this question. He would just read them to the House, and, after that, he would not detain them any longer:

"The ravages of war are rapidly retrieved, but nothing can remedy the ruin induced by bad Government, especially if a Government takes the line which bad Governments almost invariably do take, that of bad finance."

MR. BOULTBEE said he did not know that he ought to detain the House at this late hour, but some remarks had fallen from a few gentlemen on the Opposition side which he thought worthy of some notice. The hon. member for Gloucester, in alluding to the elections recently held in Prince Edward Island, ascribed the result solely to a religious cry which was raised there. As he understood it, this was not the case.

MR. ANGLIN : I say yes.

MR. BOULTBEE said this was not the issue at all in the present election, and he thought, if the information of the hon. gentleman was correct, he knew that as well as he (Mr. Boulton) did. If his information was incorrect, he had better set himself right. There was no one in the House respected more than he (Mr. Boulton) did the well-known talents of the hon. member for Gloucester, but the more talents a man had the more reason there was that he should not prostitute them. He maintained that it was improper for the hon. member for Gloucester, on an occasion like this, to attempt, as he had done more than once before, to throw a fire-brand into the House. It was not good for these cries to be raised. The hon. member for Gloucester was too much one of those men who liked to have a grievance. There was no harm in having a grievance if it was not a grievance that awakened feelings of the character he was alluding to. It was an evil thing to raise a religious cry. It had done a great deal of harm already, and surely there was no reason for it. Nothing could be gained thereby. If the hon. gentleman enquired what the true feeling in the Island of Prince Edward was, he would find that no such feeling influenced the last election, but that the sympathy of the whole people was in favour of the present Government, in their endeavour to inaugurate the policy now before the House.

MR. ANGLIN : Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to inform us where he got his information from ?

MR. BOULTBEE said he was not as old a member of Parliament as the hon. member for Gloucester, but he had apprehended that he had no right to put such questions. If he was allowed to ask the hon. member, when he delivered his orations, where he got his information, he (Mr. Anglin) would speak less than he did. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), in his remarks, stated that it was expedient that the members of this House—if he understood him correctly—that it would be well, if the members on this side of the House, would justify themselves to

MR. BOULTBEE.

the Mother Country for their attitude in regard to the late action in favour of Protection, and, as well, for their action towards the United States. He (Mr. Boulton) did not know that members on this side of the House, or on the other, need justify themselves for any attitude they had assumed towards one country or the other. They were not called upon to justify themselves to the Mother Country. They adopted such policy as they pleased in the interest of the country. They were only doing their honest level best to extricate it from the dilemma in which hon. gentlemen had placed them, and what the States think is of little consequence. Instead of saying that their utterances were idiotic, would it not become hon. gentlemen better to propound to them some theory, to suggest some way in which they themselves intended to meet these constant deficits ? How were they going to do this ? If they were going to do it at all, they were going to do it as the Government were going to do it—by increased taxation. The present Government had only done that, and they had exercised their best wisdom, and consulted the leading business men of the country, so as to best protect the many interests they had to consider. Had hon. gentlemen shown them in what way this was wrong ? He maintained that they had not. They had propounded no scheme that would relieve the country of the incubus with which they had loaded it during the past five years. It was not the proper way to criticise a measure like this, to charge them with speaking stupidly, or bringing in an iniquitous tariff. They should show the Government how they would have filled up the gap and supplied the deficiency. He did not mean to say the late Government had caused this want of prosperity, from which the country suffered. But, the late Government was chargeable for the country going from bad to worse. They made no effort to raise it from the slough of despond in which it was sunk, but sat with their hands tied behind them. The hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for Gloucester, every time they spoke, made some allusion to their loyalty. He did not know that hon. gentlemen opposite had any right to

claim a greater measure of loyalty than members on this side of the House. He did not mean to charge the party to which they belonged with being more disloyal than the Conservative party. But, he did mean to say that if there was in Canada an expatriated American, or a man with American proclivities, or a strong desire for annexation, they found him belonging to the Grit party. If there was a man discontented with our institutions and wanted to alter them, always pining, always wishing for annexation with the United States, they found he belonged to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. He did not think it lay within their province to charge them on that side of the House with disloyalty. Their constant lip service in this direction was very like carrying round the hat at a meeting, but putting nothing in it.

MR. YEO said the hon. member who had just sat down pretended that he understood all about the politics of the Province from which he (Mr. Yeo) came. The hon. gentleman asserted that the late election had turned upon the tariff now before the House. He could tell the House that the tariff had no more to do with carrying the election of Prince Edward Island than it had to do with the political affairs of Russia. The elections were run upon questions that were purely local. The discontent of one party with the School Law and another with the Assessment Act, had caused the defeat of the late Government. It was his opinion that, if the elections had taken place three months ago, so great was the discontent, the Government would not have been able to procure the return of a single supporter, except, perhaps, upon personal grounds. At the Dominion elections, last summer, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his colleagues were the great champions of Free-trade. They advocated a 15 per cent. tariff, and condemned the increase made by the late Government to 17½ per cent. They spoke of the hardship of forcing the poor man to pay as high a duty upon his cottons, woollens and other necessaries, as the rich man paid upon his silks, satins and broadcloth. They complained bitterly of the duty on tea, and promised that, if the Conservatives were returned to power, it should be free. They also

promised that the duties on all that was used by the poor man should be lowered, while the taxes on the rich man's luxuries would be increased. He (Mr. Yeo) now saw by the tariff that the very reverse of this was the case; the poor man was, by it, more heavily taxed, while the rich man's burdens were not by any means proportionately increased. For his part, he told the people, when he was elected, that he would not support any party that would not try to keep down taxation for the whole Dominion. The present tariff not only discriminated against the Americans, but it discriminated against England. Now the greater part of the trade of Prince Edward Island was with England. Its merchants sent their ships home laden with grain and lumber, and took as return cargoes everything they required. That trade was now severely injured by the high duties on import under the present tariff. The mechanics, the fishermen and the labourers of Prince Edward Island would be nothing better than serfs. They were, under the former tariff, taxed as much as they could bear, and this additional burden would be unbearable. He asked hon. gentlemen to point out a single benefit this tariff would bestow upon the people of the Island. He must, therefore, protest against the National Policy as strongly as he was able. Of course, he could not expect to do anything more than raise his voice against it, as the supporters of the Government seemed bound to vote for it, right or wrong. He did not know how gentlemen opposite could be so delighted with the tariff as they appeared to be. It was surprising they did not open their eyes to the benefit of a high Protective tariff before they left power in 1873. This tariff was framed with a view to building up a few wealthy manufactures in Ontario, while it loaded down the Maritime Provinces with taxation. It had always been his opinion, since Confederation, that the smaller Provinces would be imposed upon by the larger Provinces. This the Government, by forcing upon them an oppressive Protective system, was doing; and if it were continued the sooner the people left the Island the better it would be for them. He had brought up another matter in the House some time ago, which was not then satisfactorily re-

ceived, namely, the disposition of the Fishery Award. He had asked that \$1,000,000 should be handed over to Prince Edward Island. This was their money, and they were justly entitled to it. The papers he had asked for had not been brought down, and it appeared to him that the Government wanted to smother enquiry, and that they had no intention of expending the money for the benefit of the people of Prince Edward Island. If this money were appropriated as he desired, it would prove a great benefit to all classes of the people of his Province. He hoped the Government would take this matter into their serious consideration, and he trusted that this money, which was justly due to the people of Prince Edward Island, would be handed over to the Local Government for their benefit. He did not care whether it was given to a Liberal or Conservative Government, so long as the people got it.

MR. MACDOUGALL said the statement had been made, and often repeated, that the people, at the late election, had pronounced on the measure which the hon. the Finance Minister had submitted for their consideration. He could not, from his point of view, concur in the accuracy of that statement as to details; but this much he would venture to say, that the principle which lay at the foundation of the hon. gentleman's propositions, was clearly, distinctly, and definitively pronounced upon by the electorate of the Dominion, on the 17th September last. He was surprised to hear the contrary asserted, during this debate, by the leader of the Opposition, and by other hon. gentlemen well informed as to the state of public feeling in the country at and prior to the elections, who, by the discussions which they themselves excited, knew that the real determining influence, with the great body of the electors, was the belief that, at the hands of the late Ministry, it was vain to expect any material change in the financial policy of the country. The electors felt a strong conviction that a change was required in the interests of the country, and they were patriotic enough, and honest enough, to vote for the candidates who professed themselves ready to support a policy identical in

principle with that which had been proposed by the Finance Minister. The issue was squarely put, the question was fairly discussed, and it had been examined and considered by the electors with great care and deliberation. In fact, he had never known, during a long political career, an election in which the issue presented to the electors had attracted so much attention, was discussed and examined so thoroughly on all sides, not in the heat of party or political excitement, but with an anxious desire on the part of the great majority of the people to arrive at the truth and to ascertain the policy which, in the exigencies of the country, would be most likely to relieve it from depression and improve the industrial condition of the people. Party issues were, to a large extent, forgotten in the contest. As to his own position, he would take that opportunity to say that he had not been in the past, and, perhaps, was not at present, entirely in accord with the political ideas of the leader of this Government. He had been associated with him as a public man for nearly fifteen years. They had agreed, in 1864, to sink political differences, and to labour for changes in the Constitution and laws of the country, which he believed had, in most cases, proved to be reforms, but was not a "follower" of the hon. gentleman. He had been his ally in great affairs of State, and willingly confessed that he felt a great admiration for his ability and patriotism. He believed, even while differing from him on certain questions, that the hon. gentleman was honestly endeavouring to work out a policy, which would, in his opinion, advance the interests of his country. And, therefore, although his (Mr. Macdougall's) political antecedents might, at a certain crisis, have opened out to him the prospect of another, and, personally, a more profitable career, yet he felt, upon the whole, that duty to his country demanded further risks and sacrifices. He felt a strong conviction that the new policy which began with Confederation was not safe in the hands of his (Mr. Macdougall's) former political friends; that, while we were yet in the gristle, it was not desirable to weaken the political influence of the right hon. gentleman and his supporters in the

country. On more occasions than one he (Mr. Macdougall) had found that he could place very little reliance upon hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to that policy which, in 1864, both political parties had agreed should be the basis and the object of our new Constitution. The time came at last when this fiscal question had to be dealt with. It was foreseen, at the establishment of Confederation, that necessity would soon compel us to inaugurate a new fiscal policy for the new Dominion. Our relations with the Mother Country and with our neighbours were different from those which had previously existed, and it was evident to every thoughtful man that these new conditions involved new methods and new measures. The circumstances themselves pointed out the necessity for a National Policy. What that National Policy should be, circumstances had also very clearly indicated. It had been argued, in the course of this discussion, that they ought to adhere to the theory and practice of Free-trade. It had been pointed out to them that great calamities had befallen other nations for not adhering to that principle, and the leader of the Opposition had quoted, for their edification, certain passages from the writings of Lord Macaulay, as evidence of the failure of Protection in the Mother Country at a particular period. Very great efforts had been made to frighten them, by proving that the adoption of the system of Protection by our neighbours across the line had produced poverty and distress in that country. For his part, he had no hesitation in saying that in theory he was a Free-trader. The logic of Free-trade, to his mind, was invincible, but Free-trade in Canada, under the circumstances in which we were placed, was impossible. How could we bargain or trade with our American neighbours if they would not bargain or trade with us? It was impossible to carry on Free-trade with any country unless that country reciprocated. He had hoped, for the last fourteen years, that our American neighbours would, with respect to the natural productions of the soil, at all events, reciprocate with us, and thus return to the principle of Free-trade, which had proved so advantageous to both nations in the past. Deputations from both political parties

in this House had gone to Washington; Boards of Trade in both countries had passed resolutions, communication had taken place between the merchants and traders of the great cities; year after year we waited, and hoped that this agitation on both sides would ultimately result in a more liberal spirit, and a more equitable arrangement between us and our neighbours; but at last it became evident, from the action of Congress upon the resolution brought in by Fernando Wood, that neither the one political party nor the other in that country was in favour of the system of Free-trade, which hon. gentlemen held up as a policy that ought to be adopted by all mankind. Was there any justification, therefore, in the presence of these facts, for all this talk about Free-trade with our American neighbours, which, so long as we had no equivalents to offer them, was neither probable nor possible? He had come deliberately to the conclusion that we must strike out a course for ourselves; we must consider Canada as separated commercially from the United States, and so regulate our fiscal policy as to promote the interests of our own people. With regard to the Mother Country, it was said we would expose ourselves to the charge of disloyalty if we increased the duties on English goods. Was there any difference that could be weighed or measured, politically, between the loyalty of 17½ per cent., and the disloyalty of 20 per cent.? If it was a proof of disloyalty to make our own people pay 20 per cent. into the Canadian Exchequer, upon their importations from England, he thought it would be difficult to prove ourselves loyal so long as we exacted 17½. He was not disposed to yield to that argument. We had, at last, succeeded in impressing on the minds, even of the manufactures of Sheffield, Birmingham, and other manufacturing centres in England, that Canada possessed a Government of its own; that she had been endowed with power at the hands of the Imperial Parliament to regulate her own commercial policy, her navigation and shipping, her revenues and expenditures; in fact to exercise all the functions and powers of an independent country, except the power of making war or declaring peace, or entering into treaties with foreign nations, and a few matters of

that kind. They already recognised that fact, and they must recognise the further fact that we were the judges—of first instance, as well as in appeal—that we know best our own position, and the policy most likely to promote our own interests. They must understand that they, as representatives of the people, deliberated with the fact present to their minds that it was not only their right, but their imperative duty, to adopt the policy or course, which, upon the whole, would promote the interests of Canada, without reference to the opinions or interests, in matters of trade, of our fellow subjects of Great Britain. We were an important part of the Empire in respect to territory and resources, and, in view of what had recently happened, he believed the public men of the Mother Country, of all parties, were now convinced that our position, influence and assistance in times of difficulty or danger, was an element of considerable national importance, and, in case of war, would be appreciated even by the trading classes of Great Britain. Having visited England on two or three public occasions, and having come in contact with public men there, on both sides of politics, he had opportunities of ascertaining their views and feelings on what were called colonial questions, which he was not slow to take advantage of, and he found that, except among a narrow trading class, no one was disposed to refuse to us the right to regulate our own internal affairs in our own way, and to base our fiscal economy on those principles which we might deem best suited to our wants and circumstances. He apprehended no irritation among the intelligent people of the Mother Country with respect to this policy. What he had seen in the English press already, and what had taken place in the Imperial Parliament, ought to satisfy us with respect to that point. His hon. friends opposite would not very much disturb the minds of people in this country by holding up the prospect of a possible collision between England and ourselves, on the question of increasing our revenue to enable us to pay our debts. He had listened with great attention, the other night, to the speech of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, for whose ability, energy, and perseverance, he had a very high respect. He had expected that,

MR. MACDOUGALL.

in attempting to lead that party, through their representatives in this House, to support a resolution in opposition to the policy of the Government, he would have given his friends some logical basis for their arguments, some intelligible policy as an alternative to that of the Government. The hon. gentleman had controlled public affairs for the last five years. He knew the financial difficulty into which the country had fallen under his Administration; no one knew better the obligations of the country on account of the great public works which had been undertaken, and which he did not assume the responsibility of giving up; he knew that a large additional revenue must be raised to meet the annual expenditure; he must have discovered that the country would not tolerate a standing deficit of two millions a year, involving the necessity of borrowing money abroad to pay the ordinary expense of administration; he must have felt the consequences of his financial policy, for it had an important influence against the late Government at the polls, that they had not made provision for restoring the balance between revenue and expenditure; yet, with all these facts staring him in the face, he could stand up in opposition to a policy like this, and talk about the wickedness of taxation. He could denounce the Government, and endeavour to excite the minds of the people against them, because they were going to increase the taxes. What else could be done if we were not to repudiate, to stop our public works, to issue paper-money, which we might never be able to pay? We must either do something of that kind, or compel the people to bear the burden. The honest course was to lay on the taxes when they voted the supply. The Finance Minister had no alternative, he must raise this additional sum; and yet the hon. leader of the Opposition did not tell them how he proposed to do it. His (Mr. Mackenzie's) supporters in the country did not know by what means he intended to increase the revenue, until it should meet the expenditure. It was unfair of hon. gentlemen opposite; it was not logical, or honest, to hold out to the country the idea that they could provide means for the public service without additional taxation. This reso-

lution of the hon. the leader of the Opposition said that they were prepared—those who voted for it—“to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service and the maintenance of the public credit.” How did they propose to make this ample provision, if not by increasing taxation; and what difference could it make to the taxpayers of the country, whether the increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was levied under Mr. Cartwright or Mr. Tilley? But it did concern the interests and the trade of the country that these taxes should be laid on in such a manner as would, at the same time, enable the people who were to pay them to get work and earn wages. If they could create wealth in the country, and excite the industrial classes to renewed activity by a readjustment of the duties on imports, it was clearly their right, as well as their duty, to readjust them. Political economists and theorists might dispute as to the relations of cause and effect in such a case. But they had more than one example in modern times of the fallacy of the abstract theories of political economists. The example of our neighbours—a great, a practical, an intelligent people—was forced upon our attention, and what did we see? A people reduced to a condition of great depression through the operations and burdens of a gigantic and disastrous war, rising like the phoenix from her ashes, under a policy which gentlemen opposite persisted in telling them ought to have ruined them by this time. He thought, when he recalled the history of the last few years, and saw how the people of the United States had disappointed the economists, how they were competing to-day with old and wealthy countries like England in their own markets, that we had a most satisfactory precedent for the inauguration of the tariff system proposed by the hon. the Finance Minister. No doubt there was distress in the large cities across the border, particular classes of people out of employment, and embarrassing changes in values, but, looking at the country as a whole, and having studied its history and progress with a good deal of attention, he must say that the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to the injurious results of Pro-

tection, were not entirely borne out by the United States. Looking critically at this tariff, which the hon. the Minister of Finance and his colleagues had revised, and now proposed to pass into law, he might, perhaps, admit that there were some incongruities and inequalities in it. He could point out some items that might be advantageously modified in Committee, and he hoped his hon. friend would not refuse to consider them. But with such a multitude of items, it was absurd to discuss them out of Committee, and it was impossible to adjust them according to individual opinions. It was to be expected that some provisions of this tariff would not quite meet the personal views and interests of certain classes of people, but, looking at the tariff as a whole, knowing, as he did, the great care, attention and kindness with which the hon. gentleman in charge of these matters had received depositions, had listened to suggestions from persons of experience, from all parts of the Dominion—by letter and telegraph, as well as personal interview—and seeing the anxiety that he and his colleagues had manifested to redeem those pledges which they and their friends had made prior to the general election, he thought that even the Opposition must admit that the hon. gentleman had succeeded in preparing and bringing to this House a measure which commended itself to the judgment, and would receive the approval of the great majority of the people. He heard hon. gentlemen dissent; but, if this tariff had excited so much hostility in the public mind as hon. gentlemen contended, how was it that no evidence of such hostility had reached this House? One would have expected to have seen numerous petitions against it presented by hon. gentlemen. He had received a few letters—and he was happy to say he had friends in the ranks of both political parties—and, without exception, the writers approved of the tariff as a whole, though there might be some particular items, touching their own business, which they would desire to see modified. All, without exception, approved of the conduct of the Government in carrying out the pledges which they had made to the country.

He did not think much of that, however, because it should not be a rare thing to find public men, when in power, carrying out the pledges made in Opposition. It might be that the people, having had recent examples of the reverse, had become distrustful, and thought it a political phenomenon when they found a Government prepared to carry out the pledges upon which they secured their return to office. In this case the Government had attempted to redeem their pledges; if successful, they had done no more than their duty. He was sure the people of the constituency he represented would be satisfied, and he could tell hon. gentlemen opposite that he would not be in the House if he had not obtained the votes of a good many sound Reformers. He felt he would be carrying out their wishes as well as those of his Conservative supporters, and justifying the confidence of both, by voting for this measure, which he would do with a great deal of pleasure. He had heard, during this discussion, a great deal said by gentlemen on the other side of the House with respect to consistency, and it occurred to him that a very brief review of the political history of Canada would illustrate the ideas of those hon. gentlemen with regard to consistency in matters of this kind. He remembered very well that, in 1866, when they were engaged with the scheme of Confederation, he and others, who had belonged to the Reform party previously, had the misfortune to find that the then leader of that party felt it to be his duty, he (Mr. Macdougall) presumed, to detach himself from the coalition that had been formed to carry that great measure. It became necessary, for fiscal and other reasons, to make some changes and reductions in the Canadian tariff, and Mr. Galt, the Finance Minister, proposed to the House very material modifications. A Protective tariff had been adopted in 1859, but, in 1866, in view of the complete revolution in prices and values, caused by the American war, and in view of the difficulty likely to be encountered in the Maritime Provinces, in respect to the tariff, it was regarded as a matter of very great importance to reduce our high Customs duties, in order to adjust them as nearly as possible to the circumstances and condition of the

MR. MACDOUGALL.

whole of the Provinces. It was believed that the revenue produced by a lower tariff would be sufficient, and, therefore, it was proposed, as a matter of great political as well as fiscal importance, to reduce the tariff from 20 per cent. to 15 per cent. But what happened? One would have supposed that the motion would have been hailed with delight by Free-traders, as a step in the right direction, as approximating to the system which they believed the best in the interests of the country. Where did they find the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), and the Hon. Mr. Brown, the leader of the great Reform Free-trade party? Why, they actually opposed the reduction of the tariff from 20 to 15 per cent. He (Mr. Macdougall) had the curiosity to turn up the debates on that occasion, and he found that the hon. member for Lambton, in speaking to Mr. McGivern's anti-Free-trade motion, for which he voted, had used these words:

"With regard to the merits of the question before the House, he did not believe in building up manufactures by a Protective system. But, at the same time, if the United States had adopted a policy whereby we lose them as a market, we were bound to adopt such means as would make a market for ourselves. Under the policy of the Finance Minister, manufactures had grown up in the country, and it would be unjust to those who had embarked their capital in them that the protection should now be withdrawn without a moment's warning."

MR. MACKENZIE: I said the same thing two nights ago.

MR. MACDOUGALL said why did not the hon. gentleman say the same thing about this tariff? The United States had closed their markets to Canada more effectually now than then. They had erected a Chinese wall which they showed no disposition to remove, and, if the argument was good then, it was applicable now. But the hon. gentleman went on:

"He admitted that the policy of the Government had not been in harmony with the tendency of public men towards Free-trade. But large interests had grown up, under our system of incidental Protection, which, he considered, should not be destroyed."

The hon. gentleman was arguing for the maintenance of the 20 per cent. tariff, which the then Finance Minister

told the House was not necessary for the purposes of revenue. Then,

"In reply to a question, he said he was in favour of the Protective system which had been the policy of the country for some years, and under which interests had been created which the House should respect."

The motion to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) was then speaking, was a Protectionist motion, moved by Mr. McGivern, a Protectionist, supported by Protectionists, and the hon. gentleman and his leader did everything in their power to persuade their Reform supporters to vote against this proposal in the direction of Free-trade. Well, the Government carried their measure, and by carrying it, they opened up the way very materially to the accession of the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to the Union. They got on very well with this 15 per cent. tariff, the revenue was sufficient and continued so for a number of years after Confederation, until at last it was found necessary, by the gentlemen opposite, to increase it from 15 to 17½ per cent. He did not blame them for the increase, as he believed it was necessary at the time. But he thought it would have been more satisfactory to the great mass of the people, and more advantageous to the country, if, instead of adding to the taxation of the people, by a general increase of the tariff, they had considered the circumstances of the country, and the industrial interests of the country, and had, at that time, adjusted the tariff in such a way as to have fostered those interests. Now, one or two words with reference to another aspect of the question, which had been referred to in the course of the debate. It had been stated in the House, and elsewhere, that his (Mr. Macdougall's) advice was not required; but, perhaps, hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial benches, in view of the many years he had served in Parliament, would not object to a few observations, by way of advice or suggestion. He thought that, in addition to this tariff, and the encouragement it would afford to the industries of the country, it was absolutely necessary, in the interests of the whole people, that the Government and this House should introduce, as far as possible, in every branch of the pub-

lic service, another policy—a national policy of economy and retrenchment. He thought, further, that this House should discourage—that the Government should set their faces against—those constant applications for additional expenditure, in all parts of the Dominion, for new, and in many cases useless, public works. They had, he feared, sunk many millions of dollars in unprofitable works, and it was time they should carefully consider their position, and endeavour to stop further expenditure in that direction. Moreover, he thought there was another suggestion which would not be out of place in connection with this subject—that was, to take immediate steps to increase the trade of Canada with other countries. They had made an attempt in 1855-56 to open up new avenues of commercial intercourse with countries, with which they could profitably exchange articles of Canadian production for the products of those countries; but changes of Government and of financial policy had interfered for a time with those measures which were absolutely necessary to promote this increase of trade. He thought that, in the present circumstances of Canada, it was desirable to open up further trade with the West Indies, South America, Brazil, and the Australian colonies. He believed that was one of the objects of the hon. the Finance Minister in the arrangement made with respect to the sugar duties. It was expected that these changes would have the effect of inducing a direct trade with those countries. It appeared to him desirable that they should take another step. The Government of this Dominion should claim, by communication with the Imperial Government, and by such means as might be proper, the right to participate in all new commercial treaties between Great Britain and foreign countries. Heretofore we had not been allowed that privilege. It had been the policy of England, for ages, to secure, as far as possible, the trade of her colonial possessions for her own traders and merchants. Looking into the history of England and her colonies, he could not say that it was not a proper and even a patriotic policy for the Mother Country to strengthen her own position by retaining the trade of her own colonies in her

own hands. It did not retard the progress of the colonies during their minority. But, now, when some of them had reached maturity, when they enjoyed self-government, and had been given the uncontrolled management of their local affairs, they ought to be allowed commercial independence as well as local political independence. They ought to be permitted to make arrangements, through their own Legislature, with any country that would make arrangements with them for the interchange of commodities upon favourable terms. In looking over the tariff, regulating trade between England and France, he found that we had no share in the advantages which England had secured from that country. While our fellow-subjects in the British Islands might send their commodities into France at a moderate rate of duty, many of ours were actually prohibited, and others charged 500 or 600 per cent. more than the same goods would pay if exported from England instead of Canada. He thought it might be possible to rectify this, and, under the new treaty about to be negotiated with France, to obtain favourable terms for the productions of Canada. He might say that he had a little personal experience of the policy of England, in reference to this question of trade. He had the honour, a few years ago, to act as a Commissioner on behalf of Canada, to make favourable terms with the West Indies and Brazil. He then discovered that it was still the policy of the Colonial Office, under the direction of the Lords of the Privy Council for trade, to prevent the colonies from making reciprocal arrangements in respect to their dealings with each other. He believed that difficulty could be got rid of, as regarded the West Indies, by a full and frank explanation of the whole case to the Imperial Government, and a move in the direction of that commercial independence which Canada's position entitled her to enjoy. He had very little doubt, from his observation of public opinion, that, if the Government of Canada presented our case strongly and clearly, we would either be permitted to join in the commercial treaties of the Mother Country with foreign nations, or to make reciprocal arrangements with them and our sister colonies on our own account. We

must, if possible, find markets abroad. The predictions of hon gentlemen opposite as to the effect of this tariff upon the industrial operations of the country might prove true. They said that in a short time competition would be so great that our manufacturers would be ruined, and the capital invested lost. He admitted there was a tendency in that direction. Indeed, he trusted the competition in all branches of industry would bring down the prices of commodities to a fair and reasonable amount. If he did not believe that competition would keep down prices, his confidence in the new tariff would be greatly weakened. A portion of the people would, no doubt, be drawn away from agricultural pursuits, and, therefore, it would be the duty of the Government to see that no stone was left unturned, no opportunity permitted to pass, which would enable them to secure outlets for the surplus products of the factories, as well as the forest and the farm, wherever they could be found. Believing that it would not only be the duty, but the pleasure of the present Government, to finish the policy they had inaugurated, by making efforts in that direction, he would leave the question in their hands, expressing the hope that they would make all reasonable endeavours to accomplish that object. He believed they were carrying out fairly and honestly, the "well understood wishes of the people," which, according to the resolutions of 1841, were declared to be the rule of Government in Canada, before Confederation, and which, by the Imperial Act of 1867, were declared to be the rule of Government in this country for the future. He believed that the rule applied, not only to this case, but to another question under consideration of the Imperial Government at this moment. The well understood wishes of the people must be the rule of government in this country, in all matters of local administration as well as alterations and amendments of the law. The intelligence they had just received from Prince Edward Island would seem to prove that, in the manner in which we are dealing with the fiscal question, we are carrying out the well-understood wish of the people in that Province. The local elections

there had just been decided in such a manner as to justify him in assuming that the people of that Province were not opposed to the policy of the general Government in regard to the tariff. He believed a large majority of the people of the whole Dominion were in favour of the speedy adoption of the law which would make this tariff the policy of the country for several years to come, for it was a policy which he hoped and believed would promote the happiness, the prosperity, and the progress of the country.

MR. CASGRAIN said he did not intend, at this late hour, to say much on the tariff question, but he felt it to be his duty to say a word in behalf of his own Province, and particularly of his own county. He had decided objection both to the tariff as a whole, and to many of its details. The hon. gentleman the Finance Minister stated the other day that this tariff was the result of a compromise. It was, in fact, a compromise. It was a compromise between the Upper Provinces and the Lower Provinces; the Province of Quebec stood between the two, that is to say, she stood under a cross fire between the tax on coal at one pole, and the tax on wheat at the other. He would say that his Province was not ready to accept this tariff. It had been stated that this policy would greatly encourage the shipping interests of the country, and the workmen in the city of Quebec, as elsewhere, had been promised employment in shipbuilding. He could assert, as a fact, that at this moment the largest shipbuilders in the Dominion, the Messrs. Ross of Quebec, who had not five ships on the stocks, had recently been obliged to suspend work. He believed that many of the promises made to other industries in this country would be no better fulfilled than the one made to this shipping interest. He would say, further, that, if this policy should prove as successful as was anticipated, if it should realise the benefits which hon. gentlemen expected, but which he did not expect, he would be the first to admit that he had been mistaken, and they had been right. He did not believe, however, it would succeed. There were certain great economic laws which were as unyielding as any other laws of nature, and it was as

easy to predict scientifically the result of given economic data as it was to predict an eclipse of the sun or of the moon. Popular opinion regarded crises as an evil; he denied they were an evil, they were the result of anterior events, and the natural cure for a disordered commerce, and for a state of things which frequently arose in most countries. Here we were only four millions of people, and some of us wanted to make all our own manufactures without trading with our neighbours. If we should adopt this policy, in a few years our markets would be glutted. The true beginning of this policy was pointed out by the hon. member for Halton, which was to open up markets abroad with France, Spain, Belgium, etc. But, at the same time, he denied that we would be able to compete with other nations, any more than England was able to compete with other nations. The theory of supplying work, and of fixing and maintaining the rate of wages, was a false theory. The only way of creating manufactures was to reduce the price of the article itself, and not by imposing duties on the raw material that came from abroad. They knew very well that wages in France were lower than in England, and lower in Germany than in France, and lower in Belgium than in France. He might give an instance of the importance of cheap labour in the case of the penknife that he held in his hand, the very same kind of penknife for which \$4 a piece was paid by a notorious Tory Government, as was well remembered. The German trader was able to bring knives of that description to Sheffield and Birmingham and undersell the English in their own market. Under German competition the price had been reduced to 6s. 6d. sterling a dozen, or 14c. a piece, whilst we continued to pay for that same article here from \$1.75 to \$2. Supposing we should desire to manufacture articles of this kind, people would still be able to buy them cheaper in England, and cheaper still in Germany.

MR. TILLEY: The duty on cutlery is only 20 per cent.

MR. CASGRAIN said the knife cost him less to-day in England than the duty he would have to pay on the former im-

ported article. Therefore, he said that, if we wanted to manufacture articles, the first condition of success was to manufacture them cheaply, and afterwards, when we had got the products, to find a market for them. He could give instances of old English commercial houses who still marked on their price list the original price at which the article was sold. This proved to him that a great many articles of common use could be sold a great deal cheaper than the prices now paid for them. The present commercial crisis could not last for ever; trade would inevitably return. If it returned during the maintenance in power of the hon. gentlemen opposite, they would say that it was due to their tariff. It would not be due to that tariff, but rather in spite of it. The hon. member for Halton had spoken of retrenchment, and, certainly, we needed to practice it now more than ever. We had been in Confederation now for twelve years, and our debts had been growing at a tremendous rate. There was a farce called the militia system, which had cost a good deal of money to the country. If the citizens of this country would do as they did in other countries, Switzerland, for instance, and instead of paying others to play soldier, they were to play soldier themselves, he thought it would cost far less for parade, and the plan would be more likely to give us an efficient service, which, he was sorry to say, we had not at the present moment, because the cost of our militia system did not pay for the whistle. He would also practice retrenchment throughout our Dominion and Local Administrations. There must be some means of lessening the enormous expenses of government in this country. This House was composed of 206 members, and he thought a much smaller number would do just as well. We did not need to concentrate so much wisdom. We were living beyond our means, and going on from one extravagance to another. Suppose the country should finally build and pay for the Pacific Railway. He would ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether they thought the resources of the country were sufficient to build it, and whether the country would be able to work that road for three years without running head over heels into debt? It was

well-known that the mere working of that road would cost, at the very least, \$15,000,000 a year. Where would we go to get that \$15,000,000 a year? Suppose we had built the Grand Trunk Railway, would we, to-day, be able to support the expenses that were incurred in running it? No, it was perfectly impossible. We ought to stop, at once, this excessive expenditure incurred by the unwise schemes some years ago of the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches. The Conservative party boasted of having held the reins of power in this Dominion for over 25 years, they ought then, to be held responsible for what had occurred in the meantime. Very little had been undertaken, involving expenditure, by the Administration of the hon. gentleman from Lambton, but the financial depression had caused deficits. What was the cause of these deficits? The Government expended no more money than Parliament had voted for it. They expended the ordinary sum of \$22,000,000, but the revenue of the country fell short of that sum by somewhat over \$2,000,000, and now the hon. the Minister of Finance wanted to raise \$2,500,000 more on a tariff which had hitherto produced, on an average, \$24,000,000, for a population of only 4,000,000. This would prove a very heavy burden.

MR. TILLEY: We only ask for \$14,000,000 from Customs.

MR. CASGRAIN said the Government wanted to raise, from all sources, \$24,000,000 a year. The Government expected to get \$24,400,000 by this tariff; that was \$6 per head upon every man, woman and child in the Dominion. He was very much mistaken if this were not so, and, if he was mistaken, perhaps the hon. the Finance Minister would enlighten him upon the subject. Consequently, a man who had eight children would be taxed in proportion. He (Mr. Casgrain) was burdened with a debt of \$1,000 a year by the Federal Government, irrespective of the local and municipal taxations. Therefore, he thought he had a right to speak on the subject. There was another point he desired to call attention to, and that was that, if the hon. gentleman only wanted to raise \$2,500,000 additional, he would

only have had to increase the tariff by one and one-tenth per cent. Instead, however, he had increased the tariff, on an average from 10 to 12 per cent. He had no doubt, and he gave the hon. gentleman credit for it, that he had decided upon adopting the Yankee system of forcing the people to make true entries in regard to the value of the goods. He thought his hon. friend the late Finance Minister must have lost large sums of money on account of goods being entered below their actual value. He gave the hon. the Finance Minister credit for doing this, but he did not give him credit for having put the tariff at so high a rate. He had received numerous letters from his constituents, and one that very day, in which they said this tariff was not acceptable to them. He had also received a letter in which it was stated that they intended to protest, in every town and parish, against this tariff. They had a perfect right to do this, and they were also going to protest in the county of Montmagny. In conclusion, he observed that the motion of the member for Bagot looked very much as though they had a vote of non-confidence before the House. He would leave that motion, however, with the Ministry, in order that they might do what they thought best in the matter. For his part, he was not interested much in whatever way it went; but, certainly, before the House went into Committee, there was a motion of want of confidence in the Ministry in the paper which ought to be disposed of.

MR. LAURIER said it was not his intention to travel over the whole of the ground comprised in this question. He desired simply to repel some of the imputations of inconsistency and disloyalty which had been brought by some hon. gentlemen against the Liberal party of Quebec, to which he belonged. To the first charge of inconsistency he did not attach much importance. A French writer had observed, "The absurd man is he who never alters;" and, if the converse of the proposition was true, some hon. gentlemen opposite, in consideration of their wanderings, were entitled to claim a high order of intelligence, indeed. The charge of disloyalty was one he was surprised

to hear uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite, but since it had been uttered, it was nothing but right and fair that it should rest on the proper shoulders. The main charge brought against them was, that they had abandoned their principles—that at one time the Liberal party of Quebec held principles similar to those advocated by the Government of to-day, which they, the Liberal party of Quebec, had abandoned. His hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) had asserted that they who claimed to be followers of Mr. Papineau had abandoned the principles advocated by Mr. Papineau. When this statement was made it was cheered, and, if he was to understand anything from this accusation, it meant that the Conservative party of Quebec had at last adopted the policy once advocated by Mr. Papineau. He could rejoice that the name of Mr. Papineau could now be pronounced by Opposition members of the House, without, at the same time, coupling with it some injurious expression. He could rejoice that at last some measure of justice was to be meted to that man, who, whatever might be said of him in other directions, had been the greatest man Lower Canada had ever produced. The charge showed that hon. gentlemen were not like the stumps in the field—immovable; it showed that they could retract if they could not advance, because they adopted a principle propounded years ago, and after the issues it had in view had been settled. If it was considered inconsistent to abandon a principle after the issues had been settled and determined, they were certainly inconsistent. If otherwise, then the charge fell on hon. gentlemen opposite. He would give the floor to any gentleman who would say what was the policy of Mr. Papineau, that they were accused of having abandoned. If no one would tell the House, he himself would do so. They knew, as well as he did, that the policy Mr. Papineau once advocated, was one calculated to sever the alliance which then bound, and still bound us to England. That was the policy of the Liberal party at that day, and what occasioned the adoption of that policy? The French Liberal party had long struggled against England for responsible government and constitutional liberty. Unfortunately, at that

time, the policy of England towards her colonies was not her policy of to-day—the policy which had made her so dear to her Canadian subjects. They had been petitioning and agitating for the concession of a free and responsible government. Deputation after deputation was sent to England, and petition after petition was laid upon the table of the Imperial Parliament. The supplies were repeatedly suppressed, and all the means of agitation which the limited Constitution of that day afforded them was resorted to. And all in vain. England always turned a deaf ear to their prayers. Then Mr. Papineau proposed that policy of their party, that they should shut their ports to all English merchandise, that they should cease their commercial relations with England. His calculation was that either England would be forced to give us the liberty for which we were struggling, or that the commercial relations with England would be destroyed, and that, as soon as commercial relations were destroyed, as a necessity, the political relations would be destroyed as well. Such, at that time, was the policy of the party to which he at present belonged. But he was bound to say that, as soon as this liberty for which they were struggling was given them, this policy was abandoned. And he would defy any gentleman on the other side of the House to cite a single word of Mr. Papineau, Mr. Morin, or any other leader of the Liberal party of Quebec, that advocated, after they had obtained responsible government, the policy to which he (Mr. Laurier) had referred. And that policy remained abandoned until it was restored by the leader of the Conservative party of Canada. Now, he was free to say that, had he lived in those days, he would have been one to advocate that policy. He would have been willing to risk his life in order that the country might be free. But he was not living in the year 1837. He was living in the year 1879, and he would be remiss to his duty if he were to forget the flag which waved over this country, and which waved over a free people. Mr. Papineau never told the people that they were to expect an economical benefit from this policy, but always told them that it was a sacrifice, in order that they might obtain liberty. He, at the same

MR. LAURIER.

time, told them to make the sacrifice, because no sacrifice was too great for the precious boon of liberty. At this day they would not be worthy of the example of that great man, if they were now, when the country was free, to again try to impose the same sacrifice upon the people. They were accused of being inconsistent. He would ask the House to judge of the sincerity of hon. gentlemen in throwing that reproach across the floor. He did not know what might be the object of hon. gentlemen opposite when they tried to fasten on them the charge that they, the Liberals of this day, were not true to their antecedents, unless it was to make use of the name of Mr. Papineau, and say, was not the example given them by this great man. The policy of Mr. Papineau was one of a most revolutionary character, and nothing could have justified it but the aim which he had in view, which was the concession of free government to us by the British nation. He would just give the House an idea of the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite reproached them with having abandoned. In the year 1837, the year of the Canadian rebellion, on the 15th of May, a meeting was held at the parish of St. Laurent. The meeting was addressed by Mr. Papineau, and a series of resolutions were adopted, which set forth the grievances of Lower Canada against England, and were concluded by the following resolutions:—

“Resolved, That, under existing circumstances, it is urgent to adopt, in the first place, some means of paralysing the attacks directed against our rights and liberties, and that this can be done by draining the sources of the revenues, which the measures of the Ministry aim to rob us of.

“Resolved, That a large share of the Provincial revenue is derived from a duty of 2½ per cent., collected upon all goods manufactured in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, upon their entry in the ports of this Province, and that a large proportion of those goods, especially woollens, linens, and cottons can be manufactured in this country, or had from the United States. That we invite and recommend to our fellow-countrymen to make use of the latter, in preference, especially when we are aware that such articles have been manufactured in this country, or smuggled into it from the United States: that we will especially encourage the establishment of manufactures in this Province, and that we will consider as well-deserving of their country, those who will establish or encourage such manufactures. That we do not adopt this

course through any hatred of the English people, whom we respect, and whom we thank for their sympathy towards their oppressed Canadian brethren; but that we adopt this course from hatred towards the injustices which we have suffered at the hands of the aristocracy, both Whig and Tory, and to invite the English people to crush the iron rod of their and our oppressors."

Such was the policy which the Conservative party of to-day reproached the Liberal party of Lower Canada with having abandoned. They had abandoned it because the aim which was sought to be obtained by this policy had been obtained. They had nothing in view but to have a free government, and as soon as they had a free government, they became as loyal, if not more so, than hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House. But hon. gentlemen talked of inconsistency. He desired to go a little further in that respect, and survey the course of his hon. friends opposite. At that meeting there was a young man who was destined to play a certain part in the history of this country. He was a young, ardent spirit, one of the most ardent spirits present on that occasion, and such was his ardour that, not only did he approve of the policy then propounded, but, at a later period, he rebelled in arms, and a price was set upon his head. But as soon as he obtained the price he required, as soon as the country was set free, at least politically, Mr. Cartier became a loyal subject, and the head of the Conservative party. At a somewhat later period, when Sir George E. Cartier was at the zenith of his power, he held up to the country what was his fiscal policy. At a dinner given to him, in 1871, he said:

"Manufacturers often ask for Protective duties. This is absurd; the same may be said of extreme Free-trade notions. If you do not pay duties to the Government upon manufactured goods, you must have recourse to direct taxation to make up for the loss out of the abolition of duties. With exaggerated Protection, you kill your foreign trade, as the Americans have done, and you must have recourse to direct taxation. We shall not make such a folly. We have adopted the policy of a Revenue tariff, and not a Protective tariff."

Such was the policy of the leader of the Conservative party in 1871. Which of the two parties could be taxed with inconsistency? He could point to the day, the hour, and the minute, when gentlemen opposite ceased to hold the doctrine

of Cartier, and became Protectionists. It was in the Session of 1876, when the hon. member for Centre Huron announced he would not increase the taxation of the country. Up to that time they had always held to the doctrine of Cartier, that we should not have Protective duties, and it was not later than 1874, when the Minister of Public Works accused the late Government of having inserted the thin end of the wedge of Protection into our system. But, at that time, 1876, the depression was great, and, by-and-bye, the manufacturers of Montreal commenced to agitate for Protection. The Conservative party meanwhile, assumed neutrality, as a party. They did not pronounce at once for Protection, Free-trade, or the tariff, but sat on the fence ready to assail the Government with the whip of Protection or the bludgeon of Free-trade. Had the late Finance Minister said it was his intention to increase the tariff, they could imagine with what a roar of indignation hon. gentlemen opposite would have told the people that all their woes were to be ascribed to his policy of taxation, as they ascribed them now to his policy of not taxing the people. Another reproach made against them was that, in 1872, when the Liberal party was re-organised in Quebec, it adopted, as a part of its platform, the policy of Protection. He was not surprised at this. The Conservatives followed the fashion of King James the Second, who, according to Macaulay, who, when any proposition he affirmed was objected to, kept re-affirming in a louder tone, each time objection was made, until his voice drowned that of the one who objected. This statement that the Liberal party adopted a Protective policy in 1872 had been proven untrue time and again, but, notwithstanding that, it was still repeated, each time with more vehemence than before. He did not deny that, after the policy of Papineau had been propounded, there lingered in the hearts of many Liberals this idea of Protection. After a storm, the waters did not at once become calm, but continued their agitation; so it was with the Liberal party. But he denied most emphatically that either in 1872, or at any period since 1841, the Liberal party had held this Protective policy as a party. He had their pro-

gramme adopted in 1872, in which he defied any gentleman opposite to find a single section referring to Protection. The only reference made to a commercial policy at all was these words: "The obtaining of the absolute right to regulate our commercial relations with foreign countries, so as to ensure the establishment of manufactures in Canada." Of course, the Liberals wanted to establish manufactures as much as did the Conservatives; but the way the former wanted to do this was to establish a market for our manufactures, but the latter wanted to protect the market, to make the people pay for them. The charge of being Annexationists had been brought against his party by the last man from whom he had expected it, his hon. friend from Ottawa. There had been, at one time, Annexationists in the ranks of the Liberal party, but there had been as many in the Tory party. If anyone would give him the manifesto of 1849, he could show for every Liberal on it two Conservatives. There was this difference between the two parties: The Liberal Annexationists became Annexationists from honest conviction, while the Tory Annexationists became so out of spite and disappointed ambition. When the Governor-General would not yield to their wishes, they commenced abusing him just as the Conservatives now did the Marquis of Lorne. They were ever the same. They belonged to that race which Napoleon characterised at one time as forgetting nothing, and learning nothing. They were the same in 1879 as in 1849. The leader of the Government, yesterday, called the attention of the House to a Liberal paper which reflected on him. Let him turn to the leading Conservative organ in Quebec, and contrast the two. The *Minerve* used the following language with reference to the action of the Governor-General in the Letellier matter:—

"We have now two outrages instead of one; and the young man who represents the Queen at Ottawa is no better than the brigand who represents the Queen in Quebec."

As he had said, the Tory Annexationists in Lower Canada became so when, on a certain occasion, the Governor-General would not yield to their demands, and, after having insulted him in every possible way, they burned the Parlia-

ment buildings, and signed the Annexationist manifesto. The hon. member for Ottawa had also referred to a speech which he (Mr. Laurier) had made six or seven years ago, in which he said he advocated the doctrine of Protection. He defied the hon. gentleman to find the word Protection in it.

AN HON. MEMBER: But the thing is.

MR. LAURIER said the thing was not. It was a political speech, not a speech on political economy. It was a speech in which he invited his fellow-countrymen of French origin to turn their attention to industrial pursuits, rather than literary pursuits; and, if he had again to speak on that subject, he would again use the same language, and would say to his fellow-countrymen in Lower Canada, that their education was far too literary, and not sufficiently practical; they should give their attention more to industrial pursuits, and less to the arts. He did not want to discuss the policy of Protection; it had been exhausted. This much he would say: that he would not be averse to a moderate system of Protection to those industries which we had the ability to create, but which required, at the outset, assistance against foreign competition. He knew these views were not held by those who surrounded him, but they were his views, and he advocated them honestly, and would give any proposition of this kind his vote, but he did not believe in this system of universal taxation which was brought down under the name of Protection, and in which the Government themselves had no faith, as was apparent from the course they had adopted. The Finance Minister excused himself to the House for bringing down this tariff before making another effort to obtain reciprocity from the Government at Washington. His excuse was that the Washington Government had been approached twice on this subject, and it would have been lowering the dignity of this country to make further advances. But, at the same time, he hinted that this Government would be ready to give Free-trade to the United States as soon as the United States would give us Free-trade. Not only did he hint it, but there was actually a provision

in the tariff to that effect; that, as soon as the United States would choose to take off the Customs duty against Canadian producers, the Canadian Government would take off the Customs duties against American producers. There could not be a more candid, frank and fair avowal that Free-trade was more suited than Protection to this country, and, if this were true, what became of the long and sonorous oration they had heard from gentlemen opposite? If it was admitted that Free-trade was superior to Protection, and that this country was ready to give Free-trade to the Americans as soon as they would give us Free-trade, was it not a most eloquent denunciation of the Protection theories they had heard from the other side of the House? They had been told that the most magnificent results would accrue from a Protective policy; but, suppose the Americans gave us Free-trade to-morrow; suppose we had Free-trade with France as well, and Free-trade everywhere, what would not be the fate of this country if the theories held by hon. gentlemen opposite were true? The concession that this Government was ready to give Free-trade to the Americans, was the best condemnation of the increase of duty and of the present tariff. What was the idea at the bottom of this increase of duty? It was, as explained by gentlemen opposite, that Americans could now come here and undersell our manufacturers, though they had a duty against them of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If that were true, was it common sense to suppose that we could compete against them with no tariff at all? This concession that Free-trade was the best thing for the country justified the policy of the Parti National, in 1877, which had been spoken of by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) this evening. We did not want a contracted market, such as we would have under Protection, but a more expanded market, and he hoped the day would soon come when we would adopt the policy of the National party in 1872, and take the right to regulate our trade relations with foreign countries. There was something peculiar about this tariff. There was a provision in it that we were ready to give Free-trade to the Americans as soon as they would give us Free-trade.

MR. McCALLUM: In breadstuffs and animals only.

MR. LAURIER: In everything.

MR. PLUMB: There is no such proposition.

Mr. LAURIER said they were ready to give the Americans Free-trade, and France also, to some extent, but there was one country which had given us Free-trade, and which was denied the benefit, and that country was England. He was not so loud in his professions of loyalty as gentlemen opposite. He did not impugn the loyalty of anybody, but there was not one man, even on the other side of the House, who did not feel that this policy was injurious, and, not only injurious in itself, but unworthy of a Canadian people towards the English people. There was, also, another reason why he was against this tariff. It was a universal increase of taxation, disguised under the name of Protection. He did not understand Protection in this way. The inducement held out to the people for adopting this policy was that, though there would be an increase of taxation all round, there would be, also, an increase of labour all round. This was a fallacy in itself. He did not deny that, under this tariff, when put in operation, they might create more labour somewhere, but it would be at the expense of so much labour destroyed elsewhere. Of course, every nation had a certain power of consumption, and no more. No Act of Parliament and no amount of legislation could increase the ability to consume of a people. It stood by itself, and depended on altogether different circumstances from legislation, and was, therefore, above the control of legislation. The theory of the tariff was this: We imported so many millions every year. It was calculated that the barrier placed in the face of importations would decrease them, and the people would be compelled to manufacture in the country the amounts which would be lessened by the decrease of importations. Either this tariff would have an effect, or it would not; either it would decrease the importations, or it would not. If it did not decrease the importations, the consequence would be that everything would be made dearer to the consumer, but

there might not be a day's more labour in the country. If, on the other hand, the importations were decreased, he quite admitted that, though the article would be dearer to the consumer, there would be more labour in the country; but there would be labour destroyed, and that would be in connection with the shipping industry. There was not a more true proposition in history, than that no Protection country every had a merchant navy. Take the example of France and of the United States. He need not dwell upon them, because they had already been referred to, but, as sure as they diminished importation, they destroyed the labour of the sailor, the pilot, the stevedore, and all those who, in every maritime city, lived upon the shipping of the country. He spoke of this because he had the honour to represent one of the largest maritime cities of the Dominion, and one which had a large population living exclusively upon the shipping of the country. In the city of Quebec there was a large population of pilots, sailors, stevedores, ship-labourers and so on, whose only labour depended upon the trade of the country, upon the importations made every year, and when they stopped the importations altogether they would have completely destroyed the labour of these people. That would be the Protection given to them. He did not deny they would be giving labour, perhaps, to others, but what would they do with this large population which would be thrown out of employment. His hon. friend from the county of Quebec (Mr. Caron) had referred to his (Mr. Laurier's) election in Quebec East, and had stated he had not carried out the promises which he then made. What he promised was, that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie would endeavour to get from the French Government the same concession which was given to the English Government as to ships—that they would allow the registration of Canadian ships in France at the same rate of duty as English ships, and that, at the same time, we should admit, as a compensation, their wines at the same rate as they were admitted in England. These were promises which he then made with the authorisation of his leader. He made no other promises, and these they had carried out to their

full extent. They had endeavoured to obtain from the French Government this concession. The British Ambassador in Paris was charged to present their petition to the French Government. It was said by hon. gentlemen opposite that they had not carried out their promises. But what more could they have done than open negotiations with France through the British Ambassador? When that Government refused the Canadian Government's propositions, what was left for them to do? His hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Caron), who belonged to the militia, might think that they should have compelled France to buy Canadian ships at the same rate as English, on pain of bombarding their ports. But that might have been dangerous. They might have applied to Bismarck to assist them in compelling France to meet Canadian views; but they were the Liberal party, and, as Bismarck was a Tory, and an out-and-out Protectionist, they would not invoke his aid. The only thing they could do was done. They opened a correspondence with the French Government, showing the people that they had performed their promise. There was another reason why he could not support the tariff—because it introduced the abominable system of taxing all the necessaries of the poor. Hon. gentlemen opposite cried, "Hear, hear;" but it could not be denied that the tea, sugar, bread and clothing of the people would be taxed. So far as his own Province of Quebec was concerned, the idea of taxing wheat flour and coal appeared full of cruelty. That Province did not produce enough flour for her own consumption, while, as to coal, the people had six months of winter. Before six months expired, he predicted that every mother in every Quebec cottage would curse the day this tariff was introduced, which was to add so much to the anxieties and cares of her domestic life.

MR. CIMON said that he had not intended to speak upon this important question, but the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) had been so strange, that he could not allow the debate to be closed without refuting it. He, therefore, begged of the House to pardon him for continuing the debate a few moments.

He was really surprised to see so much loyalty professed by the hon. member for Quebec East this evening; at all events, it should be a cause of rejoicing for all to see him so firmly attached to the British Crown. No doubt but that this declaration was quite sincere. The hon. member had stated that the idea of a Protective policy had originated in the days of the late Mr. L. J. Papineau, and that the bad treatment that Canadians were then receiving at the hands of England had so irritated them, that Mr. L. J. Papineau had placed himself at the head of his fellow-citizens, in order to be revenged, and had inscribed on his flag, that "Canadians should purchase nothing from England." That, according to the hon. member, had been the origin of Protection, and this policy had been framed with the intention of bringing about the separation of Canada from England. The hon. member for Quebec East excused this disloyal policy of that period, on the ground that Canadians were then unjustly treated by England, but, he had added, times were changed. England had repaired her injustice, she had removed all cause of discontent, she treated Canada well; and Canadians could now only be grateful towards her. That was why they should not put in practice this disloyal policy of Protection inaugurated by Mr. Papineau, and it was in order to remain loyal to England that the Liberal party had long ago abandoned this idea of a Protective policy. But, curious to relate, in 1871, the hon. gentleman was a member of the Local House, and there, what had been said by this loyal subject of Her Majesty, as he now styled himself? Well, he had stood up in the Local Legislature and had endeavoured to arouse throughout the country, against England, the same feelings of hostility to which the eloquence of Papineau had given birth in 1837. The hon. member reminded the House of the days of Papineau, saying that Papineau's policy imposed itself upon the whole people then, as in 1837. Yet, in 1871, Canada was as well treated by the Mother Country as she was to-day. Long previous to 1871, England had been acting justly towards Canada, and the extreme policy of Papineau had

been abandoned. Why, then, had the hon. member, this loyal subject, who, this evening, would on no account do anything to displease England, made use, before the Local Legislature in 1871, of the following language:

"Sir, it is many years since the great patriot that we have just lost, the Hon. L. J. Papineau, seeking for a remedy against the evils of his day, summed up his policy on this subject in the following simple precept: 'We should purchase nothing from the metropolis.' I am of opinion that this policy imposes itself upon us to-day with as much force as at the time it was first enunciated."

Therefore, in 1871, this loyal subject of Her Majesty wanted the country to adopt the policy advocated by Papineau in 1837, and as this policy, according to the hon. member, was calculated to bring about the separation of Canada from the Mother Country, it must be admitted that, in 1871, the hon. member was a disloyal subject, or else that he was not sincere in what he said this evening.

MR. LAURIER asked the hon. member to continue reading his (Mr. Laurier's) speech.

MR. CIMON said he would do so. Not only had the hon. member wished, in 1871, to arouse, throughout the country, with his eloquence, the same storms as Papineau had brought upon Canada, in 1837, but he had, moreover, wished to set one race against another. The hon. member had made a strong appeal to French-Canadians, to induce them to adopt the Protective system of Mr. Papineau, which was summed up in this simple precept, that "nothing should be purchased from the Mother Country," saying that it imposed itself upon the country more strongly in 1871 than ever. The hon. member had asked him to go on reading his speech. Well, he found, in this same speech that he delivered in 1871, the following words:—"It is a duty for us, especially for us, Canadians of French origin, to create a national industry." Where, then, was the loyalty of the hon. member in 1871? Therefore, he was not sincere in what he had said this evening. He was curious to know what motives had inspired the speech that the hon. member had just delivered. He maintained that the House was not disloyal in inaugurating a Pro-

protective policy in this country. This Protective system had not the same aim as that of Mr. Papineau. This tariff was not unfavourable to England. It was framed as a set-off against the policy of the United States. The hon. member had charged the Conservative party with disloyalty. He would ask him what party had uttered, in this country, words in favour of independence or annexation, if it was not the Liberal party? Every time a man proclaimed himself an Annexationist, it was certain that he belonged to the Liberal party. Had not the members for Chateaugay and Shefford, who sat beside the hon. member, signed the Annexationist manifesto? The hon. member could not mention a single man of the Conservative party who had manifested a desire to bring about the separation of Canada from England. On the contrary, it was well known that, every time such a desire had been manifested, it came from a Liberal. The hon. member, still speaking of loyalty, had quoted an unfortunate expression that had escaped a Conservative journalist, in speaking of His Excellency, and he had endeavoured to make the whole Conservative party responsible for it. There was not a member in this House who did not regret this article. But since the hon. member for Quebec East wished to enter upon this subject, he would recall what the hon. member for Shefford, who now sat beside him, and who had, for a long time, been his colleague, had said in 1873, of Lord Dufferin, who was the Governor-General of Canada. He compared him to Nero. The hon. member for Shefford had said this:—

“He (Mr. Huntington) wished to speak of the attributes of the Crown, but he did not wish to refer to the time when Nero played the fiddle and recited verses, whilst Rome, set on fire by his own hand, lay burning at his feet. There were epochs when events were so important that the cause of truth must be placed above any man, however exalted might be his position.”

He would now take the organ of the Liberal party of Quebec, in 1873, *L'Evenement*, a paper that was supposed to express more particularly the opinions of the hon. member for Quebec East. *L'Evenement*, in its issue of the 14th of August, 1873, made use of the

following language, in speaking of Lord Dufferin:—

“The *coup d'état*, of which Ottawa was yesterday the scene, takes us back to the darkest days of our history, and Lord Dufferin, heretofore so popular, has just inscribed his name below those of the most execrated of our former Governors. * * * * *

“Well, since he wills it, since he prefers, to the respect of a free people, the embraces of men who abandon all defence of their outraged honour, since he abdicates the rôle of an impartial arbitrator, listening only to the voice of Parliament, in order to become the obedient servant of prevaricating Ministers; since he is naught but a footman, wearing the Imperial livery; therefore, let him receive his share of public contempt, and let him fall to the level of those he shields against popular justice.”

He could quote articles from the *Globe*, written in a similar strain. Here was what the *Globe* had said in August, 1873, of Lord Dufferin:—

“We regret to say that the Governor-General (Lord Dufferin) has placed himself in a false position, and the sooner he prepares for his departure from the Dominion, which he will find too hot for him, after his most unpardonable attack on the privileges of the House of Commons, the better.

“Words fail to express the heinousness of the outrage committed by Earl Dufferin. Who should blame the poor outraged people if they should, *en masse*, proceed to the capital and make guilty criminals flee for their lives. Her Majesty should be petitioned to recall Lord Dufferin, whose name will, henceforth, be held in utter execration by every honest man in Canada.”

There were so many samples of the loyalty of the Liberal party in this country. Hon. members on the other side would do well to keep silent on this subject. The hon. member had spoken but little of the tariff, but he had said enough to let the House see the manner in which he was endeavouring to arouse public opinion in Lower Canada upon this question of the tariff. He had spoken of the duties to be imposed upon agricultural products. He had referred to flour and wheat, saying that the Customs duties imposed upon these articles was an unjust and crushing tax, an enormous tax, that would weigh heavily above all on the poorer classes. But the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had said, last night, that the duty upon wheat and flour was a delusion, and that it would in no way raise the price of Upper Canadian flour. It

was easy to see that the hon. members on the other side had not come to an understanding as to the line of attack. The hon. member for Quebec East said quite the contrary to what the hon. leader of the Opposition maintained, and *vice versa*. What confidence was to be placed in such a party, and how could people believe that they were sincere? But, rather, they had come to an understanding in order to forward their political interests by setting one Province against another. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) told the Province of Ontario that her wheat and flour was not protected, that this tariff would not raise the price of those articles, whilst the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) said to the Province of Quebec: "Look at those wicked Conservatives; they tax your wheat and your flour, in order to enrich the farmers of Ontario." What conclusion was to be drawn from all that, if not that the hon. member and his friends were endeavouring to regain power by appealing to the prejudices of the people? They failed to show that they were either sincere or patriotic. The hon. member had, moreover, told the House that the Government were adding \$2,000,000 to the taxes of the country. But could the hon. member for Quebec East, who had been a member of the late Administration, complain with good grace of this increase? Was it for him to blame the present Government for imposing duties in order to make sure of sufficient revenue to defray the extravagant expenditure incurred by the hon. member and his colleagues of the late Administration? Was it for him to come and endeavour to embarrass the Government in the efforts they were making to raise the credit of the Dominion that they had lowered? The country was obliged to pay the debts of the late Administration. As soon as these debts were met, the Liberal party might be certain that the Conservatives, faithful to their pledges and to their Government, would lighten the burdens of the people. There were several other arguments made use of by the hon. member that he would like to refute, but he did not wish to trespass longer on the patience of the House. He had only risen to answer that part of the speech of the hon. member in

which he had accused the Conservatives of disloyalty. By speaking longer he would be worthy of the censure of the House, for it was not right to continue the discussion at three o'clock in the morning, especially when the debate had been going on for a fortnight. He would beg leave, however, to say that he found very strange the other argument of the hon. member for Quebec East, which consisted in saying that the present tariff, by raising the duties on foreign products, would enrich a few manufacturers, to the detriment of the farmers. There could be nothing more erroneous, for it was the farmer who was the most interested in having these duties raised. For what would occur? Capitalists, seeing that this Protective system offered them a good chance of increasing their capital, would invest a greater amount of money in manufactures. The result would be that competition would spring up among manufacturers in this country; this competition would increase the demand for raw material required for these manufactures, the demand for agricultural produce, etc., and these articles being in greater demand, their price would necessarily increase. On the other hand, manufactured goods, becoming more numerous, would be sold cheaper. Thus the farmer would sell dearer and buy cheaper, for competition would oblige the manufacturer to sell his goods cheaper and pay higher prices for what he needed.

Mr. ANGLIN said that, under the circumstances, he thought it would be well to adjourn the debate for at least one day more. He asked if the House would consent to the adjournment of the debate.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. TILLEY: It is very important to close the debate this morning. There is a general anxiety that we should do so.

Mr. ANGLIN said there might be an anxiety to do so, but many more desired to speak on this subject. Hon. gentlemen on the other side had occupied the whole of this day, and some had spoken twice. He thought it was only fair that, on a matter like this, all should have an opportunity of speaking.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he protested against the action of the Ministerial party, who seemed to think that, because they were in the majority, they should control the course and duration of the debate, and force a division when it suited them. He did not think it reasonable, at that hour of the morning, to compel a member to speak. The House should adjourn, leaving the debate to be resumed.

MR. ANGLIN said that the question before the House was a very large one, and exceedingly difficult to deal with properly at that hour, when it was hardly to be expected that hon. gentlemen opposite would listen attentively to arguments against a measure they were compelled to support. They were invited, at the opening of the debate, to consider a whole series of questions, including the present condition of this Dominion, the causes that led to the depression, and the character of the revolutionary remedies proposed by the hon. the Finance Minister. Strange to say, there was a wide difference of opinion, even with regard to the condition of the country. The Finance Minister commenced his Budget speech by drawing a contrast between the state of this country at the time he made his former Budget speech, in 1873, and its present condition, making statements not consistent with the facts. He spoke of its condition in 1873 as bright, cheerful, promising; the future was described as being full of hope and encouragement. But those who then heard that speech saw that even then the shadow of the gloom impending over this country was cast upon the hon. gentleman, for he informed the House that, although, by means of the surpluses that had accrued in previous years, he would be able to meet the liabilities then existing, he anticipated that he would find it necessary the year after to ask for increased taxation. So all was not then so bright and cheerful as he would now have them suppose. They were told that, before 1873, this country enjoyed a degree of prosperity unexampled and unparalleled; that the Government of that day, owing to their great ability and wonderful patriotism, and extraordinary powers, contrived to roll

MR. ANGLIN.

up surpluses with one hand, while, with the other, they swept away taxation. But it was important to remark that during the years before 1873, the hon. gentlemen opposite found it necessary to increase the taxation two or three different times, and so hard set were they that at one time they introduced a system of taxing all the packages in which goods were imported, adding some 5 per cent. on the total amount of taxes collected. Now, it was unquestionable that even to-day, some six months after their return to power, this country was suffering from very serious depression, which they were asked to admit was caused by the late Administration. They were told by the Minister of Public Works, too, that the magnificent fabric, the stately and beautiful and solid fabric reared by their predecessors, was ruthlessly destroyed by the bungling want of patriotism and want of ability of the Liberal Administration. That, again, was a statement entirely contrary to the facts. What was the cause of the extraordinary increase of revenue for which the gentlemen on the other side so boldly demanded credit? At the close of the American war, the whole commercial world was disturbed, and no part of it so much as Canada. The people of the United States, finding their farms without stock, and their ships and stores almost empty, bought in Canada vast numbers of horses, horned cattle, sheep, pigs, turkeys, and other fowl, at extravagant prices, and created in this country an extraordinary degree of temporary prosperity. About that time, also, there was an extraordinary amount of speculation in railway building. Ontario, from her large accumulated surpluses, had begun to assist different railways, which, with bonuses from municipalities, and the sale of bonds, led to the expenditure of some \$15,000 to \$30,000 a mile on several hundred miles of new railroads—all this contributing to swell the expenditure of the country, and increase its apparent prosperity. But, more, there was the notorious fact that the prices of merchandise, for some extraordinary reason, advanced in an unusual degree, so that the revenue of this country increased enormously for three or four years, without any effort on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. For this they were not

entitled to the slightest credit. Nor, if they had fair pretensions to the character of statesmen, would they make any claim to credit for an increase entirely independent of anything they did, or could do. They knew that the prices of cotton goods, woollen goods, and more particularly all articles of iron, advanced remarkably in price. In that way, as their imports increased—not in quantities so much as in value—the revenue increased to an unprecedented extent. Those hon. gentlemen made extraordinary efforts to overtake that increase of revenue. Each year they framed their estimates so as to cover the increase of the previous year. With a zeal, perhaps commendable, certainly very noteworthy, they kept up this chase to the last moment. The last time the present Finance Minister appeared in the same capacity, he introduced a Budget in which he proposed to expend the extraordinary sum of \$23,500,000. The Finance Minister told them in New Brunswick, before they came into Confederation, that they would never spend more than \$11,500,000 a year in their time—that \$11,500,000 would cover all expenses for all purposes that could be imagined, even including the expenditure of \$1,000,000 for Militia expenses. But his Nemesis followed him, too, and after Confederation, in the very first year in which he became Finance Minister, he introduced an estimate for almost double the amount which he said would be sufficient. Well, they knew how this increase went on. They knew how the revenue rolled up. Great credit was taken by the men now in power for striking off taxes. They took the tax off tea and coffee the last year they were in power, because the idea of a free breakfast table had taken possession of the people of the United States, and it would have been perfect folly for a Canadian Government to attempt to collect the duty on tea and coffee under the circumstances, and, therefore, they took the duty off those articles, with a magnanimity for which they had never ceased to take credit, particularly the hon. the Minister of Public Works. And they asked the people to contrast their magnificent administration and the wonderful benefits they conferred upon the country, by their patriotism and

ability, with the failure, as they alleged, of those who succeeded them in power. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had alleged, in his usually loud tones, and strong language, that the late Administration destroyed the fabric which their predecessors had raised, and that they were responsible for the large expenditure and the deficits which had since occurred. Not only had they succeeded in persuading the constituencies throughout the country, if they were to judge by the electors, but there were many hon. members of the House who seemed really to believe that such was the fact, that the expenditures had grown up to their present extraordinary dimensions because of the maladministration of the late Government, and that the necessity for imposing these new taxes had been occasioned by something or other done by the late Administration, or something they neglected to do. They had heard this statement over and over again during the debate; but he (Mr. Anglin) always looked with surprise at every hon. gentleman so speaking, and scanned his features in order to ascertain if he made the statement seriously, and believed, himself, what he alleged, and he (Mr. Anglin) was forced to believe that, in most cases, the hon. members who made those statements, were really convinced of the truth of what they said. But who was it that increased the expenditure? It was increased from \$12,000,000 or \$14,000,000 during the first years of Confederation to \$23,000,000 or \$24,000,000 in 1873-74. This fact appeared clear and unquestionable to any one examining the Public Accounts and the Estimates: that that extraordinary expenditure was first fastened on the country by hon. gentlemen opposite. There was the increase of the subsidies to the Provinces. There was the adjustment of the debt between Ontario and Quebec. When put altogether, their Estimates for the last year they were in power were some \$23,500,000 or \$24,000,000. Why, then, should the late Administration be held responsible for the increase? Where, when, or how, he would ask, were the late Government responsible for that increase? Where, when, or how did they make the addition which had been made to the permanent liabilities of the country? What was

the reason that it was necessary, to-day, to increase the taxation of the country? They were told there was a deficit of \$2,000,000, and that it would be necessary to raise \$2,400,000. They were told that the amount of the fishery award was to be absorbed in meeting existing Canadian liabilities. He agreed to a great extent with the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, who maintained that that money belonged by right to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and more especially to the men who were engaged in the fisheries, from whom, in fact, all was taken for which that money was the equivalent. However, that money had been taken to meet liabilities. He thought he understood, from the late Finance Minister, that he contemplated using that money for a similar purpose, whether permanently or not he did not say; and he alleged, as a justification, the condition of the finances of the country. He (Mr. Anglin) did not know that anything the late Government had done had rendered it necessary now to increase taxation, and that proposition was emphatically denied on his side of the House. They denied that they had in the slightest degree increased the permanent liabilities of the country, except to an extent that was unavoidable. They were compelled, in order to meet the liabilities incurred by their predecessors, and the obligations they had imposed on the Government, to borrow a large amount of money. The interest must be paid on that money, and a sinking fund provided. To that extent the Government were compelled to increase the pecuniary liabilities of the country. Then there was the establishment of the Mounted Police in the North-West, that he believed the previous Government themselves were prepared to establish. The expense caused by this was enormous, but he thought it was regarded as a salutary measure. But, if any one of the hon. gentlemen now forming the majority of this House imagined that that expense could be dispensed with, he would have an opportunity, when they came to the Estimates, of moving that the provision for the Mounted Police be struck out. In doing so, he would show his sincerity. It was also found necessary to make treaties with the Indians of the North-West. This was manifestly

MR. ANGLIN.

and obviously necessary for the purpose of maintaining peace out there, and for the purpose of avoiding expenditures, such as the United States had long had to bear, in consequence of their ill-treatment of Indians on their reserves. Treaties had to be made that would satisfy the Indians, at least for a time, and prevent any danger of an outbreak. The establishment of the Supreme Court was one of the expenditures for which the country was indebted to the late Administration. He (Mr. Anglin) confessed that he himself never saw any necessity for the immediate establishment of that Court, but all the lawyers, he believed, on both sides of the House were very anxious for its establishment. The present right hon. Minister of the Interior, when Minister of Justice, more than once introduced a measure for the purpose of establishing that Court. The hon. gentleman failed to introduce a Bill that would satisfy the House, or satisfy himself. He had to withdraw two Bills, because they did not meet with the approval of the House, and that was the reason this Court was not established in his time. But it was established by the late Administration, and had become one of the permanent burdens of the Dominion. The Post Office establishment was reconstructed, and the postage of letters to the United States and Great Britain was very materially reduced. A free delivery was established in several of the large cities, and very great additions were made to the number of post-offices in the Dominion, and to the number of miles to be travelled over by conveyances carrying the mails. All this entailed very large additional expense. He had seen it stated in a speech made in another place, that 20,000,000 more letters and packages were now conveyed through the post-offices every year, than were conveyed before the change was made. Now, he presumed no gentleman would move that they go back to the state of things which formerly existed, in regard to the post-office. No doubt that improvement could have been deferred for a time, and it would have been imprudent to have incurred the additional expense if the Government had been regarded as a bankrupt concern. The people of this country, when this matter was fairly and

fully stated to them, would say that it was an expenditure fully justified, and that they would not, on any account, return to the old state of things. When the late Finance Minister made his Budget speech, in 1874, he anticipated a deficit, but he could not have anticipated that there would be so sudden a decline in the prices of merchandise of all kinds. He was charged with not having had the courage to come down with a proposition which would enable him to meet fairly the wants of the country, by imposing additional taxation. They all knew that, in 1874, he informed the House that there would be a deficit, and did ask for increased taxation, which, but for the decline in the prices of goods imported, would have yielded an additional revenue of three million dollars; but, as the prices continued to go down year after year, he found that the revenue, notwithstanding the additional taxation, barely kept up to the former standard. Had the Government exceeded its estimates of expenditure year after year, or had it wasted money in any way, the charge made so often by hon. gentlemen would be a tangible one. But such was not the case; the deficit was caused solely by the decline in the revenue, for which the Government could not be held responsible. They were told that this country was in a worse condition than any part of the civilised world, and they were asked to contrast its condition with that of the United States, which the hon. the Minister of Public Works held up as an example of all that was great and prosperous. But Canada was successful beyond all comparison. If they considered that the population of the United States was eleven times greater than that of Canada, it would be found that we imported fifty per cent. more than they did; and if great exportations were a proof of prosperity, we were vastly more prosperous than the people of the United States. The hon. gentleman also pointed out that the imports of the United States were small, and assumed that the reason for this was that the manufactures of the country had grown to such an extent as to supply the wants of the people. If the decline in imports was a proof of prosperity, then, instead of holding the late Government

responsible for the distress of this country, he should admit that, if they influenced the amount of imports in any way, they rendered great service, by reducing it so materially. What in truth was the state of affairs in the United States? Nearly two-thirds of the factories there had been idle for a long time past. An hon. gentleman had stated that some were now working at double time. That might be; but, nevertheless, for some years past, a number of factories had been working at half time, and had paid very small wages, and very many had been closed altogether. They had all heard of the riots among the foundry operatives in Troy, a year or two ago, and of riots in Pittsburg, and a great many other cities, where crowds filled the streets, demanding employment, and using threats, and sometimes violence, so that it was necessary to call out the troops to quell the tumults. They had heard of the extraordinary suffering among miners in the coal regions, of the immense number of 31,000 people out of employment in the manufacturing State of Massachusetts last year. The value of real estate, in the principal cities in the United States declined year after year, not merely in proportion to the change in the relative value of paper and gold, but absolutely, so that it had fallen far below the gold value, as it was before the Civil War. Another assertion frequently made by gentlemen opposite was that, owing to the misgovernment of the last five years, the people of Canada flocked in thousands to the United States; but the truth was that, while the Conservatives were in power, no less than 500,000 native-born Canadians emigrated to the United States; but about the time the late Government got into power that emigration almost absolutely ceased; so that, where thousands went in previous years, hardly ten went now. And not only was that a fact, but large numbers of the expatriated Canadians had returned to settle again in this country. The hon. the Minister of Public Works told them of the unexampled prosperity of the United States, and contrasted the condition of that country, as described by himself, with the condition of Free-trade England. But they all knew that, some two years ago, large numbers of the mechanics and operatives

of New York and other large cities in the United States, who had emigrated from Europe, returned to poor Free-trade England, because they could not find employment in the Protectionist United States. This that hon. gentleman seemed to have forgotten; but they all knew that he did not always recollect those facts which told against his side of a case, while he was very fond of exaggerating those which were favourable. It was a well-known fact that those people returned in tens of thousands to Great Britain. They knew that emigration to the United States, more especially from Ireland, England and Germany, had almost entirely ceased for some years past, because emigrants did not hope to find employment at fair wages in that highly protected country which the Minister of Public Works alleged so loudly was so very prosperous. He found in the *Boston Pilot*, a paper devoted to the interests of the working classes, a protest against a proposal to pass a law, making vagrancy a criminal offence in some of the United States, while there were so many thousands of honest workmen tramping in search of employment there. He found also that there had been in Rouen, one of the towns in France, a protected country, a meeting of some 20,000 workmen who were unable to get work. That was a condition of things that was very much to be deplored. There was, no doubt, a great deal of distress prevailing throughout the cities and towns of the Dominion. No one could walk through the streets of Ottawa and see the number of stores closed up on the principal streets, and deny that a great deal of depression existed in the country. The late Government had been charged by their successors with not having done anything to retrieve the depression. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) had repeated the charge frequently in his speech this evening, and had called upon members of the Opposition, not merely to find fault with this tariff, but to propound some counter proposition for relieving the distress of the country. But the late Government had expended millions of dollars upon public works which went directly to the relief of the workman, and had, by judicious economy, kept down

the ordinary expenditure, so that, notwithstanding the great increase of interest, and the large expenditure in the North-West, and the post-office improvements, the total expenditure exceeded the Estimates submitted by the present Finance Minister in 1873 only by two or three hundred thousand dollars. It would have been necessary to propose the imposition of heavier taxes, but he could not see that the people of the country would be assisted or relieved in any way by the imposition of additional taxation. The present Government proposed to tax the people. The late Minister of Finance thought it better to run a little into debt, and allow one or two small deficits to grow, than to impose additional taxation at a time when the people were least able to bear it, when the people were already suffering from depression of business and want of employment, and he (Mr. Anglin) thought the policy pursued by that gentleman (Mr. Cartwright), was the correct and proper policy. With regard to the cause of the depression, he did not think it had been shown, as was alleged, that the late Government was in the slightest degree responsible for the decline in the revenue. The distress that existed in this country never equalled the distress existing to-day in England and other countries. Of the 4,000 or 5,000 bricklayers, carpenters, labourers, and others, who came to St. John after the great fire, he believed nearly two-thirds came from the United States—because that was a better place than their own country for workmen, and because wages were better. If they wanted any additional proof of the actual state of things in the United States, the hon. member for Niagara had furnished it in that statement of a gentleman from Albany, which he had read to the House, to the effect that railroads had gone into bankruptcy whose capital amounted to no less than seven hundred million dollars. It was absurd to suppose that no manufactures would have sprung up in the United States if there had been no Protection. We, in this country, manufactured, in proportion to our population, more than the people of the United States. Was it to be supposed that a people of 45,000,000 living in a country like that, with such variety

of climate, unlimited water power, with the raw material lying at their doors, would not have become manufacturers without Protection? They had succeeded, not because of Protection, but because of the intelligence and ingenuity of the people, and their marvellous ability in inventing machinery, and the superiority of their shelf hardware, and various little knick-knacks. It had been well said by an hon. gentleman that, of all the classes in this country, none had suffered less, by reason of the business depression, than the manufacturers. Of those who had become bankrupt in this country, no class had furnished so few as the manufacturing class. Go to any of our towns and cities, visit any of their suburbs, and look at the palatial residences, and three out of four of those residences would be found to belong to manufacturers. All honour and all credit to them for their success, but their success should satisfy them that they, at all events, were not entitled to receive larger profits from their business, at the expense of the working masses of this country. France had always been held up as a country which was greatly prosperous, because it had a high Protectionist tariff. France had been more prosperous commercially since the Cobden treaty than ever before, and from that day down to this she had had special treaties with her manufacturing neighbours, and had received a large amount of the manufactures of Great Britain, Belgium and Holland, and Germany, at very low rates of duties, as low as 10 per cent. in many cases. These were the countries from which she had to fear competition. She had not much to protect. She had iron and coal on the German frontier, and some coarse cotton, but, as regarded the finer classes of manufactures, the finer furniture, silk goods, ribbons, glass, china, and articles *de Paris*, besides her extraordinary products of brandy and wines, it would be found that, no matter what her tariff was, her exports were large, because her people peculiarly excelled in their production. Add to these circumstances the frugality and thrifty habits of her people, and the effects of the division of the landed property throughout the country, and they had the secret of the success of the French people, and of the extra-

ordinary recuperative powers she had displayed since her disastrous war. If they contrasted the condition of Canada with the condition of our neighbours in the United States, people for people, city for city, farm-house for farm-house, labourer for labourer, mechanic for mechanic, we would find that the people of Canada, to-day, were a more prosperous, more happy, and more comfortable people in every respect than the people of the great United States. True, there was more amassed wealth in that country, and the fact that the people had invested so many million dollars in their bonded debt was pointed out as proof of their prosperity. But this really did prove that the business of the country was not in a condition to afford safe employment for its capital. The capital of the United States, compared with the wants of the people, might be said to be very small, even to-day, and yet they found millions seeking investment in United States bonds at a low rate of interest, and that, instead of being a proof of prosperity, was a proof that the business of the country was not in a paying condition. He would now make some remarks on the present tariff. He had stated that the hon. the Minister of Finance had assured the people of New Brunswick, before they came into Confederation, that \$11,500,000 annually would cover all the expenditure of the four old Provinces for many years to come, and that the taxation of Canada would not exceed \$2.75 per head for, at all events, twenty-five years, and on that the hon. gentleman staked his reputation as a financier. He had heard the hon. gentleman make that statement frequently. He (Mr. Anglin) contradicted it, and they brought the question out before the people. Himself and those who were then associated with him carried the country by an overwhelming majority, and never was any question more fairly and thoroughly discussed before any people than was that question at that election. Some attempts were made to introduce personalities, and he thought the hon. the Minister of Finance would give him credit for having carefully avoided anything approaching personality. They fought the question out before the people, and he would do the hon. gentleman the credit to say

that in that fight he endeavoured with fair argument to persuade the people that it was to their advantage to accept the Quebec scheme. By an overwhelming majority, the people of New Brunswick declared that they did not like the scheme, and would not have it. What followed he need not dilate upon. Somebody had stated that Confederation never would have been carried in New Brunswick without the help of the Fenians, and this was true. A band of Fenians came upon their borders just about the time that the Lieutenant-Governor, having tried in vain to induce the Government, led by Sir A. J. Smith, to unite with him in carrying the scheme of Confederation, was prepared to spring the mine laid with the help of the Finance Minister, and some others, and drive that Government from power. Sixty or seventy men calling themselves Fenians exhibited themselves in the neighbourhood of Eastport, and immediately the alarm spread. Troops and volunteers were sent to defend the frontier. A force of regulars was called from Halifax, and the fleet was summoned from the West Indies. Reports spread that the enemy was several thousand strong, and the whole Province was in a state of alarm. The whole thing was so skilfully managed that the people were led to believe that the Fenians had come down to help the anti-Confederates, and that these were responsible for their coming. In that way Confederation was carried. Where the anti-Confederates had had a majority of 700 or 800 at the first election, they found themselves, at the next, in a minority almost as great. The promise then made was that the taxation should not exceed \$2.75 per head. He (Mr. Anglin) could not understand how the affairs of the country could be managed at that rate of taxation. The hon. member for Halton said that, about that time, in order to coax the Maritime Provinces into this bargain, the taxation of old Canada was reduced from 20 per cent. to 15 per cent., and they were promised, very distinctly indeed, that 15 per cent. was to be the rate thenceforth; that they who were Free-traders need not feel the slightest hesitation, as they would never be forced into Protection; and that, if any attempts were made to force Protec-

MR. ANGLIN.

tion upon them, they would have the power to prevent it in their own hands. They were told that the interests of Quebec were precisely similar to the interests of New Brunswick, and that the people of Quebec would stand beside them if the necessity arose. Well, to-day, how did they stand—the members from New Brunswick? There were 16 of them, and 12 of the 16, at least, were elected to oppose the imposition of Protection in their Province. There they were, on this occasion, protesting in vain against it. The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Thompson) chose to taunt them because some of their people eat cornmeal; and many hon. gentlemen joined in the sneers and taunts at the people of New Brunswick. On the medal struck at the time of Confederation, among the figures emblematic of the four Provinces, New Brunswick was placed upon her knees before the other three. On her knees she appeared now asking in vain for fair play, and demanding that the promises given her might be carried out—that she might be protected from this system of Protection against which she protested. Helpless and powerless, the majority of her representatives stood, scarcely permitted to raise their voices in her behalf. But hon. gentlemen told them that, in the introduction of this tariff, they fulfilled the promises made to the country. If he (Mr. Anglin) believed that, he would not make a long speech. He would simply content himself with protesting against the measure in a very few words. He could not, for the life of him, see wherein this was the fulfilment of any promises made to the country. It might be said to be the fulfilment of the desires of a few, and of the apprehensions of a great many. When was it promised that there should be a tax of 35 per cent. on furniture and 40c. per barrel on Indian meal, or that coarse woollens should be taxed by the pound and the yard to the extent of 50, 60, 80 or 90 per cent.? When was it promised that coarse cottons should be taxed 1c. a yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*? Such promises were never made by the hon. the Finance Minister. If that hon. gentleman had gone before the people of New Brunswick last September with that tariff in his hands, instead of being here with a questionable majority of seven or

eight, he would have received a decided minority of the votes of the electors. He had heard a great many gentlemen declare in this House, he had heard the hon. the Minister of Public Works declare, in a most emphatic manner, that they had no idea of increasing the taxation; that what the men now in power contemplated was at most a readjustment of the system of taxation. Hon. gentlemen went through the country, in one place talking about the Protection the farmer ought to have, and the hardship from which he suffered; in another about the slaughtering of American manufactures in the furniture market, and, if anyone attempted to fit their statements together, and form an accurate opinion of the tariff, he found this impossible. He (Mr. Anglin) listened with a great deal of attention to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance when he made his first speech of the campaign in St. John, and he found his utterances as sybilline and ambiguous as he could have anticipated. The hon. gentleman told them in New Brunswick that, if he had been in the House when the duty on flour was imposed, he would have voted against it. He (Mr. Anglin) believed a good many who heard the hon. gentleman make that statement believed the hon. gentleman was opposed to a duty on flour. He had also said, in regard to the unenumerated list, that he would have voted against the increase of duty from 15 to 17½ per cent., and he said that it was a very simple thing indeed to take out of this list some of the articles which were manufactured in the country, the manufacture of which could be very materially assisted by a slight increase of duties. As far as New Brunswick was concerned, four-fifths of the whole of the articles in that unenumerated list were now taken out, and subjected to greatly increased taxation. The right hon. the Premier telegraphed to Mr. John Boyd, of St. John, denying that the tariff was to be increased to 35 per cent., and now they were told by the Minister of Justice, that what he meant was that the unenumerated list should not be so increased. He (Mr. Anglin) thought, if they estimated fairly the effects of the whole tariff, they would find that it was a tariff of 35 per cent.

MR. TILLEY: The American tariff is only 27 per cent., and this is 16 per cent.

MR. ANGLIN said that reminded him of another statement the hon. gentleman had made. The hon. gentleman, in his last speech, compared the British importations with the American, and he included in the American importations the price of all cereals that merely passed through this country on the way to Europe. Thirteen or fourteen millions, so included in his calculation, ought to be struck out. Striking out this sum, and the duty upon other things exported again, he thought they would find the present tariff was very little short of 35 per cent. upon all we consumed. In all the public declarations of hon. gentlemen, they had no statement that would lead the people to conclude that any such tariff as this was to be imposed.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: This noise is simply intolerable. I have never seen in my life, such utterly disgraceful conduct. Hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side must be assured that they will get no division to-night if they do not behave themselves.

MR. ANGLIN said that there was a gentleman opposite calling "question," who occupied ten times as much of the time of this Session as he did. He had endeavoured to treat every hon. gentleman with courtesy, and did not deserve those interruptions. If his remarks hurt hon. gentlemen opposite, he could not help that. With regard to this tariff, he did not know whether its friends had clear ideas of what its effects would be. If all he heard were true, the Finance Minister had little more to do with framing it than the supervision of the work. They had heard of a gentleman from Washington, and of one who might be styled a secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, and of others employed in the Finance Department, who, it was said, had had much to do with framing this tariff. He did not grudge the hon. gentleman all the assistance requisite to render it as perfect as possible, but it might be doubted whether the Finance Minister himself had a very clear idea

when he began to frame this tariff of what it would be when his work was done. Hon. gentlemen opposite taunted the Liberals with not having stated their policy, although they had exhibited it sufficiently during the last four or five years. He remembered how hon. gentlemen opposite had refused to expound their Protection policy while they were in Opposition. They had heard of deputations and delegations crowding to Ottawa, to see the Finance Minister, and of a secret meeting of manufacturers in St. John and elsewhere, and rumours as to what the result had been—that they were in secret correspondence with the Central Association of Toronto, and other associations. All that class of people were strongly agitated for months before this tariff saw the light, and they had heard that, among those who were very active in suggestions to the Finance Minister, as to the duties he should impose, were a great many wealthy manufacturers who had worked their way up from humble positions, and who now wanted to control the destinies and the commercial policy of this country. He had heard that a large number of them were Americans, and, if so, it was no wonder that the tariff bore an American character. If, as was reported, manufacturers, formerly American citizens, had had a large share in the framing of the tariff, it was no wonder that it appeared to be such a revolutionary measure, and one threatening to affect this country most disastrously. It gave furniture a protection of 35 per cent.; woollens 40 to 70 per cent., and a few cotton manufacturers in the country a very large protection on coarse cottons. There was a pretence of protecting almost everybody. Coal miners got 50c. a ton, which would enable them to put very little additional coal in the Canadian market, while hurting the poor of the cities by compelling them to pay higher prices. He saw, by a letter lately published, that parties professing to be representatives of the iron works of Londonderry, complained that the taxation on coal more than destroyed the advantage of the duty on pig iron, and that the public need not look for an increase in the number of the blast furnaces in that place. What classes were really protected, except those few manufacturers

who had been able to exercise so large an influence during the elections, and since—which, he was satisfied, the people never wished, or expected they would possess? They were told that this tariff was to build up the depressed industries, and afford a vast amount of employment to the people, and that the very moment that the country decided in favour of the party now in power, there would be an end of the distress which prevailed so widely. That party had now been seven or eight months in office without any great improvement in the state of the country. How was the improvement to be wrought? How many additional people would be employed in manufacturing all the goods now imported, that could be produced under this tariff? It was absurd to assume that the purchasing power of the people would be at once increased by the tariff, as hon. gentlemen opposite had from the first imagined. Had the boot and shoe manufacturer suffered for want of this tariff? He doubted if even one per cent. of the quantity consumed was imported, and, yet, thousands of people were idle in Montreal and elsewhere. The boot and shoe makers were thrown idle because the rest of the people could not buy as much as before. Then as to furniture—he thought the importations last year reached \$300,000; was it to be supposed that the dullness in that trade was caused by the importation of that amount? Was it larger than the imports of previous years? The facts did not sustain that assertion. A very large proportion of the furniture imported, perhaps, could not be profitably manufactured in this country, while, even if it could, the people would not have the means to buy it, unless there were a great change in the condition of the people generally. Some parties also imported a cheap washy kind of furniture, that was sold at any price that could be got, and never did seriously compete with our home-made furniture. He thought that the member for Centre Huron stated that at most all those manufactures, fostered by the tariff, would employ only 5,000 people. He (Mr. Anglin) thought, however, that that was an under-estimate. The usual estimate was that the net product of any particular manufactory would be \$1,000 a year for each person employed. Thus,

MR. ANGLIN.

a very few thousand additional people could be employed, supposing all those articles of coarse woollens, cottons, furniture, and one per cent. additional boots and shoes, nuts, bolts, etc., now imported, were manufactured in Canada. He did not believe it would add to the population of the whole country a number equal to the population of one of our larger towns, and yet that was all the price to be paid the country for the heavy additional burdens thrown upon it by the present tariff. If we could not give the farmers a large market for their products, what else did this tariff do for them? It imposed a duty on wheat and flour, barley and oats, and made an imperceptible increase in the duty on pork. The duty on flour would add to its price in the Lower Provinces. Whenever the crop of wheat in this country, to which we would, in future, for domestic purposes, be strictly confined, proved too small for the consumption of the country, the large dealers would buy it up, fill their granaries, and raise the prices all over the country; and, even when we had a full supply, or a surplus, it would be possible, by the formation of rings, to raise the price of flour. Our surplus to-day had to seek a market in Great Britain. It would be the simplest thing in the world for operators in grain to slightly accelerate the shipping of this surplus, and then have the consumers in their power. In New Brunswick, last year, 56,000 barrels of flour were imported from the United States, being one-sixth of the whole importation. That 56,000 barrels was to be shut out next year, thus destroying a large carrying trade, as the most of it was brought in our vessels as return freight, when otherwise they would have to return in ballast. It would also render it necessary for parties living along the coasts to go back into the country to railway stations for their supplies, at an additional cost of freight, and delay of time. With respect to cornmeal, there was no pretence that Ontario could supply them for years. New Brunswick, last year, consumed 60,000 barrels, on which quantity she would have, in future, to pay a duty of 40c. per barrel. Nobody could argue that a duty of 15c. per bushel on barley would be of the slight-

est value to the farmers of Ontario, as very little barley was imported. On the contrary, we exported several millions more than we imported. Pork could be protected, but it was not, because protection on it would make the burdens of the lumberman absolutely intolerable. Wool was not protected. That the imposition of a duty on coarse woollen goods would lead to the use of our wool, farmers would be slow to believe. They now sold their wool to the United States, getting for it there double the price at which the short staple wool used in Canadian manufactures could be purchased. The Finance Minister had been extolled over and over again as an old Free-trader who had been converted by the exigencies of the moment to the principles of Protection. Those who spoke so did not know his history. He began public life as a Protectionist of the deepest dye. The first he (Mr. Anglin) heard of him was at a meeting, held in Carleton, St. John, at which he earnestly advocated Protection. They had tried Protection in New Brunswick, and went so far as to impose a duty on hides, which, under this tariff, were not protected. All the Protection offered to the farmer by this tariff was merely nominal, merely a myth, and, unless the farmer was more stupid than he (Mr. Anglin) believed him to be, as stolid indeed as hon. gentlemen opposite must think he was, he would find out that in this wonderful tariff there was no Protection for him. Everything he used, his spade, his shovel, his scythe, his threshing-machine, his ploughs, the clothes he wore, every article of goods he purchased, was taxed from 20 to 60 per cent., to add to the revenue of the poor, distressed manufacturers, who were starving on half a million dollars apiece. Next to the farming, came the lumbering industry. The hon. member for North Renfrew undertook to prove that this was a declining industry, by showing a falling-off in the export return of lumber to the United States, and the hon. the Finance Minister was reported to have so spoken of it; but it was still, and it would for many years continue to be, one of the great industries of Canada, and, when times improved in the United States, as he hoped they soon would, and the people of that

country could afford to use more of our lumber, and afford to pay a better price for it, that great industry, now so depressed, would revive. What did this tariff do for the lumber trade? It did not because it could not, afford it the slightest Protection. Nothing that this Parliament could do would increase the price of lumber in the foreign market a single cent, but it did impose grievous burdens on that industry. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B., who was well acquainted with the business, calculated that the burdens so imposed were equal to 60c. per thousand superficial feet, and that in New Brunswick alone it would amount to \$300,000. This enormous sum could not be taken out of the profits of the trade, which were already exceedingly small, and it must come out of the pockets of the unfortunate workmen employed in the woods, in the streams, in the mills, and in loading the vessels in the ports, although their wages were now lower than they had been for many many years. What did the fishermen get under this tariff? They were a most deserving and industrious class, and added a great deal to the wealth of the country. But they found that they had received no consideration whatever. On every article they used they would have to pay greatly increased duties, except their canvas and lines and twines, on which, thanks to the exertions of some hon. gentlemen who represented fishermen, the increase at one time proposed would not be imposed, and molasses, the duty on which was to be reduced some 2c. a gallon. What had been done for the ship-owners, and those engaged in the important shipping industry of the country? There was to be a drawback on articles used in ship-building, but an hon. gentleman who tried to find out what the drawback meant, was met by the vague promise that some arrangement would be made by-and-bye, for returning a portion of those duties. On articles used in the construction of ships no drawback, as far as he (Mr. Anglin) could see, would be paid, unless these articles were imported. On articles manufactured in the country, no drawback would be allowed, and so the cost of construction would be very greatly increased. The cost of production of agricultural implements, of sewing machines,

MR. ANGLIN,

and other articles which we now exported, would also be greatly increased, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the amount of drawback to be paid. He doubted very much if the hon. the Minister of Finance would be troubled very much about drawbacks upon these articles, because the cost of production would be increased so much that it would be perfectly impossible for the manufacturers of Canada to compete with those of other countries. In fact, in all probability the increased cost of production would prevent exportation altogether. The whole system of drawbacks propounded by the Minister of Finance must have the effect of encouraging imports, and discouraging the manufactures of this country. A drawback, if it could be given at all, would only be given on the articles imported. No benefit whatever was conferred on the shipowners, and the effect of this tariff would be very detrimental to the carrying trade of the country. He believed the tariff proposed would bear most oppressively and unjustly on all the great interests of this country—on the farmers, on the lumbermen, on the shipowners, on the fishermen, on the mechanics, and on all workmen who would not get so much additional employment as would compensate them for the additional burdens. It would cripple all industries, and force capital into less productive channels than it would seek if left to pursue its natural course, and he thought it would prove absolutely disastrous to the country as a whole. It would stop the expansion of our manufactures, and render impossible such an arrangement as that suggested by the hon. member for Halton. He opposed it because he believed it would be particularly unjust to the people of the Province one of the constituencies of which he had the honour to represent in this House. As a whole, it meant and promised nothing but additional taxation. He intended to say a word about sugar, merely to point out that the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell was more than corroborated by the hon. member for Kingston, who was one of the first authorities on that question in the Dominion. That gentleman spoke as an importer, and he told them that the effect of this tariff would be to compel

the people to pay on their sugar \$1,116,000 more than would go into the Treasury, for the benefit of a few refiners who would employ some 500 men in the work of refining. It would be better for this House to give those men a pension of \$1,000 a year each, than to find them employment in the sugar refineries at such a price. This was but one of the many burdens imposed by this tariff, not for the general welfare of the people, but for the advantage of a few individuals, making the rich richer and the poor poorer. For all these reasons, he should, vainly, perhaps, but most earnestly, oppose this tariff.

SIR A. J. SMITH moved the adjournment of the debate.

Question *put*, and motion to adjourn the debate *negatived*, on a division.

Question *put*, and amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) *negatived* on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messrs.

Anglin	King
Bain	LaRue
Borden	Laurier
Bourassa	MacDonnell
Burk	Mackenzie
Burpee (St. John)	McIsaac
Burpee (Sunbury)	Malouin
Cameron (S. Huron)	Mills
Cartwright	Olivier
Casey	Olivier
Casgrain	Paterson (S. Brant)
Chandler	Pickard
Charlton	Rinfret
Christie	Robertson (Shelburne)
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Rogers
Dumont	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Fiset	Rymal
Fleming	Scriver
Galbraith	Skinner
Geoffrion	Smith (Selkirk)
Gillies	Smith (Westmoreland)
Gillmor	Snowball
Gunn	Thompson (Haldimand)
Haddow	Trow
Holton	Weldon
Huntington	Yeo.—53.
Killam	

NAYS :

Messrs.

Allison	Benoit
Arkell	Bergeron
Baby	Bergin
Baker	Bolduc

Boulbee	McDonald (C. Breton.)
Bourbeau	McDonald (Pictou);
Bowell	McDonald (Vict. N.S.)
Brooks	Macmillan
Bunster	McCallum
Bunting	McCarthy
Burnham	McCuaig
Cameron (N. Victoria)	McDougall
Carling	McGreevy
Caron	McInnes
Cimon	McKay
Cockburn (W. Nthmd)	McLennan
Colby	McLeod
Connell	McQuade
Costigan	McRory
Coughlin	Massue
Coupal	Merner
Coursol	Méhot
Currier	Mongenais
Cuthbert	Montplaisir
Daly	Mousseau
Dawson	Muttart
DeCosmos	O'Connor
Desaulniers	Ogden
Desjardins	Orton
Dewdney	Quimet
Domville	Patterson (Essex)
Drew	Perrault
Dubuc	Pinsonnault
Dugas	Platt
Elliott	Plumb
Farrow	Pope (Compton)
Ferguson	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Fitzsimmons	Poupore
Fortin	Richey
Fulton	Robertson (Hamilton)
Gault	Robinson
Gigault	Robitaille
Gill	Rochester
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Ross (Dundas)
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Rouleau
Grandbois	Routhier
Hackett	Ryan (Marquette)
Haggart	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Hay	Rykert
Hesson	Shaw
Hilliard	Sproule
Hooper	Stephenson
Houde	Strange
Hurteau	Tassé
Ives	Tellier
Jackson	Thompson (Cariboo)
Jones	Tilley
Keeler	Tupper
Kilvert	Valin
Kirkpatrick	Vallée
Kranz	Wade
Landry	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Lane	Wallace (W. York.)
Lantier	White (Cardwell)
Little	White (E. Hastings.)
Longley	[P.E.I.] White (N. Renfrew.)
Macdonald (King's.)	Williams
Macdonald (Vict., B. C.)	Wright—126

Question *put* on the motion to agree to the resolutions (Mr. Tilley).

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House do not agree to

the resolution, but that it resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. ANGLIN asked if the hon. the Premier proposed to really carry the amendments at this sitting, or was his motion merely *pro forma*.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: They had better be carried and reported; then they will be discussed.

MR. MACKENZIE said that some of the most distinguished members of the House had been refused a hearing to-night, and he thought all should be allowed to speak upon the measure.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I was proposing that we should pass these resolutions *pro forma*. Let them be reported, and they can be read this afternoon, as reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, and then the discussion can go on as well as now.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have taken this course in order to vindicate the rights of the minority in this House. The hon. gentleman would have done the same thing under the provocation we have sustained to-night. We intend to vindicate our rights, and we know how to do it.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means to further consider the said resolutions.

(In the Committee.)

Resolutions agreed to and ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, as follows:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the value of all bottles, flasks, jars, demi-johns, carboys, casks, hogsheads, pipes, barrels, and all other vessels or packages, manufactured of tin, iron, lead, zinc, glass, or any other material, and capable of holding liquids; crates, barrels, and other packages containing glass, china, crockery, or earthenware, and all packages in which goods are commonly placed for home consumption, including cases in which bottled spirits, wines or malt liquors are contained, and every package, being the first receptacle or covering enclosing goods for purpose of sale, shall in all cases not otherwise provided for, in which they contain goods subject to an *ad valorem* duty, be taken and held to be a part of the fair market value of such goods

for duty, and when they contain goods subject to specific duty only, such packages shall be charged with a duty of Customs of twenty per cent. *ad valorem*, to be computed upon their original cost or value; and all or any of the above packages described as capable of holding liquids, when containing goods exempt from duty under this Act, shall be charged with a duty of twenty per cent. *ad valorem*; but all packages not hereinbefore specified, and not specially charged with duty by any unrepealed enactment, and being the usual and ordinary packages in which goods are packed for exportation only, according to the general usage and custom of trade, shall be free of duty.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that on all goods imported into Canada, subject under this Act or any other Act to *ad valorem* duty, upon which a drawback of duties has been allowed by the Government of the country where the same were manufactured, the amount of such drawback shall in all cases be taken and considered to be a part of the fair market value of such goods, and duty shall be collected thereon; and in cases where the amount of such drawback shall have been deducted from the value of such goods upon the face of the invoice under which entry is to be made, the Collector of Customs or proper officer shall add the amount of such deduction, and collect and cause to be paid the lawful duty thereupon, and the fair market value of all goods, wares, and merchandise imported into Canada shall be understood to be the ordinary wholesale price at which the same are sold for home consumption in the country where they are purchased or manufactured without deduction of any kind because of any drawback paid or to be paid thereon, or because of any special arrangement between the seller and purchaser, having reference to the exportation of such goods, or the exclusive right to territorial limits for the sale thereof, or because of any royalty payable upon patent rights, but not payable when goods are purchased for exportation, or on account of any other consideration by which a special reduction in price might or could be obtained: Provided that nothing herein shall be understood to apply to general fluctuations of market values.

3. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that any or all of the following articles, that is to say:—Animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots) plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, flour of wheat, and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted, or smoked), and lumber may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation, when imported into Canada.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that if at any time any greater duty of Customs should be payable in the United States of America on tea or coffee imported from Canada than on tea or coffee imported from any other country, then the Governor in Council may impose on tea or coffee imported into Canada from the said United States, an additional duty of Customs equal to the duty payable in the United States on tea or coffee imported from Canada: Provided that tea or coffee imported into Canada from any country, other than the said United States, but passing in bond through the United States, shall be taken and rated as a direct importation from the country wherever the tea or coffee was purchased.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that an allowance may be made for deterioration by natural decay or breakage upon all perishable and brittle goods imported into Canada, such as green fruits and vegetables, crockery, china, glass and glassware, provided such damage is found to exceed twenty-five per cent. of the value thereof, upon an examination to be made by an appraiser or proper officer of Customs, at the first landing, or within three days of such landing; but such allowance shall be only for the amount of loss in excess of twenty-five per cent. of the whole quantity of such goods contained, or included in any one invoice; and provided the duty has been paid on the full value thereof, a refund of such duty may be allowed and paid in the proportion and on fulfilment of the conditions above specified, but not otherwise, on application to the Minister of Customs.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that, in determining the dutiable value of merchandise, except when imported from Great Britain, there shall be added to the cost or the actual wholesale price, or fair market value, at the time of exportation, in the principal markets of the country from whence the same has been imported into Canada, the cost of inland transportation, shipment and transshipment, with all the expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in which shipment is made, either in transitu or direct to Canada.

7. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council shall, from time to time, establish such regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be required to secure a just, faithful and impartial appraisal of all goods, wares and merchandise imported into Canada, and just and proper entries of the actual or fair market value thereof, and of the weights, measures, or other quantities thereof, as each case may require, and such regulations, whether general or special, so made by the Governor in Council, shall have the full force and authority of law, and it shall be the duty of the appraisers of Canada and every of them, and every person who shall act as such appraiser, or of the Collector of Customs, as the

case may be, by all reasonable ways and means in his or their power to ascertain, estimate and appraise the true and fair market value and wholesale price, any invoice or affidavit thereto to the contrary notwithstanding, of the merchandise at the time of exportation and in the principal markets of the country whence the same has been imported into Canada, and the proper weights, measures or other quantities, and the fair market value or wholesale price of every of them as the case may require.

8. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that no refund of duty paid shall be allowed because of any alleged inferiority or deficiency in quantity of goods imported and entered, and which have passed into the custody of the importer under permit of the Collector of Customs, nor because of the omission in the invoice of any trade discount, or other matter or thing, which might have the effect of reducing the value of such goods for duty, unless the same shall have been reported to the Collector of Customs within ten days of the date of entry, and the said goods shall have been examined by the said Collector, or by an appraiser or other proper officer of Customs, and the proper rate or amount of reduction certified by him after such examination, and if such Collector or proper officer reports that the goods in question cannot be identified as those named in the invoice and entry in question, then and in such case no refund of the duty or any part thereof shall in any case be allowed, and all applications for refund of duty in such cases shall be submitted with the evidence and all particulars for decision of the Minister of Customs, who may then order payment on finding the evidence to be sufficient and satisfactory.

9. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide, that the whole or part of the duty of thirty per centum *ad valorem* imposed by this Act upon wines imported into Canada, may be dispensed with upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the Governments of France and Spain, or either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada in reduction or repeal of the duties now in force in said countries.

15. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal all Acts, and parts, or Schedules of Acts, and all Orders in Council imposing any duties or Customs upon goods, wares, and merchandise, or providing for the exemption of goods, wares, and merchandise from Customs duty, when imported into Canada, and to make the following provisions in lieu thereof.

11. *Resolved*, That it is expedient that the following articles shall be subject to the several rates of duties set opposite to each respectively:—

Acid, Sulphuric, half a cent per pound.
Acetic, twelve cents per Imperial gallon.
Muriatic and Nitric, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

[But carboys containing acids shall be subject to the same duty as if empty.]

Agricultural implements, not otherwise herein provided for, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart and twelve pint bottles to be held to contain one Imperial gallon) eighteen cents Imperial gallon.

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottles, ten cents per Imperial gallon.

Animals, living, of all kinds not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Artificial flowers, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Babbitt metal, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, bound or in sheets, not being foreign re-prints of British copyright works, nor blank account books, nor copybooks, nor books to be written or drawn upon, nor Bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books, six cents per pound.

British copyright works, re-prints of six cents per pound, and in addition thereto twelve and a half per cent. *ad valorem*.

Bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books, five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Books, periodicals and pamphlets imported through the Post-office, for every two ounces in weight or fraction thereof, one cent.

Blank books, bound or in sheets, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Printed, lithographed, or copper, or steel plate bill-heads, cheques, receipts, drafts, posters, cards, commercial blank forms, labels of every description, advertising pictures or pictorial show-cards or bills, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Advertising pamphlets, one dollar per hundred.

Maps and charts, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Printed music, bound or in sheets, six cents per pound.

Playing-cards, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Book-binders' tools and implements, including ruling machines and binders' cloth, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

Billiard tables, without pockets, four feet six inches by nine feet, a specific duty of twenty-two dollars and fifty cents.

On those of five feet by ten feet, a specific duty of twenty-five dollars.

On billiard tables, with pockets, five feet six inches by eleven feet, a specific duty of thirty-five dollars.

And of those of six feet by twelve, a specific duty of forty dollars.

And in addition thereto ten per cent. *ad valorem*; each table to include twelve cues, and one set of four balls, with markers, cloths, and cases, but no pool balls.

Blacking, shoe, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Brass, old and scrap; in bars, bolts and sheets, in wire, round or flat; on seamless drawn tubing and on plain and fancy tubing, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On manufactures of brass, not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Breadstuffs, viz.:

Barley, fifteen cents per bush.

Buckwheat, ten cents per bush.

Indian corn, seven and a-half cents per bush.

Oats, ten cents per bush.

Rice, one cent per pound.

Rye, ten cents per bush.

Wheat, fifteen cents per bush.

Pease, ten cents per bush.

Beans, fifteen cents per bush.

Buckwheat, meal or flour, one-fourth of one cent per pound.

Cornmeal, forty cents per barrel.

Oatmeal, one-half cent per pound.

Rye flour, fifty cents per barrel.

Wheat flour, fifty cents per barrel.

Rice and sago flour, two cents per pound.

Brick, for building, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Brooms and brushes, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Butter, four cents per pound.

Buttons, of all kinds, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Candles, tallow, two cents per pound.

Candles, parafine wax, five cents per pound.

All other candles, including sperm, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Carriages, waggons, railway cars and carriages, sleighs, wheelbarrows, and other like articles, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cement, raw or in stone from the quarry, one dollar per ton of thirteen cubic feet.

Cement, burnt and unground, seven and a half cents per one hundred pounds.

Cement, hydraulic or water lime, ground, including barrels, forty cents per barrel.

Cement, in bulk or in bags, nine cents per bushel.

Cement, Portland or Roman, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cheese, three cents per pound.

Chicory, raw or green, three cents per pound.

Chicory, or other root or vegetable, used as a substitute for coffee, kiln-dried, roasted or ground, four cents per pound.

China and porcelain ware, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Clocks, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Coal, anthracite and bituminous, fifty cents per ton of two thousand pounds.

Coal tar and coal pitch, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cocoa-nuts, one dollar per hundred.

Cocoa paste and chocolate, not sweetened, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cocoa paste and other preparations of cocoa containing sugar, one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Coffee, green, two cents per pound.

Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations of, and substitutes for, three cents per pound.

Coke, fifty cents per ton of 2,000 pounds.

Copper, old and scrap, in pigs, in bars, rods, bolts, ingots, sheets and sheathing, not planished or coated; copper wire, round or flat; and copper seamless drawn tubing, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cordage for ships' purposes, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cordage, all other, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Copper rivets and burrs, and on all manufactures of copper not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Corks, and other manufactures of cork-wood or cork-bark, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cotton, manufactures of, viz.:

On grey or unbleached and bleached cottons sheetings, drills, ducks, cotton or canton-flannels, not stained, painted, or printed, one cent per square yard, and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all cotton jeans, denims, drillings, bed-tickings, gingham, plaids, cottons or canton-flannels, ducks, and drills, dyed or coloured; checked and striped shirtings, cottonades, pantalon stuffs, and goods of like description, two cents per square yard and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all cotton wadding, batting, batts and warps, carpet-warps, knitting yarn, hosiery yarn or other cotton yarns under number forty, not bleached, dyed or coloured, two cents per pound and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

And if bleached, dyed or coloured, three cents per pound and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cotton warp, on beams, one cent per yard and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cotton seamless bags, two cents per pound and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cotton shirts and drawers, woven or made on frames, and on all cotton hosiery, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cotton sewing-thread, on spools, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cotton in hanks, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cotton duck or canvass, of hemp or flax and sail twine, when to be used for boats' and ships' sails, five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all clothing made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component part of chief value, including corsets, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all manufactures of cotton not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Drain-tiles and drain pipes and sewer pipes, glazed or unglazed, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured, and Rockingham ware, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Earthenware, white, granite or iron-stone ware, and "C.C." or cream coloured ware, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Electro plated ware (see plated ware.)

Essences, viz: of apple, pear, pine-apple, raspberry, strawberry, vanilla, and other fruits, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Essential oils, for manufacturing purposes, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Excelsior, for upholsterers' use, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Feathers, ostrich and vulture, undressed, fifteen per cent.; and dressed, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Fire-brick, or tiles for lining stoves and furnaces, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Fish, fresh, salted or smoked, except fish free of duty as provided by the Treaty of Washington, one cent. per pound.

Flax fibre, scutched, one cent. per pound.

Flax fibre, hackled, two cents per pound.

Flax, tow of, scutched or green, one-half cent per pound.

Flax seed, ten cents per bush.

Fruit, dried, viz.: apples, two cents per pound.

Currants, dates, figs, plums, prunes, raisins, and all others, not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Apples, forty cents per barrel.

Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, two cents per quart.

Cherries and currants, one cent per quart.

Cranberries, plums and quinces, thirty cents per bushel.

Grapes, one cent per pound.

Peaches, forty cents per bushel.

Oranges and lemons, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Fruits, in air-tight cans, including cans, three cents per pound if sweetened, and two cents per pound if not sweetened.

Fruits, preserved in brandy, or other spirits, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon.

Furs, viz.:—

Fur, skins, dressed, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

Caps, hats, muffs, tippets, capes, coats, cloaks and other manufactures of fur, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Furniture, house, cabinet or office, including hair and spring mattresses, show-cases, caskets, and coffins, of any material, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Gas, coal-oil or kerosene fixtures, or parts thereof, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Glass and Manufactures of, viz.:—

On carboys and demijohns, on pressed bottles, flasks and phials of every description; on telegraph and lightning-rod insulators; and on fruit jars and glass balls, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On lamp and gas-light shades, lamps and lamp chimneys, globes for lanterns, lamps and gas lights, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On ornamented, figured and enamelled stained glass, stained, tinted, painted and vitrified glass, and stained glass windows, figured, enamelled and obscured white glass, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On common and colourless window glass, and on coloured glass not figured, painted, enamelled or engraved, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all other glass and manufactures of glass not herein otherwise provided for, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Gunpowder and other explosives, viz.:—

On gun, rifle and sporting powder in kegs, half-kegs, or quarter-kegs and other similar packages, five cents per pound.

On cannon and musket powder in kegs and barrels, four cents per pound.

On canister powder, in pound and half-pound tins, fifteen cents per pound.

On blasting and mining powder, three cents per pound.

On giant powder, dualin, dynamite and other explosives in which nitro-glycerine is a constituent part, five cents per pound, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On nitro-glycerine, ten cents per pound, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Gutta-percha, manufactures of, twenty-five cent. *ad valorem*.

Hair, curled, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Hats, caps and bonnets, not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Hatters' plush, of silk or cotton, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Honey, bees', in the comb or otherwise, three cents per pound.

Hops, six cents per pound.

India rubber, viz: boots and shoes, and other manufactures, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Iron and Manufactures of, viz:—

Pig, two dollars per ton.

Old and scrap, two dollars per ton.

In slabs, blooms, loops or billets, puddled or not, and muck and puddled bars or billets, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

In bars, rolled or hammered, including flats, rounds and squares, nail and spike rods, and all other iron not otherwise provided for, seventeen and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

On rolled round wire rods, in coils under half an inch in diameter, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On iron rails or roadway bars for railways or tramways, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On railway fish-plates, frogs, frog-points, chairs and finger-bars, seventeen and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

On tin plates, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On band and hoop; sheet, smoothed or polished, coated or galvanised, and common or black; number seventeen gauge or thinner, boiler plate and Canada plates twelve and one-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

On iron and steel wire, and galvanised, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On stoves and other castings, not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On gas, water and soil pipes of cast iron, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On car-wheels, and axles, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On rolled beams, channels and angle and T iron, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On iron bridge and structural iron work malleable iron castings and iron safes and doors for safes, and vaults, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On mill-irons and mill-cranks, and on wrought forgings, for mills and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing 25 pounds or more, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On locomotive engines and on stationary, fire or other steam engines and boilers, and on

other machinery composed wholly or in part of iron, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On locomotive tires of steel or Bessemer steel in the rough, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On seamless drawn boiler tubing, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On bedsteads and other iron furniture and ornamental iron work and wire work, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On skates and on locks of all kinds, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On tinned, glazed or enamelled hollow-ware, of cast or wrought iron, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On hardware, viz: builders, cabinet makers, upholsterers, carriage makers, saddlers, and undertakers, including coffin trimmings of metal, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On bolts, washers and rivets, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On tacks, brads, and sprigs, Hungarian and clout nails, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On horse-shoes and horse-shoe nails, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On iron wire nails, called "Points de Paris," thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On iron and steel screws, commonly called "wood screws," thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On scales, balances and weighing beams, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On chain cables over half an inch in diameter, whether shackled or swiveled, or not, five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On nails and spikes, cut, half-a-cent per pound, and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On nails and spikes, wrought and pressed, whether galvanised or not, three-fourths of a cent per pound and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Nuts, one cent per pound and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On composition nails and spikes and sheathing nails, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On sewing machines, whole, or heads or parts of heads of sewing machines, two dollars each, and in addition thereto, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Ink, for writing, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On jewelry and other manufactures of gold and silver, and on watches, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Jute, manufactures of, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On lard, tried or rendered, two cents per pound.

On lard, untried, one and a-half cents per pound.

On lead, old and scrap, and on pigs, bars, blocks, and sheets, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On lead pipe and lead shot, and all manufactures of lead not otherwise specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Leather board, three cents per pound.

Leather, on boots and shoe counters made from leather board, half-a-cent per pair.

Leather, sole, tanned but rough or undressed, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On morocco skins, tanned, but rough or undressed, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On sole leather and belting leather, tanned, but not waxed; and on all upper leather, and French kid, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

On leather, as above, dressed and waxed, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On japanned, patent or enamelled leather, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all other leather and skins tanned, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On boots and shoes and other manufactures of leather, including gloves and mitts, and on leather belting, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Lithographic stones, not engraved, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Machine card clothing, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Malt, two cents per pound.

Marble, in blocks from the quarry, in the rough, or sawn on two sides only, and not specially shapen, containing fifteen cubic feet or over, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Marble slabs, sawn on not more than two sides, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

Marble blocks and slabs, sawn on more than two sides, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On finished marble, and on all manufactures of marble not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On meats, fresh or salted, on actual weight, as received in Canada, except shoulders or sides, bacon and hams, one cent per pound.

On shoulders, sides, bacon and hams, fresh, salted, dried or smoked, two cents per pound.

On all other dried or smoked meats, or meats preserved in any other way than salted or pickled, not otherwise specified, two cents per pound.

Mustard seed, unground, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mustard, ground, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Nuts of all kinds, except cocoa-nuts, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Ochres, dry, ground or unground, washed or unwashed, not calcined, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Oils, coal and kerosene, distilled, purified or refined; naphtha, benzole and petroleum; products of petroleum, coal shale and lignite, not elsewhere specified, six cents per wine gallon.

Carbolic, or heavy oil used in making wooden block pavement, for treating wood for building, and railway ties, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Cod liver, medicated, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Lard, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Linseed or flaxseed, raw or boiled, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Neatsfoot, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Olive or salad, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sesame seed, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sperm, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Oil-cloth for floors, stamped, painted or printed, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Opium, drug, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Opium, prepared for smoking, five dollars per pound.

Organs, Cabinet, viz:—On reed organs having not more than two sets of reeds, a specific duty of ten dollars; having over two and not over four sets of reeds, fifteen dollars; having over four and not over six sets of reeds, twenty dollars; having over six sets of reeds, thirty dollars; and in addition thereto, ten per cent. *ad valorem* on the fair market value thereof.

Pipe organs and sets or parts of sets of reeds for cabinet organs, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paintings, drawings, engravings and prints, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paints and colours not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paints and colours, ground, in oil or any other liquid, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

And white and red lead, dry, also dry white zinc and Bismuth, five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paper-hangings, or wall-paper, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paper calendered, twenty-two and one-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paper of all kinds, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paper envelopes and all manufactures of paper not otherwise specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paper, union collar cloth, in sheets, not shapen, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paper, mill board, not straw board, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Paper collars, cuffs and shirt-fronts, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Pencils, lead, in wood or otherwise, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Hair oils, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes and all other perfumed preparations used for the hair, mouth or skin, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Phosphor bronze, in blocks, bars, sheets and wire, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Pianofortes, viz: On all square pianofortes, whether round-cornered or not, not over seven octaves, twenty-five dollars; on all other square pianofortes, thirty dollars; on upright pianofortes, thirty dollars; on concert, semi-concert or parlour grand pianofortes, fifty dollars; and in addition thereto ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

On parts of pianos, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Pitch, coal and coal tar, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Plants, viz: Fruit, shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Plaster of Paris, or gypsum, ground, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Plaster of Paris, calcined or manufactured fifteen cents per 100 pounds, or forty-five cents per barrel of not over 300 pounds.

Plated-ware, electro-plated and gilt of all kinds, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Plates, engraved on wood, and on steel or other metal, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Playing cards, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Plumbago, ten per cent. *ad valorem*; and on all manufactures of plumbago, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Pomades, French, or flower odours, preserved in fat or oil for the purpose of conserving the odours of flowers which do not bear the heat of distillation, when imported in tins of not less than ten pounds each, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

Printing presses of all kinds, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

Proprietary medicines, commonly called patent medicines, or any medicine or preparation of which the recipe is kept secret, or the ingredients whereof are kept secret, recommended by advertisement, bill or label, for the relief of any disorder or ailment, in liquid form, fifty per cent.; and all other, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Prunella and cotton, and woolen netting for boots, shoes and gloves, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Pumice stone, ground or powdered, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Putty, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Quills, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Quinine, sulphate of, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sails for boats and ships; also tents and awnings, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Salt (except salt imported from the United Kingdom, or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries, which shall be free of duty), in bulk, eight cents per one hundred pounds; in bags, barrels and other packages, twelve cents per one hundred pounds.

Saltpetre, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sandpaper, glass and emery paper, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Seeds, viz.: flower, garden, field and other seeds, for agricultural purposes, when in bulk or in large parcels, fifteen per cent.; when put up in small papers or parcels, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Seed, mustard, unground, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*; ground, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Shingles, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Ships and other vessels, built in any foreign country, whether steam or sailing vessels, on application for Canadian register on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery and all appliances, an *ad valorem* duty of ten per cent.

Silk, in the gum, not more advanced than singles, tram, and thrown organzine, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sewing silk and silk twist, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Silk velvets and all manufactures of silk, or of which silk is the component part of chief value, not elsewhere specified, except church vestments, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Silver, rolled, and German silver, in sheets, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Slate, for roofing, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Slate slabs, square or in special shapes, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Slate mantels, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

School and writing slates, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Soap, common brown and yellow, not perfumed, one cent per pound.

Soap, castile and white, two cents per pound.

Soap, perfumed or toilet, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Spelter, in blocks or pigs, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Spices, viz.: ginger and spices of all kinds (except nutmegs and mace), unground, twenty per cent.; ground, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Spices, nutmegs and mace, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Starch, including farina, corn starch or flour, and all preparations having the qualities of starch, two cents per pound.

Spirits and strong waters not having been sweetened or mixed with any article, so that the degree of strength thereof cannot be ascertained by Sykes' hydrometer, for every Imperial gallon of the strength of proof by such hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, and for every greater or less quantity than a gallon, viz.: Geneva gin, rum, whiskey, and unenumerated articles of like kinds, one dollar and thirty-two and one-half cents per Imperial gallon; and on brandy, one dollar and forty-five cents per Imperial gallon in bulk.

On "Old Tom" gin, one dollar and thirty-two and one-half cents per Imperial gallon in bulk.

Spirits, sweetened or mixed, so that the degree of strength cannot be ascertained as aforesaid, viz.: Rum shrub, cordials, Scheidam, Schnapps, tafia, bitters and unenumerated articles of like kinds, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon.

On spirits and strong waters, not elsewhere specified, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon.

Spirits and strong waters imported into Canada, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, and although thereby coming under the denomination of proprietary medicines, tinctures, essences, extracts, or any other denomination not elsewhere specified, shall be, nevertheless, deemed spirits or strong waters, and subject to duty as such, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon.

On Cologne water and perfumed spirits in bottles or flasks, not weighing more than four ounces each, forty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On Cologne water and perfumed spirits in bottles, flasks or other packages weighing more than four ounces each, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, including ginger, orange, lemon, strawberry, raspberry, elder and currant wines, containing twenty-six per cent., or less, of spirits of the strength of proof, by Sykes' hydrometer, imported in wood or in bottles (six-quart and twelve-pint bottles to be held to contain an Imperial gallon), twenty-five cents per Imperial gallon; and for each degree of strength in excess of

twenty-six per cent. of spirits as aforesaid, an additional duty of three cents per Imperial gallon, until the strength reaches forty per cent. of proof spirits, and in addition thereto, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On champagne and all other sparkling wines in bottles containing each not more than a quart and more than one pint, three dollars per dozen bottles; containing not more than a pint each and more than one-half pint, one dollar and fifty cents per dozen bottles; containing one-half pint each or less, seventy-five cents per dozen bottles; bottles containing more than one quart each shall pay in addition to three dollars per dozen bottles at the rate of one dollar and fifty cents per Imperial gallon on the quantity in excess of one quart per bottle; in addition to the above specific duty on sparkling wines, there shall be an *ad valorem* duty of thirty per cent.

But any liquors imported under the name of wine, and containing more than forty per cent. of spirits of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer shall be rated for duty as unenumerated spirits.

Stationery of all kinds not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Steel and manufactures of, viz.; On and after the first day of January, 1881, steel in ingots, bars, sheets and coils, and railway bars or rails and fish plates, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Shovels, spades, hoes; hay, manure and potato forks; rakes and rake teeth; carpenters, coopers, cabinet-makers, and all other mechanics' tools; edge tools of every description, including axes, scythes, files and saws of all kinds, and on steel skates, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cutlery; on firearms, viz.: Muskets, rifles, pistols and shot guns; and on all manufactures of steel, and of iron and steel, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On knife blades or knife blanks, in the rough, unhandled, for use by electro-platers, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Stereotypes and electrotypes of standard books, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Stereotypes and electrotypes for commercial blanks and advertisements, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Stone, viz.: rough freestone, sandstone, and all other building stone, except marble, one dollar per ton of thirteen cubic feet.

Water limestone, or cement stone, one dollar per ton.

Grindstone, in the rough, one dollar and fifty cents per ton.

On dressed freestone and all other building stone, except marble, and on all manufactures of stone and granite, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sugars Syrups, and Molasses:—

On all sugar above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, one cent. per pound and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On sugar equal to number nine and not above number fourteen Dutch standard, three-fourths of a cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On sugar below number nine Dutch standard, half-a-cent per pound and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Provided, that the *ad valorem* duties shall be levied and collected on sugar and melado when imported direct from the country of growth and production, upon the fair market value thereof at the place of purchase, without any addition for the cost of hogsheads or other packages, or other charges and expenses prior to shipment, anything contained in section 34 of the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 10, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

On syrups, cane juice, refined syrup, sugar-house syrup, syrup of sugar, syrup of molasses or sorghum, five-eighths of a cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On melado, concentrated melado, concentrated cane-juice concentrated molasses, concentrated beet-root juices and concrete, three-eighths of one cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Molasses, if used for refining, clarifying, or rectifying purposes or for the manufacture of sugar when imported direct from the country of growth and production, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

And for the same purposes when not imported direct from the country of growth and production thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Molasses when not so used when imported direct from the country of growth and production, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

And when not imported direct from the country of growth and production twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery, one cent per pound, and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

(Glucose or grape sugar, to be classed and rated for duty as sugar according to grade by Dutch standard in colour.)

Glucose syrup, half of one cent per pound and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Tallow one cent per pound.

Tea, viz.: on all black tea, two cents per pound and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

And on all green and japan tea, three cents per pound and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Tin, in blocks, pigs, bars, plates and sheets, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Tinware, stamped and japanned ware, and on all manufactures of tin not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Tobacco:—

On manufactured tobacco and on snuff twenty-five cents per pound, and in addition thereto twelve and-a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

On cigars and cigarettes, fifty cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Turpentine, spirits of, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Trunks, satchels, valises, and carpet-bags, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Twines, manufactured of flax and not otherwise specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Type, for printing, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Type metal, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Varnish, not elsewhere specified, twenty cents per Imperial gallon and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Vegetables, viz.: On potatoes, ten cents per bushel.

On tomatoes, thirty cents per bushel.

And on all other vegetables twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Vinegar, twelve cents per Imperial gallon.

Watches, watch movements and watch cases, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Wire, of brass and copper, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Wire cloth, of brass and copper, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Wood and manufactures of wooden ware, viz.:—Pails, tubs, churns, brooms, brushes and other manufactures of wood not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Hubs, spokes, fellos, parts of, and wheels, rough, hewn or sawn only, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Lumber, and timber, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Wool and woollens, viz.: Wool, unmanufactured, hair of the alpaca, goat and other like animals, free.

On manufactures composed wholly, or in part, of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animals, viz.: Shawls, blankets, and flannels of every description; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, cloakings, felt cloth, of every description, not elsewhere specified; horse-collar cloth, yarn, knitting yarn, fingering yarn, worsted yarn under number 30; knitted goods, viz.: Shirts, drawers and hosiery of every description, seven and a-half cents per pound, and in addition thereto twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description, including cloth caps, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress or manufacturer, except knit goods, ten cents per pound, and in addition thereto, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animals, not herein otherwise provided for, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On treble, ingrain, three-ply and two-ply carpets, composed wholly of wool, ten cents per square yard, and in addition thereto, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

On two-ply and three-ply, ingrain carpets, of which the warp is composed wholly of cotton or other material than wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animals, five cents per square yard, and in addition thereto twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Felt for boots and shoes, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.; and for glove linings and endless felt for paper makers, when imported by the manufacturers for use in their factories, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Whips, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

Wire of brass and copper, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

Wire cloth of brass and copper, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Zinc, in pigs, blocks and sheets, ten per cent. *ad valorem*; seamless drawn tubing, ten per cent. *ad valorem*; manufactures of zinc not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

On all goods not enumerated in this Act, or any other Act as charged with any duty of Customs, and not declared free of duty by this Act, or some unrepealed Act or provision, shall be charged with a duty of twenty per cent. *ad valorem*, when imported into Canada, or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein.

12. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the following goods shall be exempt from duty when imported into Canada, viz:—

Agaric,
Agates, unmanufactured,
Alkanet root,
Aloes,
Aluminum,
Alum,
Ambergris,
Ammonia, crude,
Aniline dyes,
Aniline oil, crude,
Aniline salts,

Animals brought into Canada temporarily, and for a period not exceeding three months, for the purpose of exhibition or competition for prizes offered by any agricultural or other association. But a bond shall be first given in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs, with the condition that the full duty to which such animals would otherwise be liable shall be paid in case of their sale in Canada, or if not re-exported within the time specified in such bond,

Animals for the improvement of stock under regulations to be made by the Treasury Board, and approved by the Governor in Council,

Annato, liquid or solid,
Annato, seed,
Anchors,
Antimony,
Ashes, pot, pearl and soda,

Apparel, wearing and other personal and household effects, not merchandise, of British subjects dying abroad, but domiciled in Canada,

Argal, dust,
Argal, crude,
Arsen c,
Arseniate of aniline,
Articles for the use of the Governor-General,
Articles for the use of foreign Consuls General,

Articles imported by and for the use of the Dominion Government or any of the Departments thereof, and for the Senate and House of Commons,

Army and Navy and Canadian Militia, for the use of: Arms, clothing, musical instruments

for bands, military stores and munitions of war,

Bamboo reeds, not further manufactured than cut into suitable lengths for walking sticks or canes, or for sticks for umbrellas, parasols or sunshades,

Bamboos unmanufactured,

Barrels of Canadian manufactures exported filled with domestic petroleum and returned empty, under such regulations as the Minister of Customs may prescribe,

Barilla,

Barytes, unmanufactured,

Bells for churches,

Berries for dyeing or used for composing dyes,

Bolting cloths,

Bones, crude and not manufactured, burned, calcined, ground or steamed,

Bone-dust and bone-ash for manufacture of phosphates and fertilisers,

Borax,

Botany, specimens of,

Bristles,

Brimstone, crude, or in roll or flour,

Brim moulds for gold beaters,

Bromine,

Broom corn,

Buchu leaves,

Bullion, gold and silver,

Burgundy pitch,

Burr stones, in blocks, rough or unmanufactured, and not bound up into mill stones,

Bichromate of potash,

Carriages of travellers and carriages laden with merchandise, and not to include circus troupes nor hawkers, under regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs,

Cabinets of coins, medals, and other collections of antiquities,

Casts, as models for the use of schools of design,

Cornelian, unmanufactured,

Canvas for manufacture of floor oil-cloth, not less than forty-five inches wide, and not pressed nor calendared,

Caoutchouc, unmanufactured,

Cat-gut strings or gut cord for musical instruments,

Cat-gut or whip-gut, unmanufactured,

Chalk and cliff stone, unmanufactured,

Chamomile flowers,

Chloride of lime,

Citrons, and rinds of, in brine, for candying,

Clays,

Clothing, donations of, for charitable purposes,

Cobalt, ore of,

Cochineal,

Cocoa, bean, shell and nibs,

Coins, gold and silver, except United States silver coin,

Communion plate, and plated ware for use in churches,

Coir and coir yarn,

Colcothar, dry oxide of iron,

Conium maculatum, or hemlock seed and leaf,

Cotton waste and cotton wool,

Cork wood or cork bark, unmanufactured,

Colours, viz. :—Bichromate of potash, blue black, Chinese blue, coultile lakes, scarlet and marine in pulp, Paris green, Prussian blue, satin and fine-washed white, ultra marine, umber, raw,

Cream of tartar, in crystals,

Diamonds, unset, including black diamonds for borers,

Diamond dust or bort,

Dragons' blood,

Duck for belting and hose,

Dyeing or tanning articles, in a crude state, used in dyeing or tanning, not elsewhere specified,

Eggs,

Emery,

Entomology, specimens of,

Esparto, or Spanish grass, and other grasses, and pulp of, for the manufacture of paper,

Extract of logwood,

Felt, adhesive for sheathing vessels,

Fire clay,

Fibre, Mexican,

Fibre, vegetable, for manufacturing purposes,

Fibrilla,

Fish bait,

Fish oil and fish of all kinds, the produce of the fisheries of the United States (except fish of the inland lakes, and of the rivers falling into them, and fish preserved in oil),

Fish-hooks, nets and seines, and lines and twines, for the use of the fisheries, but not to include sporting fishing-tackle or hooks with flies or trawling spoons,

Fur, skins of all kinds, not dressed in any manner,

Flint, flints, and ground flint stones,

Foliæ digitalis,

Fossils,

Fuller's earth,

Gentian root,

Ginseng root,

Gold-beaters' moulds and gold-beaters' skins, Grease and grease scrap, for manufacture of soap,

Gravels,

Guano and other animal and vegetable manures,

Gums, amber, Arabic, Australian, British, copal, damar, mastic, sandarac, shellac and tragacanth,

Gunny cloth and gunny bags,

Gut, and worm gut, manufactured or unmanufactured, for whip and other cord,

Gutta percha, crude,

Gypsum, crude (sulphate of lime),

Hair, angola, buffalo and bison, camels, goat, hog, horse and human, cleaned or uncleaned, but not curled or otherwise manufactured,

Hatters' furs, not on the skin,

Hemlock bark,

Hemp, undressed,

Hides, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted or pickled,

Hoops, horns and horn tips,

Hioscyamus, or henbane leaf,

Ice,

India-rubber, unmanufactured,

Indian hemp, crude, drug,

Indigo,
 Iris, orris root,
 Istle or tampico fibre,
 Ivory and ivory nuts, unmanufactured,
 Ivory veneers, sawn only, not planed nor polished,
 Iron masts for ships, or parts of,
 Jalap, root,
 Junk, old,
 Jute, butts,
 Jute,
 Kelp,
 Kryolite,
 Lac, dye, crude, seed, button, stick and shell,
 Lava, unmanufactured,
 Leeches,
 Liquorice, root,
 Litharge,
 Litusus and all lichens, prepared and not prepared,
 Lemons and rinds of, in brine, for candying,
 Logs, and round unmanufactured timber, not elsewhere provided for,
 Lumber and timber, plank and boards, sawn, of boxwood, cherry, walnut, chestnut, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, Spanish cedar, oak, hickory and whitewood, not shaped, planed, or otherwise manufactured,
 Locomotives and railway passenger, baggage and freight cars, being the property of railway companies in the United States, running upon any line of road crossing the frontier, so long as Canadian locomotives and cars are admitted free under similar circumstances in the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs,
 Madder and mungeet, or Indian madder, ground or prepared, and all extracts of,
 Manilla grass,
 Medals of gold, silver or copper,
 Meerschaum, crude or raw,
 Mineralogy, specimens of,
 Models of inventions and other improvements in the arts, but no article or articles shall be deemed a model or improvement which can be fitted for use,
 Moss, Iceland and other mosses, crude,
 Moss, seaweed, and all other vegetable substances used for beds and mattresses, in their natural state, or only cleaned,
 Menageries—horses, cattle, carriages, and harnesses of, under regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs,
 Machinery for worsted or cotton mills, of kinds which are not manufactured in Canada,
 Nitrate of soda, or cubic nitre,
 Nut galls,
 Newspapers received by mail,
 Nickle,
 Oak bark,
 Oakum,
 Oil cake, cotton seed cakes, palm nut cake, and meal,
 Oils, cocoanut and palm, in their natural state,
 Oranges and rinds of, in brine, for candying,
 Ores of metals of all kinds,
 Osiers,
 Oxalic acid,

Paintings, in oil, by artists of well-known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists,
 Palm leaf, unmanufactured,
 Pearl, mother of, not manufactured,
 Persis, or extract of archill and cudpear,
 Philosophical instruments and apparatus, including globes and pictorial illustrations of insects, etc., when imported by and for the use of colleges and schools, scientific and literary societies,
 Phosphorus,
 Pelts,
 Pipe clay,
 Pitch (pine),
 Plaster of Paris, not ground or calcined,
 Pumice and pumice stone,
 Plaits, straw, Tuscan and grass,
 Precipitate of copper, crude,
 Rags, of cotton, linen, jute and hemp, paper, waste or clippings, and waste of any kind, fit only for manufacture of paper,
 Rattans and reeds unmanufactured,
 Rennet, raw or prepared,
 Resin,
 Rhubarb root,
 Salt, coarse, imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries,
 Saffron and Safflower, and extract of,
 Saffron cake,
 Sal ammonia,
 Sal soda,
 Sand,
 Sea-weed, not elsewhere specified,
 Sea-grass,
 Senna, in leaves,
 Silex or crystallised quartz,
 Silk, raw or as reeled from the cocoon, not being doubled, twisted or advanced in manufacture any way, silk cocoons and silk waste,
 Skins, undressed, dried, salted or pickled,
 Soda ash,
 Soda, caustic,
 Soda, silicate of,
 Settlers' effects, viz.: Wearing apparel, household furniture, professional books, implements and tools of trade, occupation or employment, which the settler has had in actual use for at least six months before removal to Canada, not to include machinery, or live stock or other articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment, or for sale, provided that any dutiable article entered as settlers' effects shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of without payment of duty until after two years' actual use in Canada,
 Until the first day of January, 1881, steel in ingots, bars, sheets and coils, railway bars or rails and fish plates, shall be free of duty.
 Sulphur, in roll or flour,
 Tails, undressed,
 Tampico, white and black,
 Tanners' bark,
 Tar (pine),
 Terra Japonica,
 Teasels,
 Tobacco, unmanufactured for excise purposes, under conditions of Act 31 Vic., cap. 51,
 Tortoise and other shells, unmanufactured,

Travellers' baggage, under regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs,

Turmeric,
Turpentine, raw or crude,
Turtles,
Tree nails,
Varnish, black and bright, for ships' use,
Vitriol, blue,
Veneers of wood and ivory, sawn only,
Verdigris, or subacetate of copper, dry,
Vegetable fibres, natural, not produced by any mechanical process,
Whiting or whitening,
Whalebone, unmanufactured,
Whale oil, in casks from on ship board, and in the condition in which it was first landed,
Willow for basket makers,
Wire rigging for ships and vessels,
Wire,
Yellow metal, in bolts, bars, and for sheathing.

The following articles shall be prohibited to be imported under a penalty of two hundred dollars, together with the forfeiture of the parcel or package of goods in which the same may be found, viz. :—

Books, printed papers, drawings, paintings, prints, photographs or representations of any kind of a treasonable or seditious, or of an immoral or indecent character,
Coin, base or counterfeit.

13. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to add the following to the list of goods exempted from Customs duty when imported into Canada.

The following articles, being the natural products, or the manufacture of the colony of Newfoundland, viz.:

Fish, fresh, dried, salted or smoked.
Fish-oil and all products of fish.
Seal-oil.
Animals of all kinds.

14. *Resolved*, That in lieu of all excise duties, except license fees, now or heretofore imposed on spirits, there shall be imposed, levied and collected upon every gallon, of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength of spirits, the manufacture of which has not been wholly completed, or upon which the duty has not been paid before the passing of this resolution, an excise duty of one dollar.

15. *Resolved*, That in lieu of all excise duties except license fees, now or heretofore imposed on malt, there shall be imposed, levied and collected on every pound of malt made and weighed as removed from the kiln, and upon which the duty had not been paid before the passing of this resolution, an excise duty of one cent.

16. *Resolved*, That upon all stocks of malt liquor held by licensed brewers at the time of passing this resolution, a drawback may be paid on the malt contained in such stocks equal to the duty paid thereon in excess of one cent per pound, and the quantity of malt contained in such stocks of malt liquor shall be determined under the existing Departmen-

tal regulations for determining the quantity of malt contained in malt liquor.

17. *Resolved*, That in lieu of all excise duties except license fees, now imposed on tobacco known as common Canadian twist, otherwise called "tabac blanc en torquette," being the impressed leaf rolled and twisted and made wholly from raw tobacco the growth of Canada, and upon raw leaf the growth of Canada, there shall be imposed, levied and collected on every pound or less quantity than a pound, an excise duty of four cents.

18. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing Resolutions, and the alterations made in the duties of Customs and Excise and on the other articles therein mentioned, shall take effect upon and after the 15th day of March, instant.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced, and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 79) Respecting Building Societies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

House adjourned at
Ten minutes after
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 10th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

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

(Mr. Rylert.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

MR. RYKERT moved that the said Bill be withdrawn, and the fee thereon refunded.

Motion agreed to and Bill withdrawn.

QUALITY OF MEMBERS' STATIONERY.

REFERRED TO PRINTING COMMITTEE.

MR. KIRKPATRICK moved, That the Printing Committee be requested to enquire into and report upon the quality of and mode of procuring the stationery supplied to members, and the best mode of distributing the same.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

MR. TILLEY moved the second reading of the resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (April 9th).

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the question under consideration was admitted to be one of very great importance. It seemed to him, although much time had been consumed in its discussion, that he would fail in his duty if he did not make some observations before it reached its finality. This question revived the memory of events of very considerable consequence and importance in the Province of New Brunswick. It reproduced, naturally, from the attitude of the hon. the Finance Minister, the recollection of events which took place in the early stages of this Confederation, and it was natural that his colleagues from New Brunswick should have adverted to the attitude of the Finance Minister in connection with the agitation incidental to the accomplishment of Confederation, which took place at the time in his Province. In 1864, the Finance Minister, being then a member of the Government, was appointed with one or two others, by the Government, delegates to the Quebec Conference, which had relation to the final Confederation of these Provinces. Having been Secretary of the Province, and having had charge of its financial affairs, it naturally fell to him to look after the financial interests of New Brunswick at that Conference. The Conference met and passed a variety of resolutions which formed the basis of Confederation, so far as New Brunswick to have 80c. per head of the population of 1861, which amounted to about \$201,000, and in addition, \$63,000 per year for ten years. The Conference closed; the Finance Minister returned to New Brunswick, and, with the view of preparing the people for the dissolution which was shortly to take place, he called public meetings in St. John, as well as in other parts of New Brunswick. He (Sir A. J. Smith) was one of those who opposed Confederation, as propounded at the Quebec Conference. The Finance Minister, at all these public meetings, strongly advised the people to accept the

terms of the Conference. He told them he had obtained the most liberal terms for New Brunswick, and, had the people endorsed his action, and adopted his advice, all that the Province would have had in this Confederation would have been \$201,000, and \$63,000 for ten years.

MR. TILLEY: Where are the \$50,000 for the Government?

SIR A. J. SMITH said that was a supplementary allowance; there was nothing said about it at the Conference, or in the resolutions. All that the Finance Minister had to offer the people, and which he strongly urged them to accept, were the 80c. per head according to the census of 1861, which amounted to \$201,000. and the \$63,000 per year for ten years, and these amounts were to be in full satisfaction of any claim New Brunswick was to have on this Dominion with reference to its financial matters. Had the people accepted the advice of the Finance Minister, what would be the condition of New Brunswick now? Since then, New Brunswick has received, in addition to those terms, \$50,000 a year, 80c. per head of the population, until it reached 400,000, which, according to the last census, did give a considerable amount, \$150,000 compensation for the abolition of export duties—and had now a revenue of nearly half a million dollars derivable from the Dominion Treasury. He asked the Finance Minister where New Brunswick would have been had she accepted his proposition in 1864? She would have been in the lowest depths of financial despair. All she could do at present was barely to meet requirements of her Civil Government. It had been said, across the floor of this House, that he (Sir A. J. Smith) had changed his politics, and, from a Tory, had become a Liberal. He and the Finance Minister had been associated together for many years in the same Government; they were in perfect accord and sympathy, and were members of the first Liberal Government, in 1854, ever formed in New Brunswick, and, if there had been a change, it was the Finance Minister who had changed, who, for many years, had been a Liberal, and was now a Tory. What did the Finance

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

Minister himself say in 1864, about the manner in which New Brunswick would be financially affected by joining Confederation? At this time, the tax per head in New Brunswick, Customs duties, for there were no Excise duties, was \$3.20. He told the people that, if they joined Confederation, their taxes would be diminished, and, instead of \$3.30, they would pay only \$2.75 per head for the next quarter of a century. His views were not adopted by the people, and he was defeated by an overwhelming majority, despite every means legitimate and illegitimate, which were used against the anti-Confederate party. The following year a dissolution was forced, and the Confederate party won the election. He would not repeat the causes of this change, because his hon. friend from Gloucester had put plainly before the House the agencies which had been resorted to to bring about the result. He (Sir A. Smith) alluded to those utterances of the Finance Minister to show that his judgment was not to be relied upon, that, when he assumed the rôle of prophet, his prophecies should be received with considerable allowance, that he had not a great prevision and forecast for the future, and it was impossible for him to explain why he told the people of New Brunswick that for the next twenty-five years all they would be called on to pay would be \$2.75 per head. He had not been five years in power before he submitted a scheme of taxation which would involve at least six dollars a head on the people, after promising it should not exceed \$2.75. How were they to enforce this agreement? There was no doubt this was a compact, because it was repeated on the second election. The Minister of Justice ought to be consulted, to see by what means this agreement could be enforced, and an indemnity be given to the people of New Brunswick for the pledge the Finance Minister had given, that they would only pay \$2.75 per head. It had been stated here, over and over again, that the question referred to the people at the polls on the 17th September, was whether a revenue tariff, as a policy of Protection, should be adopted. Well, he admitted in many portions of the Dominion, that was the fair issue at the polls, but he denied that in the Province

of New Brunswick it was the real issue. The hon. the Finance Minister endeavoured to make the people believe the policy of the then Opposition was simply a re-adjustment of the tariff. He would like to ask him whether he believed he would have been elected had it not been for the telegram sent by Sir John A. Macdonald to Mr. John Boyd? Did the present tariff come within the meaning of the communication made by the leader of the Government to Mr. Boyd, that the tariff was simply to be re-adjusted, and no increase of taxation? Had the Finance Minister gone to the people of St. John's with his present tariff, he would not have been elected. He went to his election under peculiarly auspicious circumstances. He had occupied the first position in that Province for five years. He (Sir A. J. Smith) did not wish particularly to refer to the way in which his hon. friend got that appointment, but he thought the circumstances which led to it were to be regretted. He was amused to see the Finance Minister, the other day, refer to the First Minister as to the circumstances connected with the passing of the Order in Council on the 22nd October. He invoked the testimony of the First Minister as to whether he knew that the Order in Council had been passed. It was never pretended that he knew. He was in England at the time. On the 5th November, in his place in the House, he made a speech, in which he exhibited himself in the most chivalrous manner, and said he would sink with the ship, and fall with his colleagues. At that hour there was an Order in Council, dated 22nd October, appointing him Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, and he occupied the position for five years after by Order in Council, and by virtue of that order. It then had vitality on the 5th November as no other Order of Council appointing him Governor ever passed; and yet he told us that, after his return from England, he told the Governor he did not think he would accept the appointment. Was it understood between him and the leader that this order was to remain in abeyance until they saw the result of the vote of want of confidence then pending? The Order in Council was never changed, and his acceptance of the Governorship

had relation back to the 22nd of October, when that Order in Council was passed. He said he thought that the Finance Minister had entered upon his office of Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick rather ingloriously. He did not say it with any kind of bad feeling. The hon. gentleman had referred to a conversation he had had at the time with Mr. Burpee and himself (Sir A. J. Smith.) He recollected having a conversation with the Finance Minister, and believed he had said to him then that he was pleased of his appointment, and would have been glad to have suggested himself the nomination. But on this occasion there was nothing said about an Order in Council. He had not seen the Order in Council, and it was not spoken of at that time. The Finance Minister, more fortunate than his colleagues, who went out of power without office, rose to a higher position. Well, he was prepared to admit that he made a very good Governor. He discharged his duty well within the limits of the Constitution. There was no friction, everything went on smoothly, and he discharged his duty satisfactorily; but the hon. gentleman, while he was unfortunate in his entrance to that high position, was equally unfortunate in his exit from it. This House would be astonished to hear that the hon. the Finance Minister, while he was yet Governor, attended a public political meeting in St. John, and accepted the nomination for the city. He made, also, a violent speech on that occasion, in which he condemned the Government, of which he was but an officer, and criticised Mr. Cartwright in his policy and measures.

MR. TILLEY: I made no speech at all.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Then the papers misrepresented you.

MR. TILLEY: No; they did not.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: You went to St. John for the purpose of accepting the nomination.

MR. TILLEY: No; I did not go there for that purpose. I knew nothing about it.

SIR A. J. SMITH: The hon gentleman was in St. John receiving a re-

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

quisition. The papers published the next morning that the Governor had accepted the nomination and made a speech. Whether he did or not, he (Sir A. J. Smith) did not know personally. The meeting was not an open one, but was attended by a large number of strong political partisans, and the hon. gentleman held office as Governor several weeks after. This was an unprecedented proceeding, because the Governor was supposed to be, for the time being, at all events, without any party politics. The hon. the Finance Minister appeared before the people of St. John under very favourable circumstances. He had all the prestige and moral influence which the occupation of that high position could give him; he had no political sins for five years to answer for; he had many political and personal friends who would stand by him under all circumstances. The people of St. John were anxious and interested about the question of Protection, and, from his utterances, were not induced to believe that the scheme now submitted to this House was the scheme and policy then contemplated. If it was, why did he seek to remove from the minds of the people then that his policy was one of Protection? Why did he communicate with the First Minister? The telegram of the First Minister implied that there was no such thing as Protection contemplated, but simply a readjustment of the tariff. Was this a readjustment of the tariff? It was admittedly a policy of extreme Protection. Without this telegram he could not have been elected, and with all these influences and powerful agencies, personal, official, and moral influence, he was only elected by a majority of nine. That illustrated very strongly that the sentiments of the people was not in favour of Protection, and the Finance Minister must have received letters innumerable from St. John and other parts of New Brunswick, complaining that this policy was most oppressive. He (Sir A. J. Smith) did not believe he had received letters in which it was recommended, but must have received letters in which it was almost universally condemned. The Finance Minister was elected by a majority of nine, and he thought more, that on that occasion, in addition to all the other agencies used by that hon.

gentleman, he told the people of St. John that he had the virtue to resist a proffered bribe of \$45,000. He (Sir A. J. Smith) thought the Minister of Finance was not justified in resorting to such means during that election. He was not aware that any such offer was made to him (Mr. Tilley). He (Sir A. J. Smith) had some correspondence with him, and he had no hesitation in saying that he did not care whether it was made private or public. The Finance Minister told the people of St. John that he was so anxious to serve his country, so anxious to obtain the position of Finance Minister, that he was unable to accept the offer of \$45,000 made to him. After the election, the hon. the Finance Minister was kind enough to pay his (Sir A. J. Smith's) county a visit, accompanied by the Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Mr. Mitchell, and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Donville). He (Sir A. J. Smith) thought he was in Ottawa at the time; but he saw an account of the affair, and there was a torch-light procession, and all that kind of thing, in the town of Moncton, where those gentlemen had come to attend a meeting. The hon. the Finance Minister, he thought, was rather moderate on that occasion. Mr. Mitchell was very lavish in his abuse, and was only excelled by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who had the kindness to speak of him (Sir A. J. Smith) in terms of considerable severity. The Minister of Public Works, he was told, stated to the people on that occasion, as he had on previous occasions, that he (Sir A. J. Smith) was an office-seeker, that he had knocked at the doors of his (Mr. Tupper's) Government, for office, and was refused. He had been rather surprised that the hon. the Finance Minister should stand by, and by his silence acquiesce in the statement. The Minister of Finance knew him; they had personal and political relations for many years, and he (Sir A. J. Smith) thought he could appeal to that hon. gentleman, though an opponent, as testimony in refutation of the charge thus made by the Minister of Public Works. He would ask him if he ever had been an office seeker? He had been in the same Government with him (Mr. Tilley) for seven years, and had no office. During the fifteen years

that he had sat as a representative in the New Brunswick Legislature, he had held office for only some two years, that was as Attorney-General, and he thought he was treated undeservedly by the hon. the Minister of Finance, when he allowed his colleague to charge him before his (Sir A. J. Smith's) constituents with being an office-seeker, and having knocked at the door of their Government for office. He (Mr. Tilley) knew it was not true, and the Minister of Public Works had no warrant for making any such statement. He recollected that, in 1872, when the present Prime Minister occupied the same position as he did now, they had offered him (Sir A. J. Smith) the Lieutenant-Governorship of New Brunswick. He had thanked the Government at the time, but had declined the offer. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, would recollect, too, the proposition made to him (Sir A. J. Smith) at St. John in 1873. It was not a confidential matter, as he (Mr. Tupper) had mentioned it to several persons. He (Mr. Tupper) had proposed that he (Sir A. J. Smith) should take the Governorship of Nova Scotia, and that he (Mr. Tupper) should take the Governorship of New Brunswick. He had told him (Mr. Tupper) on that occasion, that he did not care for any position, and that he was content to remain an independent member for the county of Westmoreland. The hon. gentleman knew too, that, in 1873, a member of his Government was commissioned by the First Minister to offer him a seat in the Cabinet. That was not a secret. The hon. gentleman also knew that, when he (Sir A. J. Smith) came to Ottawa in 1873, in October, that he was not here an hour, when he was waited upon by the Minister of Public Works and pressed to accept a portfolio in the then Government. Here were two offers of Governorships, and two seats in the Cabinet, the whole of which he had declined, and he would ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works whether, in view of these facts, he had any authority or warrant for saying that he (Sir A. J. Smith) was an office-seeker, and that he had knocked at the door of their Government for office? He did not think it was fair or just to make such an accusation against a public man when there was not the slightest foundation for any

such charge. He never was an office-seeker. Did not the hon. the Minister of Finance know that when he (Sir A. J. Smith) first came here, in 1867, they had been associated together for many years? The Confederation discussion had made a divergence between them, but it had not terminated the kindly feeling that had existed between them. He (Mr. Tilley) knew very well that he was not an office-seeker, but that he had been offered office day after day, and had refused it. It was most unfair for the hon. member (Mr. Tupper) to make that charge against him, and he felt it his duty, before the House and the country, to refute those charges, and to show that they had no foundation in fact whatever. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) had read an extract from a speech, reported to have been made by him (Sir A. J. Smith) in 1872. That speech was incorrectly reported. In 1867, having fought the battle of Confederation, and having been beaten, he had laid down his arms, and admitted he was conquered, and he believed it was his duty, as a public man, to exert all influence towards making Confederation a success, and the country prosperous. In 1867 he appealed as an Independent candidate to his constituents, who had always returned him to the New Brunswick Parliament, from 1852, without any interruption, and he was returned by a majority of more than nineteen hundred. Though his antecedents were Liberal, as were those of the hon. the Minister of Finance, who had always been a Liberal, and they had voted side by side for years, he (Sir A. J. Smith) had come to Ottawa as an Independent member of the House. He supported the Government when they were right, and opposed them when they were wrong. As every hon. gentleman knew, he had always exercised his own judgment in regard to matters submitted for the consideration of this House. When he had first come here, he had no political affinities with either party; in fact, he knew hardly any of the then public men of Canada, except by reputation. Confederation, the only question, perhaps, upon which he held opinions adverse to those of the majority of the House, had been disposed of, and accepted by both sides, and, therefore, he was entirely indepen-

dent of any party. Whenever he had any doubt, he always gave the Government the benefit of the doubt, because he did not desire a change of Government at all. Then, having occupied that position for five years in this House, he returned to his constituents in 1872, and what did he say to them? He told them that he again offered himself, that he was pledged to neither one side or the other; that, during the five years he had been in Ottawa, he had been prepared to give the Government credit for everything they did; that he had found the then Government willing to do justice to his Province, and that he had supported them when they were right, and opposed them when they were wrong. He had gone further, and told them that the interests of the Lower Provinces were as safe in the hands of the Government as they would be in the hands of the Opposition. He declared himself entirely independent of both sides on that occasion, and was again elected by acclamation. He felt it necessary to make this explanation, because he did not know that he would ever have another occasion of explaining the matter, and because there seemed to be some misapprehension with regard to the attitude which he held towards the Government of the day in 1872. The hon. the Minister of Finance knew that from 1867 to 1872, and from 1872 until the time the Government fell, he (Sir A. J. Smith) had never asked for office, and that he had declined the four propositions which were made to him. Having made this explanation, which he thought was necessary, in order to inform the House and the country the true position he occupied in reference to these matters, he thought it was necessary, in dealing with the question now before the House, to find out, if they could, when it was that this Protective policy had its origin in this country and was born. By reference to the utterances of hon. members on the Government side of the House in 1873 and 1874, he found that there was no indication at all that this was the policy of the men who were in power in 1873, and afterwards in Opposition. It was said that the Protection of 1871 was in the sense of a National Policy; but that Protection lived but a

few months and then died. He would see what were the reasons given by the First Minister, and he would then call attention to the reasons given by the Finance Minister, and see how far they agreed upon this question, what was called the National Policy of 1871. They arrived at the same conclusion, but their premises were entirely different. Here was what the Minister of Finance said :

"It is true, that, in the National Policy introduced in 1871, a tax was placed on flour and coal. But you must consider the circumstances under which the tax was imposed. We were going into the Treaty of Washington, intending to make an effort to secure reciprocity, so that we would have free market for our lumber, fish, cattle and agricultural products. We could not ask for all these advantages without offering something in return. We must have something to offer for a renewal of the treaty, as we had made few changes in our tariff since it was abrogated, and the United States continued to enjoy all the privileges they possessed under it. We felt we must have something to offer as the price of its renewal, and the duties were imposed accordingly. It is supposed that these bore unequally on the Maritime Provinces, the fact being that the Maritime Provinces paid on flour, grain, coal and coke, but 5 per cent. more than Ontario and Quebec, in proportion to the population. I would have voted against the coal and flour resolutions last Session, but I would re-impose these duties in circumstances similar to those attending the Washington Treaty negotiations, and would take something off sugar and other articles largely consumed by the masses."

Now in that the Finance Minister said that, in order to secure reciprocity, it was necessary, in the interests of the country, in 1871, to impose duties. Here was what the First Minister said on the same subject, in 1872 :

"The feeling in 1865 was, however, very strong in favour of doing everything in our power in order to induce the Americans to renew the treaty. The Government did everything it could, and, while its members were exerting themselves in that direction, it would have been a suicidal course—it would have been threatening the very purpose in view—if they had increased the taxes at that time, even to inaugurate a National Policy. Because the Americans could have said, 'How can we give you a reciprocity treaty when you are increasing the duties on our goods?' Therefore, from year to year, so long as there was any hope of a renewal of the treaty, Canada declined to raise a larger revenue than was absolutely necessary to carry on the Government."

This was the utterance of the First Minister, diametrically opposite to that of the Finance Minister. One said put on the duty, and the other said take it off. In 1871, when a duty was put on flour and coal, this Government never contemplated establishing a National Policy. The fiscal policy of the United States was the same now as it was then ; and if it was necessary now, and the country called loudly, thinking its prosperity was imperilled, for some such system as obtained in the United States, why did not those hon. gentlemen propound this National Policy in 1871? The circumstances were precisely the same. He would call attention to some of the utterances of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, in 1874, also of the First Minister in 1872, in this question, and it could not be denied that the fiscal policy of the United States had remained unchanged since then. It was said then that this country was in a most prosperous condition, and that they did not want even reciprocity ; that they were going on successfully and prosperously. The First Minister said, in 1872 :

"Although we have been without reciprocity from 1866 until now ; although we have been virtually excluded from the markets of the United States, our farmers are richer than ever, and easily find a sale for their products in the markets of the world. They are increasing their farms, and improving the breed of their live stock. In every branch of the agricultural community you see they are rising superior to the temporary disadvantage caused by the loss of the United States markets."

That was the declaration of the First Minister in 1872. How had things changed since then ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
A change of Ministry.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that recalled to his mind that this National Policy never was thought of until it became a necessity of the Conservative party. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, after the change of Government in 1873, believed, because he stated it to many of his friends, that the other Government would not remain in power six months. He seemed to have the conviction that the Government would not even be able to administer the public affairs of this country,

The Government did live six months and longer, and the hon. gentlemen on the other side found that the Mackenzie Government could administer the affairs of the country, and not only that, but they had done so well and honestly. They found that, in order to succeed to power, it was necessary to resort to some other agency than usual. They found discontent, depression and hard times existing in the country, and they felt that, by working upon the prejudices of the people, they could create a public opinion in favour of a National Policy. Those gentlemen knew that this statement had been proved correct. He would now see what the Minister of Public Works said in 1874, after the late Government had been in power some months :

"The only interest the Finance Minister pretended was suffering the slightest depression, was the agricultural interest, and he (Mr. Tupper) would ask the great consuming population of the country whether they thought the great agricultural interest was suffering? He thought they would give a decided response, without any hesitation, that the agricultural interest, at this moment, was enjoying a condition of prosperity second to none in the world."

That was after the change of Government; he presumed after the six months within which the hon. gentleman had predicted that the Government would be overthrown. The late Government challenged full enquiry, to see if they had not conducted public affairs to the entire satisfaction of the people. He repeated that, in the Session of 1874, the hon. gentlemen now in power never contemplated a policy of Protection. They declared the country to be in a most prosperous condition; that the country, notwithstanding the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty, was becoming rich; that they could find markets for their agricultural produce in every part of the world, and that they were not dependent upon the United States. He had now occasion to refer to the position taken by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). He was a gentleman who represented very advanced thoughts and ideas; he had studied the public affairs of this country, if not in this House, outside of it, and if he was not here long ago it was not his fault, because he tried often enough, and his utterances were entitled

SIR A. J. SMITH.

to considerable consideration. While that gentleman said now that he was a Protectionist, in 1873 he was entirely opposed to Protection, as shown by the resolution which he moved in the Dominion Board of Trade, at the annual meeting :

"That, without forming any opinion upon some of the details of the present Customs tariff, and the anomalies, which are inevitable in all tariffs, this Board is of opinion that no changes should be made in it, unless the exigencies of the public service demand larger revenues; and that in such case any increase to be made should be in accordance with the principle of the present Customs tariff, which, while not interfering with the commerce of the Dominion, affords incidental Protection to its manufactures."

He did not say that Free-trade was practicable in this country. He said they must have incidental Protection, must have a revenue tariff, having a proper regard for the industries of the country. The resolution concluded as follows :—

"That this Board is further of opinion that permanence in the fiscal policy of the country is most important alike to its commerce and its manufactures, and that no changes should be made in the tariff not demanded by the absolute necessities of the revenue."

How was it that the hon. gentleman changed his mind since then? He (Sir Albert J. Smith) did not believe that he had changed his honest conviction, but that he was really of the same opinion still, because it was based upon sound reason—that they could not stimulate, encourage and foster industries that required artificial means to sustain them. He (Sir A. J. Smith) thought he had shown that the National Policy was the outcome of political necessities of the gentlemen on the other side, and that it was not the result of conviction, because he found that, up to 1874, they never uttered a word in favour of the National Policy. It was said that Protection had accomplished wonders for the United States, and Mr. Wells had been quoted in connection with that assertion. He would quote from a lecture that was delivered, in 1878, before a Science Congress in Cincinnati, to show the effect of Protection on the industries of that country as compared with effect of Free-trade as it existed in England. It was as follows :—

"The great commerce of England has been built upon invention, and by a policy of ocean postal service, which enables her to reach every seaport by steam on the face of the earth. Her merchants are in every land; her marine on every sea. How our foreign commerce fails before that of England—less than one-third—yet you may put the United Kingdom into Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and have 15,000,000 acres to spare. Last year we mined 42,000,000 tons of coal; England, 133,000,000. She built 687 sailing vessels, and 300 steamers, last year; we, six steamers, seven ships, four brigs! Last year she produced \$124,000,000 of wool, clothed her people, and exported \$115,000,000; we purchased \$7,000,000, and exported \$317,000 worth. England paid us \$191,000,000 for our cotton, and exported \$358,000,000 of cotton goods, while we, raising the cotton, exported \$13,000,000 worth. England manufactured 6,000,000,000 yards of cotton goods, sending 1,155,000,000 to India; 279,000,000 to Turkey; 100,000,000 to Egypt; 54,000,000 to the United States—more to this country than we to all the world—178,000,000 to Brazil; we, 5,000,000 yards. She sent to all South Africa, 354,000,000; we, 53,000,000. China, in 1860, took from us 5,300,000 yards; from England, 150,000 yards. Last year we sent 11,000,000 yards to that land; England, 408,000,000. Such has been the development of trade with that country."

Now, that was a country where cotton was produced, and its manufacture was favoured by a high Protective policy. What had it done as compared with Free-trade England? Quotations without number might be found to show the injurious effects of Protection in the United States. Refutations of that policy came from many in the Republic, and he would read from an authority in St. Louis:

"Things here are dull, as usual, no signs of improvement visible to my naked eye in the business line. Land and property generally has fallen, on the average, 50 per cent. in the last four years, at the lowest calculation. The iron furnaces are closed, and other manufactures are in various stages of collapse, or non-prosperity. Not one in ten is making money. Protection, for some years, has piled up the filthy lucre in their pockets, but too many rushed in, and they are now in a most calamitous state. The manufacturers have not prospered under Protection, while the people here have been fleeced right and left, and have, in the last fifteen years, paid enough in the difference between a revenue and Protection tariff to have built all the mills in the country more than once."

Now, that gentleman's experience urged him to condemn Protection as most disastrous, ruinous, to the country. The hon. the Finance Minister had taken abun-

dant credit for Protection to what he called the shipping interest. Had he considered that question thoroughly, and did he know the effect his tariff would have on it as compared with that of the old tariff? He could not think it possible. It might be that, with the multiplicity of his duties, he had been unable to give that attention to the subject which it deserved. That interest, however, was one of the most valuable in the country, and required every reasonable encouragement and protection. But still it was not more depressed than others, and did not ask special provision. In 1874, it was called upon to pay certain duties by the tariff of that year, but he had heard no complaint of them. They were only a trifle; but the Finance Minister proposed to abolish them or impose higher duties, giving the shipbuilder, at the same time, what he called a drawback. He (Sir A. J. Smith), however, had seen no provision for a drawback in the tariff resolutions. The shipping interest was, no doubt, in a depressed condition, but considering its development in the Lower Provinces, and its circumstances as compared with other industries, he believed there was no other so prosperous. New Brunswick built, last year, 270,000 tons of shipping, and Nova Scotia 550,000 tons, which was equivalent to about \$3,000,000 thus invested. Each of those Provinces had more than a ton for every man, woman and child of its population, it being wonderful how the shipping interest in the two Provinces had kept pace, as to tonnage, with the increase of the population. The shipping had a light duty so far, but he was sure the proposed burden would strike a serious and deadly blow at it, instead of benefitting it, as the Finance Minister declared he intended. It seemed to be natural for the people of the Maritime Provinces to build ships and invest their money in enterprises connected with shipping. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), who was thoroughly acquainted with shipbuilding, stated the old duty on this trade was comparatively nothing. For a practical illustration of the effects of the new duties, let them consider the case of a vessel of 1,530 tons, classing A 1 at Lloyd's; in nine years the duties paid on her materials, under the old tariff, would reach

\$470.99, equal to about 31c. per ton, which was a mere trifle. The total cost of dutiable goods entering into her construction would be \$7,939, under the old tariff; the non-dutiable added, gave a total of \$23,208. The dutiable amounted to about \$5 a ton, and the non-dutiable to \$10. The cost of the vessel would be about \$88,000. Now, the old tax of 31c. a ton no shipbuilder complained of, all being willing to pay necessary taxation. But, in increasing it, the Finance Minister put 10 per cent. on cordage, upon which he understood there was to be no drawback.

MR. TILLEY : None.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the old duty was but 5 per cent., or \$100 for such a vessel, but the new would be \$200, and no drawback. The hon. member for Yarmouth, who knew all about shipbuilding, had condemned the drawback as anomalous, and stated it would be practically impossible to carry out that principle. The only way it could be done would be by giving a bounty of so much per ton in ships built.

In answer to Mr. DOMVILLE,

SIR A. J. SMITH said the duty on the imported goods required for a vessel of 1,500 tons would now be \$3,000, under the new tariff. Suppose he wanted iron knees, and got them from the hon. member for King's, who imported the iron and made the knees for vessels—who would get the drawback, the shipbuilder, or the person who sold him the articles?

MR. TILLEY : That depends on the arrangement between them. The shipbuilder obtains the benefit—gets the article at the lower price.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the matter was not provided for. A builder could buy iron in various places. He might buy from the hon. member for King's, for example. How was he to know? If the iron came from the Londonderry, N. S., works, would the drawback be allowed?

MR. TILLEY : No.

SIR A. J. SMITH asked was that a fair policy to the iron manufacturer at
SIR A. J. SMITH.

Londonderry, to refuse a drawback on his iron, while allowing it on imported iron? They would thus discriminate in favour of the iron-makers of foreign countries. Suppose a man could import iron, duty paid, for about the price of it at the Londonderry mines, and get a drawback of 10 per cent. on the imported, was not that an inducement to import the foreign article?

MR. TILLEY : Yes.

SIR A. J. SMITH asked was not that anomalous and a discrimination against the interests of the country in favour of the foreigner? He dared say the Finance Minister had overlooked that result, which he could hardly have intended. He would appeal to the hon. gentleman, representing, as he did, a Province deeply interested in shipbuilding, to repeal altogether that clause which would impose \$3,000 of duties on a 1,500-ton vessel. He had as much right to be heard on that question as a member of any of the manufacturers' rings they had seen at Ottawa, and who had moulded the tariff policy to suit their own interests. The increased duties would embarrass seriously the shipbuilding interest. Did the hon. gentleman say that, when the ship had gone to sea, the builder would be refunded the duties on the materials? But much time might elapse before that, so as to make the loss of interest equal the refund. And yet the hon. gentleman claimed great credit for benefitting the shipbuilders. Did it require any argument to show that this was false, or that he was striking a serious blow at the best interest of the Maritime Provinces? Let him repeal that resolution, if he wanted to get anything out of ships without injuring the trade. Why embarrass himself with this drawback clause which must inevitably lead to fraud and inconvenience, and be found absolutely impracticable? The Finance Minister ought to have consulted men like his hon. friend from Yarmouth before making such a change, and formulated the mode of returning the drawback. He had evidently no adviser he could rely on.

MR. TILLEY asked how the hon. gentleman made it out that the ship-

builder, on a 1,500-ton vessel, would have to pay \$3,000.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he had not then the details, but would furnish them. In preparing his tariff, the hon. gentleman had listened to the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, but had not consulted the interests of the great body of the people, the labouring men and farmers. Rings of manufacturers had been in Ottawa of late, and the changes they had secured in the tariff since its submission were perfectly marvellous and magical. He knew a gentleman interested in pulp, on which the Finance Minister put ten per cent.; but it did not require his attendance in Ottawa more than half an hour to secure a change to 20 per cent. That was an example of the pressure brought to bear on the hon. gentleman, and its effect. He said that, in September last, the people had pronounced in favour of this tariff. He (Sir A. J. Smith) would like to know how, or what tariff, since a great many changes had been made in it. He had excused himself for delay at first by stating he was receiving all the deputations before presenting his Budget; but he thought the hon. gentleman had had as many since as before he submitted it. Fifty changes or more had been made, and it must have been through some magical hidden power. With regard to the elections of September last, the tariff, doubtless, formed the issue in Ontario, but it did not in New Brunswick. If it was the issue there, how did he stand here without the confidence of the people of his own Province? He had only three or four of its representatives supporting him. The Finance Minister would not like to return now to St. John for re-election. He would advise him, should this tariff pass, to try and find a constituency in Ontario. The hon. gentleman had just said something about his (Mr. Smith) having to spend \$20,000 for re-election. Was he prepared to back up that statement? It was said there were enormous sums spent in St. John to secure the Finance Minister's election, and that otherwise he would not have been returned—that there had been a marvellous change, by which 45 votes against him were changed to 20 for him, in one night in one ward, and that money accounted

for the phenomenon. He had made the sugar trade one of the issues in St. John, asserting that the policy of the late Government had destroyed the refining interest. He (Sir A. J. Smith) maintained it did not. What did that interest amount to? To the refining of about 100,000,000lb. per year, which employed about 266 hands, at the expense of \$1,000,000 to the people, for the benefit of a few wealthy refiners. They knew that Redpath, of Montreal, amassed a colossal fortune in this business; that they had now resumed refining, after having discontinued it, the papers saying they were going to employ 300 men. He would read an extract from a work, to show how comparatively unimportant an industry this was. He was amazed to hear hon. gentlemen make the statement they did—it was evident they did not understand the question—that sugar refining was going to encourage a very large trade with the West Indies. Why, any man, almost, in Montreal, knew that they could not do a large direct trade with the West Indies, on account of physical difficulties and natural obstacles, the St. Lawrence being closed five months in the year. The West Indian crop came in January and February. But if the whole quantity used in Canada were brought hither in Canadian vessels, it would only employ 40 of 1,000 tons each, the consumption being 55,000 tons. Vessels of 1,000 tons could carry 1,500 tons dead weight.

MR. DOMVILLE: Why does the hon. gentleman not take into account the molasses?

SIR A. J. SMITH said he was speaking of the refining only.

MR. DOMVILLE: That is not a fair calculation. The hon. gentleman knows they do not employ vessels of that kind in the trade.

SIR A. J. SMITH said, suppose they included molasses, and admitted that 80 vessels of 1,000 tons each would be employed—what did that amount to? They could not conceive that the carrying of 40,000 tons of merchandise would prove of great consequence to Canadian trade. Some supposed that if a sugar refinery were established in Montreal, the sugar would be carried thither in

English bottoms, whereas none of the vessels would come by the St. Lawrence, as the sugar crop was carried to Canada in winter. Their Canadian vessels went out for it in November and December. Nothing was clearer than that the sugar used at Redpath's refinery in Montreal, would come in by Portland, being carried to that port by, perhaps, Canadian, or as likely by Danish or other foreign vessels, as there was no monopoly. A large portion of the sugar imported now was carried by Canadian vessels to New York and Boston.

"Recent English trade tables show that the entire amount of sugar refined in the three kingdoms, in 1875, was 1,821,647,632 lbs., giving employment to 5,174 persons. In Canada, we consume 94,000,000 lbs. annually, and, if this whole amount was refined in the Dominion, it would give employment to 266 persons; computing according to the ratio of labour to production, as shown by the English returns."

Now, the facts set forth in that extract, as to the smallness of the number of those employed in refining all the sugar Canada needed could easily be verified by the Minister of Finance. Three hundred were all that would be necessary. Was it worth while—would it help the labouring classes to take \$1,000,000 out of their pockets for the purpose of employing but 300 persons, and increasing the already enormous fortunes of the few sugar refiners? The whole Dominion was not interested in that small industry. The people wanted cheap sugar, which the hon. gentlemen seemed determined they should not have. The drawback paid the American refiners on sugar exported to Canada must inure to the benefit of its people. But the Finance Minister would not allow that to continue; he said, practically, we want to swell the fortunes of the Montreal refiners at the expense of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman from Cardwell had read several extracts from speeches made by leading statesmen in England, to show that the bounties given by France on sugar were injurious to the interests of England, or would prove injurious ultimately; but they all admitted that the effect was to make sugar cheaper in England. It was said here that sugar would not be cheaper under this

SIR A. J. SMITH.

system than it would be under this new tariff, but all the speeches quoted were to the effect that the bounty system made sugar cheaper. His hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as well as his hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Gunn), had dealt most effectively with this subject. They seemed to understand what they were talking about, and, therefore, he would not go further into the matter. It was now said they must import their tea direct from China. He (Sir A. J. Smith) would assert that this was impossible. We could not shut our eyes to the fact that the United States lay to the south of us. We had only two ports—St. John and Halifax—open in the winter, every other port of the Dominion being closed during that season. How, then, could we trade with these distant countries? His hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) knew well that they could not navigate the St. Lawrence during the winter months, and that they could not do direct trade from the St. Lawrence ports with these distant countries. The voyage of a vessel would vary from 30 to 60 days, and, when she arrived at the mouth of the St. Lawrence in winter, she had to seek some other open port. We should mould our policy with due regard to the conditions of our country. The United States had the advantage of us in that respect. Every port there was open in the winter months, and why was it in the interests of the people of this country that two or three men in Montreal, or other cities, should have a monopoly of the tea trade? Was it not desirable to buy tea where we could get it the cheapest? When he looked at the condition of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, he saw that a great and serious injury would be inflicted by the passage of this resolution, which imposed a duty of 10 per cent. on tea imported from the United States. They sent vessels from the western coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, laden with the products of the country, potatoes, apples and fish, even fresh fish, to the United States, and they had tea brought back. The small trader in Nova Scotia would send apples or potatoes, and would get a return cargo of sugar, tea, or other things required for a country store. Were they going to prevent his doing

his legitimate business, by saying he must buy from Montreal, which had monopolised the tea business? It was said that an importer could buy in England, and get tea in bond through the United States, and bring it to Montreal in bond, and pay the duty in this country. Would they allow this rich man, this wholesale dealer, who was doing a large business, to import his tea through the United States, in bond, and then tell the poorer people and small traders that they should not buy anywhere else? Why had not the trader, who went to Boston, or New York, a right to buy in bond, and take his tea home, if it would advance the interests of his business? It seemed to him that this provision was entirely in the interest of two or three men, who wanted a complete monopoly of the tea trade of the country. No Canadian would bring his tea direct from China. He would bring it into the United States and pass it through that country in bond, and that man would have 10 per cent. advantage over another who bought his tea in the United States, or anywhere else. He trusted the Finance Minister would give this matter his consideration, in order to see if he could not change it. It was no reason, because the suggestion came from the Opposition, that it should not be considered, as the provision was detrimental to the interests of the country. Now he came to the consideration of the lumber interest. This was confessedly one of the most important interests in this country, next to the farming interest. He would ask the Finance Minister where there was any Protection for the lumbermen. The lumbering interest was as much depressed as any interest in this country, and probably more. Unless some change took place, lumbermen must break down, and fail. Unless freights were low, it would be impossible to ship lumber at all, but the manufacturers of lumber did not get more than enough to pay for the labour, and the lumber itself was practically given away. They were giving a drawback to the shipping interest, which was as prosperous as the lumber interest, because ships went to every part of the world wherever they heard of prosperity. A ship was not confined to any country. She went abroad, and her flag floated on

every sea. It was very different with the lumber interest. While the hon. gentleman was desirous of protecting the shipping interest—although he (Sir A. J. Smith) did not think any change was required; it ought not to complain, and the duty now was very trifling—they should not discriminate against and destroy the lumber interests. The latter gave employment to more men than the shipping interest did, and should have some protection. What protection had it? His hon. friend from Queen's county (Mr. King), than whom no one was more competent to make a calculation, had reckoned the very serious additional tax which this tariff would place on lumber. He (Sir A. J. Smith) could see no compensating advantages for this additional duty, which was struck at this important duty. There was nothing in the tariff which did not strike at the lumber interest. Lumbermen would have to cease their operations in consequence of this tariff, in which there were elements of destruction and decay of that industry which could not possibly be avoided. He had already stated that the Finance Minister had turned his back upon his own Province. His predictions had certainly been falsified. He had stated that a taxation of \$2.75 per head was all that would be required for twenty-five years. His hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Burpee) had prepared with great skill a statement showing the effect of this tariff on the commerce of this country, showing that, if the importations were the same as those of last year, this tariff would increase the burdens of the people to the extent of \$7,000,000 a year. He (Sir A. J. Smith) had not heard that statement challenged. He thought, therefore, it was fair to assume it was true; if not, he thought the Finance Minister would have challenged it before this.

MR. TILLEY: We will challenge it. There is plenty of time.

SIR A. J. SMITH: You are slow about it.

MR. TILLEY: I am not as slow as you. I have spoken twice, and this is your first speech.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he had been in hopes of getting light from the hon. gen-

tleman ; but his first speech, instead of throwing light, seemed to throw darkness. The hon. gentleman had not thrown a great deal of light on the subject. He had not told the House, as he ought to have told them, how much money this tariff would realise.

MR. TILLEY : Yes.

SIR A. J. SMITH : How much ?

MR. TILLEY : \$2,100,000.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that was what was estimated to get into the revenue ; but the hon. gentleman had not told the House how much it would take out of the people. The statements of his hon. friend from St. John had remained unchallenged, that the burdens on the people would amount to \$7,000,000. They would accept the statement of the Finance Minister, that the operation of this tariff would put into the Treasury \$2,100,000. That, then, would leave a balance of \$4,900,000 to go into the hands of manufacturers. That would be the logical conclusion. He now desired to show the effect which this tariff would have on New Brunswick, because, though he owned they ought not to be governed by sectional feeling—

MR. TILLEY : Hear, hear.

SIR A. J. SMITH said, still, he would ask, did the Finance Minister want him, as a representative of New Brunswick, to consent to a tariff which discriminated against her own people. It was the duty of the representatives from the Province to endeavour to protect the interests of the Province. This tariff did operate injuriously to New Brunswick, and discriminated against that Province. The Finance Minister seemed to have shut his eyes to the true interests of New Brunswick. The amount of Customs duties collected in New Brunswick, last year, amounted to \$1,448,000, which was equal to about \$5 per head.

MR. TILLEY : Was it not more than that last year ? There was \$400,000, or \$500,000 from the St. John fire.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that no doubt the fire had made the amount rather abnormal, but the normal condition, under the late tariff, would be about \$1,448,000.

SIR A. J. SMITH.

MR. TILLEY : No.

SIR A. J. SMITH said this would be equal to about \$5 per head. Then the amount received from excise was \$261,000, and from stamps \$14,000, or about \$1 per head, making a total of about \$6 per head of the population. That was about the same amount as existed when the Finance Minister left office in 1873. He had admitted that the late Finance Minister was correct in his calculations as to the shrinkage in values.

MR. TILLEY : The average of Custom and Excise for 1876-77, was \$1,321,464.

SIR A. J. SMITH : What was it last year ?

MR. TILLEY : Last year was the year of the fire.

SIR A. J. SMITH : But the hon. member said the whole amount of taxation would be only \$2.75 *per capita*.

MR. TILLEY : Yes, I remember that.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the hon. gentleman had exceeded that in any case. The least increased cost under the present tariff, exclusive of the tax on coal and flour, would be \$806,000. He would like to know if the Finance Minister was prepared to controvert these figures ? Suppose the price of coal and flour was not augmented, there would still be an additional cost to the Province of New Brunswick. The population of New Brunswick being about 300,000, this would amount to upwards of \$3 per head under the new tariff.

MR. TILLEY : Hear, hear.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he would like the Finance Minister to controvert that if he could. If the importations were the same as those of last year, the increase would be \$3 per head, making the total taxation from \$8 to \$9 per head on the population of New Brunswick. That was a matter which deserved the most careful consideration of the Government. He (Sir A. J. Smith) felt it his duty to protest, on behalf of the people of New Brunswick, against this tariff, as specially injurious to them. He

believed it would be an incubus on the whole Dominion. He believed it would be inimical to the interests of the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen deprecated sectionalism, though, he thought, they ought to regard the interests of the different Provinces in preparing a tariff. They were not to prepare a tariff for the interests of Ontario, if they were inimical to those of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. He considered they must have regard to the interests of the whole Dominion, because there were great diversities of climate, soil and resources. There were great geographical differences, which made it necessary to consider the interests of various portions of the Dominion. He believed this tariff would have the effect of disturbing the domestic harmony which existed between the different Provinces, and which it was most desirable to promote as far as possible. If they created a bad feeling in one Province, it must injuriously affect the interests of the whole Dominion. More than that, though the idea seemed to be scoffed at by the other side, he believed the tendency of the tariff would be to alienate and estrange, commercially and politically, this country from the Mother Country. They knew what the policy of the Empire was. They saw from the tone of the papers, the various indications in the press of England, that much dissatisfaction was felt towards this Government and the people, by the recent imposition of this policy. These resolutions provided that the United States, whenever they showed a disposition to reciprocate, on certain articles mentioned in the free list—and he might remark that he thought the article of free-stone should be included in that list—might do so. They had not made any provision in regard to England. England now received these goods free, but no consideration had been shown for England. It was true we had a right to regulate our own fiscal affairs, and it did not seem to be disputed in England, that we had a right to adopt such a course as would best protect our interests. But it seemed to him only fair that, as an integral part of the Empire, we should have some regard for, and consult, as far as was consistent with our own interests, the policy of the Empire. They knew that the feeling of England was against

this tariff. Why should we discriminate against England? Would the Finance Minister say that this tariff did not discriminate against England?

MR. TILLEY: Yes, I do.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the statistics showed that, while this tariff averaged 7 per cent. on our whole imports from the United States, it averaged 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. on English goods. The hon. gentleman included in his estimate \$14,000,000 of grains and flour exported, which simply passed through Canada *in transitu*. His impression was, in conclusion, that the effect of the tariff would tend to bring about ultimately a separation between the two countries.

MR. TILLEY said he found, by the arrangement made, that the House was to adjourn at six o'clock, but he could not allow this matter to pass without making some remarks before adjournment. His hon. friend referred to the fact that he expected him (Mr. Tilley) to refute some statements as to the operation of the tariff, especially in the Province of New Brunswick. He purposed doing that on the next opportunity, but he could not allow this to pass without promptly, and at once, meeting some of the statements made by his hon. friend which were of a personal character. And first, with reference to his appointment as Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. That appointment, the hon. gentleman said, was of a questionable character, and one of which he could not approve. A year ago, or more, statements were made by members of this House relative to that appointment, which put the matter unfairly and unjustly before the country with reference to his (Mr. Tilley's) position; and he had applied to the then Governor-General to relieve him of his oath of office, so far as it related to that matter, so that he might, at the first fitting opportunity, meet the accusations made. That consent he had obtained, and he was here to state exactly what took place. On his arrival in Halifax in 1873 from England, where he had been to negotiate a loan, he received a telegram from the leader of the Government, urging him to come to Ottawa at once without delay, and by express, if necessary. There were circum-

stances of a domestic character which detained him. A daughter of his was to be married, at St. Andrew's, on the Tuesday, and he said he would go to St. Andrew's on the Tuesday evening, would then take express, and be at Ottawa as soon as possible. On the Thursday afternoon, on his arrival at Ottawa, he found that Parliament had assembled, and had adjourned until the Monday following. He proceeded at once to the Privy Council Chamber, and there found his colleagues in session; and, after congratulations on his return, and reference to the negotiations which he had concluded, the leader of the Government said: "We were very near making you Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick in your absence." Before his departure for England, the leader of the Government, Mr. Mitchell and himself had talked about a gentleman who was to be nominated to the Lieutenant-Governorship of New Brunswick, as likely to be acceptable. He (Mr. Tilley) was not the person nominated, and was not referred to at all in the matter, and the leader of the Government said: "The appointment will not be made till you return, and can stand until then." The morning after his return he waited on the Governor-General, and, after giving him a report of the result of his mission, he (Mr. Tilley) referred to the fact that, in his absence, his colleagues had recommended his appointment as Lieutenant-Governor, and added: "Your Excellency, the circumstances which led to the recommendation no longer existing, I have no intention whatever of accepting that position." That was the language used by him, distinctly and unreservedly.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Did that destroy the Order in Council?

MR. TILLEY said he hoped the hon. gentleman would preserve his soul in patience. He (Sir A. J. Smith) had said that he (Mr. Tilley) had made a speech in the House on the 5th of November, when he said he would go down with the Government. He did not make the speech on that day. That was the day on which the leader of the Government announced that the Ministry had resigned. A few days before, however, he did make such a speech, and when the proposition came up in Council before

MR. TILLEY.

that, in reference to the appointment of a Lieutenant-Governor, he (Mr. Tilley), with a majority of the Council, took ground against that appointment being made, and, when he made the speech, he had no expectation—nothing to justify him in expecting that he would be appointed if the Government were defeated. He made that speech, believing he would go down with them.

SIR A. J. SMITH: There is no other Order in Council.

MR. TILLEY said never mind about the Order in Council; that was made on the 22nd of October, when he was not here. On the morning of the 6th November, the leader of the Government came into the Council and said he had been in communication with the Governor-General, in reference to the appointment of Lieutenant-Governors, and that His Excellency had said that it was customary in England, on the retirement of a Ministry, to make appointments to fill vacancies, and he was prepared to take the Premier's recommendation in reference to the Lieutenant-Governors. And then, for the first time, it was proposed by Sir John A. Macdonald, in his presence, that he (Mr. Tilley) should be appointed, and for reasons stated, and he was amazed. His family were amazed at the offer being made, as no such appointment had been anticipated. Was it likely that, if he had anticipated anything of the kind, he would have brought his family here a week after the appointment was said to have been made? His hon. friend from Westmoreland had suggested to him that he would like him to take the position. He (Mr. Tilley) suggested to him that he should take the Governorship, but the hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith) had advised him to take it, and had said that his appointment would be most acceptable to the people of the Province of New Brunswick.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I stated that I was very glad to see the Finance Minister Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick and that, had he not been appointed, I would have felt pleasure in recommending the appointment.

MR. TILLEY: Yes; and, in the city of St. John, at a public dinner,

tendered by his old constituents, he congratulated him (Mr. Tilley), and said he only regretted he had not the privilege of nominating him. If he (Mr. Tilley) had been guilty of any dishonourable act, would his hon. friend have expressed regret that he had not had the honour of appointing him? He (Mr. Tilley) said here, as a man having some reputation for veracity, that he was not aware of the matter until the morning of the 6th November, when it was proposed by his right hon. friend that, on account of his long services to his Province and the Dominion, the Government should confer on him this mark of recognition, feeling satisfied the appointment would be acceptable to the country and the Province of New Brunswick. The proposition was made to the Governor-General, who expressed his willingness to make the appointment. He would appeal to his hon. friend to say whether this statement was true or not. Notwithstanding that, the hon. member for Charlotte, when speaking of flattery being dumped by cartloads on him (Mr. Tilley) as Finance Minister, repeated the charge, but it did not affect him any more than did the false assertions made against him during the past thirty years, as a public man, and which had fallen harmless at his feet, because they had no foundation in truth. What did he find here? Even the home organ of the leader of the Opposition, the *Sarnia Observer*, stated, a few days since, and the statements were copied in the *Free Press*, of this city:

"So it appears that Mr. Tilley, the immaculate, not only sat and voted in Parliament after he had been appointed Lieutenant-Governor, but drew pay for both services; that is, he drew his salary and indemnity as a Minister of the Crown and a member of Parliament up to the 5th November, and he drew salary as Lieutenant-Governor, at \$50 per day, from the date of his appointment, 22nd October. It was only fourteen days, of course, but it netted the snug little sum of \$700. We fear there is a good deal of the 'Heathen Chinese' about Mr. Tilley's child-like innocence."

Here was an assertion that he gave a vote after accepting the position, which he utterly denied, and received payment in a double capacity. The appointment was offered to him the morning of the 6th. He took time to consider it. He did not dream of the appointment. In

1872, the leader of the Government offered him the Governorship of British Columbia, when he (Mr. Tilley) explained the difficulties in the way, and said he had no ambition in that direction. It was after the leader of the Government had been in communication with His Excellency the Governor-General, on the morning of the 6th November, that he made this offer, which he (Mr. Tilley) accepted, and he thanked his hon. friend for saying that, in his capacity as Lieutenant-Governor, he had discharged his duties satisfactorily, and that everything went on smoothly. He (Sir A. J. Smith) said the way in which he (Mr. Tilley) entered the Government House was unfortunate, and the way in which he left it was equally unfortunate; that he had attended a public meeting while he was Lieutenant-Governor, and made a violent party speech.

SIR A. J. SMITH: The papers said so.

MR. TILLEY said the statement was not true. He had occasion to visit St. John on business frequently, as he had been entrusted with the Mayor of the city and the President of the Chamber of Commerce, with the distribution of the money contributed by Liverpool and London, and other cities, to alleviate the distress in St. John after the fire. At the ferry floats on the west side of the city, he met two gentlemen on one of those visits, who said they were a deputation appointed to wait on him with a requisition to accept a nomination as candidate for the city. They asked him where he would meet them, and he invited them to accompany him to the hotel where he was going at the time. When they came there, they said that several of the gentlemen who had signed that requisition wished to be present, that his room in the hotel was hardly large enough, and proposed that they should go to a room in Prince William-street. They there read the requisition, and he replied that, while he had no desire to re-enter public life, still, when a requisition—signed by over a thousand of the electors of St. John, many of them his old supporters, but some of them who had been his opponents for a lifetime—was made him, he did not feel himself at liberty to decline; but, he said to them: You see the posi-

tion in which I am placed, that I am still Lieutenant-Governor; you cannot expect me to make any remarks, and, until I shall have communicated with the Governor-General, I must refrain from offering any remarks. He then withdrew from the meeting, without having said a single word with reference to the late Administration, or upon any public question whatever. He then communicated with the Governor-General. Some little delay took place owing to the Governor-General being down the Saguenay, but, on his return to Quebec, he immediately wrote him accepting his resignation. It was all important that he (Mr. Tilley) should have then entered the contest, but he held himself perfectly aloof until he had the acceptance of his resignation from the Governor-General. Then he did enter into the contest. Never had he been in a contest in any election he had ever run which was more consistent with the laws of the land than that election, and, in obtaining nine of a majority, it was in spite of all the influences of the Government that could be brought to bear to defeat him. Even the leader of the Opposition and the late Minister of Finance came down to accomplish the work, but failed.

MR. MACKENZIE: You do not object to that?

MR. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman had referred to the speech which he made in the Mechanics' Institute, when he (Mr. Tilley) referred to the fact that he might have remained in Government House, and received the \$45,000 for the five years, but he declined to do that, and accepted the nomination. Now, the hon. gentleman said that he (Mr. Tilley) had no justification for making that statement.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I do not know of any myself.

MR. TILLEY said all he could say, in the first place, was that a gentleman, a Senator, a friend of the Government, in intimate accord with them, and a brother-in-law of a member of the Government, came to him and stated most distinctly and emphatically, that it was only necessary, and he gave him to understand that he had authority

for saying so, for him (Mr. Tilley) to say he would accept the position for another term, and it would be formally offered him for another five years. He need not refer, because it would only destroy, perhaps, the effect of what he was going to say, to the various rumours spread by members of the House of Representatives for the Province, that he was to be offered another term, and Mr. King was to be offered a judgeship, and, by getting them out of the way, New Brunswick would be safe to the Government. He (Mr. Tilley) stated to the gentleman who made this proposal, that he admitted the position he occupied was a great relief to him from the cares and anxieties of public life, after a quarter of a century's anxious turmoil and labour, he believed in the interests of the country, though there were times when the country was against him; but, as it had been then, so it would be now. Those who opposed this tariff now would twelve months hence be in favour of it, as they had been opposed to Confederation in 1864, but afterwards agreed to it. If they went to the election in another twelve months, they would find that, with all the interests benefitted, the country would rise up and declare for this policy, and instead of there being five New Brunswick supporters of the Government, he doubted whether there would be five altogether in opposition to it. He said to the gentleman referred to, that he had enjoyed this position very much, that he was now sixty years of age, and had no desire to re-enter public life, but there were these difficulties. Were he in perfect accord with the Government, did he believe in their policy, he could not be charged with accepting the position for the purpose of closing his mouth. More than that, he wanted to be free. His policy had been arraigned by his successor throughout the length and breadth of the land, his position as a Lieutenant-Governor had been misrepresented, and, though he did not desire to enter Parliament, he wished to be a free man that he might go over his Province and instruct the people in what he considered to be their interest. He wanted to be free to defend the true policy and interest of the country. He was surprised at the statement made by the hon.

MR. TILLEY.

member for Westmoreland at a picnic meeting held at Salisbury, in reference to the Governorship, that he (Mr. Tilley) had betrayed confidence in giving publicity to a private communication in the statement he had made. He made no reference to that communication whatever, and, the hon. member having referred to a part of that letter, if he would take off the seal of secrecy on the balance of it, he (Mr. Tilley) could more clearly put his position before the country to-day.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I am satisfied to take it off. Let us see the letters.

MR. TILLEY said he had not the letters, but the hon. gentleman would not deny the statement he was going to make. The hon. member wrote him (Mr. Tilley) that he was anxious to see him, and intended calling at Fredericton, had he not been detained at the Fishery Commission in Halifax, and that he wished to know his views.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Had you not better wait and get the letter?

MR. TILLEY: The hon. member wanted to know, in that letter, what were my views in reference to a second term. He said he believed that my appointment would be acceptable to the people generally.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I did.

MR. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman, after referring to some domestic matters on this subject, said "Do not answer me unless you desire to do so, but it is important before Christmas that I should know what your views are on the subject. Write me before that time, if you write at all. He did not write an answer until the gentleman to whom he previously referred came to him at his house a few days before Christmas. He told him that he had made up his mind he could not accept the position. He then sat down, and in almost the same language which he used at the meeting,—perhaps that was the reason the hon. gentleman supposed he had referred to his communication,—he wrote to the hon. gentleman, declining the offer. But the hon. gentleman went further in his let-

ter. He spoke about the chances of the election, that Quebec would certainly be carried in favour of the then Administration. He then pointed out how anxious he would be to have him (Mr. Tilley) as a colleague and a supporter; that it would not be long before he (Mr. Tilley) would be in the Ministry, because the Liberal party would be sustained. Further than that, Mr. James Dunn, as respectable a man as lived in this Dominion, asked him for an interview, which he (Mr. Tilley) gave him. He said he had been in communication with the Ministers of Customs and Marine and Fisheries, when recently at Ottawa, and told him, as a friend, that he was anxious he should remain where he was, that there would be a hard fight, and money spent against him, and that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Hon. Mr. Burpee had authorised him to come to him (Mr. Tilley), and say that, if he would accept a second term, they would be glad to give it to him. He called the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact after he had made the picnic speech, and, in his letters in answer, he said that he had had some communication with Mr. Dunn, but that it was confidential.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Read the letter.

MR. TILLEY said, with all these statements, he declined to accept the position, and gave both gentlemen his answer. He thought he was sufficiently justified, under these circumstances, in saying that, if he had desired to remain in that position for another five years, he could have done so. It was said by the hon. member for Northumberland that this was said to be his (Mr. Tilley's) last effort. Did he understand him to say it was the last Parliamentary effort he should make. If it was, he felt confident that not only would it retain the support of the present Parliament, but of the country throughout. His hon. friend said no doubt he had letters from his constituency against his policy. He had not received three letters against it. He found, from one end of the Dominion to the other, an uprising of the people in its favour and a restoration of confidence. They might take up the public press, on both sides, and they would find that everywhere new industries were grow-

ing up, and new energy, life and vitality being manifested. If it should be his last act, he felt the people would sustain him and say it was worthy of a life-long devotion to this country, because it produced the most beneficial results. He proposed going on to show why he believed that, to show why the fears that had been entertained here with reference to his own Province, and the effect of this tariff, were groundless, and that the statements in reference to the effect of the Union of his Province with this Confederation, had no foundation; though he might be open to the same imputation as in 1872, when there were men who said "That is the man you want to have as a representative of New Brunswick, who tells the people the Province has more than justice, and thus deprives himself of demanding further amounts from the Dominion." When he undertook to vindicate his character, no doubt the same line of argument would be adopted now as was adopted then; but he would risk it, because his colleagues would not deny to New Brunswick a single thing that she was honestly entitled to.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Mr. Speaker—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Adjourn.

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

Several HON. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

Motion for the adjournment of the House (Sir John A. Macdonald), with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he had removed the seal of secrecy from the letter which he had written to the hon. the Minister of Finance, on the condition that the hon. gentleman should produce the letter, but the hon. gentleman, instead of consenting to that proposition, went on to give his own version of it. This was all he (Sir A. J. Smith) wanted to say on that point. He had not consented to the hon. gentleman giving his own version of the

MR. TILLEY.

letter, and it was only fair and reasonable that the letter should be produced. Mr. Dunn, who had been referred to by the hon. the Minister of Finance, was a very respectable resident of St. John, whom he recollected having been in his office. He believed that Mr. Burpee was also present. Mr. Dunn was, and had always been, a strong personal friend of the hon. the Finance Minister, and had himself introduced the subject. He seemed extremely anxious that the hon. the Finance Minister should be re-appointed to the position of Lieutenant-Governor, and took a great interest in the matter, but certainly he had never been authorised to state to the hon. gentleman that he could have the re-appointment. They could not distribute patronage in this way. Mr. Dunn might have inferred, he did not deny, from the conversation which then passed between them, that, if Mr. Tilley expressed a wish to be re-appointed, the Government might consider it, and might do so favourably. This was his recollection of the matter. Mr. Dunn had broached the subject, and had expressed a great deal of interest in seeing Mr. Tilley continue in the position he occupied at the time, as he administered the affairs of the Province to the entire satisfaction of the people. That was his recollection of the conversation, and he thought Mr. Dunn would confirm what he (Sir A. J. Smith) said in regard to it. He had no authority for making any such communication, and the House would see that it could not be done. They could not distribute patronage in such a way. Such a communication could only come through the First Minister, and not otherwise. This was the whole of the conversation, according to his recollection.

MR. TILLEY said he did not understand that the hon. gentleman had made any condition. He recollected that the hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith) had asked him, in the letter referred to, to destroy the correspondence, but he did not think he had done so. He would search for the correspondence, and, if he found it, would be very happy to submit it. It was true that Mr. Dunn was a personal friend, but he was opposed to him politically during the late election. Mr. Dunn had come to him, and the

proposition was unsought on his (Mr. Tilley's) part. Some time after he had written his answer to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith), Mr. Dunn came to him, speaking as if he had been deputed with authority, and everything of that kind. There was no hesitation or reservation whatever, in reference to the authority he had; but the matter did not depend on that point. He would search among his correspondence, and he thought that he might find the letter, which, if found, he would be very happy to submit.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he thought that he had made in the letter a statement which would not be denied by the Finance Minister as to the contents of the letter. He had stated that he had no authority from Mr. Mackenzie or any other person to write it.

MR. TILLEY: You said so with respect to Mr. Mackenzie.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he thought he had stated distinctly that nobody knew what he had written.

MR. TILLEY: No.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he thought he stated also that he desired to aid Mr. Tilley in reference to a domestic matter, which it was not necessary to refer to. He stated also that, unless he (Mr. Tilley) signified it was his desire to have a second term, he should treat the matter as never having been written.

MR. TILLEY: That is it.

SIR A. J. SMITH said it was written under the strictest injunctions to secrecy and confidence on these two points. He thought he had a copy of the correspondence at home. He had no authority whatever to write, but wrote on his own responsibility. He made no offer to him (Mr. Tilley) whatever. He only desired to know what his wishes were in regard to the second appointment, and, if he did not desire the second appointment, he was to destroy the correspondence. He thought he stated that the hon. gentleman was on the wrong side of politics.

MR. TILLEY: That is quite true.

MR. TILLEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Tea minutes after
Eight o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 15th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS BILL.

[BILL 67.]

(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

Resolutions on the subject of Census and Statistics, reported from Committee of the Whole (March 27th), read the second time and agreed to, and referred to Committee of the Whole on Bill 67.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill (No. 67).

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked in what respect this Bill differed from the Bill of 1869-70.

MR. POPE (Compton) said that no alterations had been made in regard to the taking of the census. The Bill had been extended by the addition of several clauses relating to the collection of vital and other statistics.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked why the Government asked for power to proceed with this work two years in advance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, ten years ago, when the last measure was passed, Mr. Dunkin was Minister of Justice. They found that, between the time that Act was passed and the opening of 1871, when it was put in operation, it was a very hurried and complicated matter making

the necessary preparations. Then, everything having to be done in a hurry, it was found it entailed additional expense. It was supposed that the Department of Agriculture, with the experience they had had, by taking plenty of time, with the assistance of two or three additional clerks, would be able to prepare the schedules and forms so as to have them all ready to start next spring. This measure would not entail much additional expense, because, if the hon. gentleman would look at the Estimates, he would find that they only asked for \$5,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he would suggest that the details of the measure should be submitted to the House next spring, because some hon. members might be able to make some very valuable suggestions in regard to it.

MR. POPE (Compton), said that that was their intention, as they desired to have the most complete census that could be obtained. There was a difference between taking the census in this country and England; there they had a trained statistical staff composed of permanent officers. The Registrar-General had charge of it. There were 672 superintendents, and 2,197 permanent officers. These people understood their business, and were looking continually at the statistical branch. We had nothing of the kind here, almost every officer we appointed had to be educated to his work, and it was for the purpose of educating the staff for this work that the Bill had been introduced this Session.

MR. MILLS said, from the statement of the First Minister, it appeared that legislation was not absolutely necessary this Session, and that the Minister of Agriculture would be prepared to submit a better measure, if he took more time to consider what should be done. There was no necessary connection between the measure now before the House, and the objects aimed at as stated by the hon. the First Minister.

Section agreed to.

On section 29,

MR. ANGLIN said this clause authorised the Government to establish a new

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

system for the collection of vital, criminal and other statistics. Such a measure had often been proposed in previous years, but the House had always refused to adopt it. He understood this clause to authorise the Government to establish a permanent system of collecting vital, criminal and other statistics at all times. He desired that the House should be put in possession of fuller information as to the scope of this clause, and the probable cost it would involve.

MR. MILLS said this measure was an entirely different thing from the ordinary provisions for taking the census. He desired to know more particularly what the Government aimed at, what kind of machinery they intended to employ, the duties of the officers, and the probable cost. The House ought not to abdicate its functions altogether in this matter, and transfer them to the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. member for Gloucester was scarcely correct in stating that this House had refused to deal with this question on former occasions. The subject had been discussed from time to time, but there had never been a vote upon it. There had always been a common accord that it was very desirable to have some improvement in our collection of statistics. The Union Act relegated this subject to the Dominion Parliament, and difficulties had arisen in the consideration of this subject, from the fact that in some Provinces organisations, more or less perfect, existed, having the same object in view. Clause 28 of this Bill provided for utilising any such organisation or system as far as might be by co-operation between the two Governments. This was but a tentative measure. It was not proposed to put it at once into operation; but it provided for the means of taking up the question and maturing it. No action could be taken until a vote of money was made for the purpose. No new powers were conferred on the Department of Agriculture. But, inasmuch as they were obliged to have an elaborate scheme for taking the ordinary census, it was thought desirable to engraft upon it whatever other means might exist, in order to enlarge the amount of information in connection with the country's statistics.

MR. ANGLIN said he found, by this clause, that they were providing for the establishment of a permanent bureau of statistics, with all the necessary officers, and that without knowing what was likely to be the extent of the machinery or the cost. It had always been urged against a measure of this kind that it would cost a great deal more than the statistics would be worth. The attempt to establish this bureau should not be made by attaching a few clauses to a Bill of an entirely different character. He observed that subsequent clauses provided for the appointment of officers for this extra work. This was a matter of such importance that the House ought to pause before passing this Bill. The House should not be asked to pass a measure of this kind, and in such a way, without such ample information as it was possible for the Minister to procure as to the probable extent of the work, and its cost.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was generally agreed that it was very desirable to have some statistical information on many subjects oftener than once in ten years. As a full set of officers and machinery would have to be provided for taking the census of 1881, the Government thought it was a proper time to utilise the same officers in collecting vital, criminal, and other statistics for that year. The same machinery would do at a less expense than by any separate and distinct procedure in the way of collecting this kind of statistics; the same body of men would be available at very little additional cost. The body of statistics in 1881 would form the basis of a complete census. They would start from that point, and then Parliament, year after year, would grant such sums of money as might be necessary, in order to continue the collection of those statistics. Statistics, to be of any real value, should be collected annually. This matter would be completely under the control of the House hereafter.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he agreed that it was very desirable to obtain such statistics as had been referred to; but he saw, on examining the latter clauses of the Bill, that it virtually created a bureau of statistics, which should collect information every year, and

certainly clauses 25, 26 and 31 gave full power, apparently, and made it the duty of the Minister to establish a bureau of statistics. All they wanted to know was the probable extent and cost of that service. No one could deny its importance, which he had never heard anybody gainsay. But, heretofore, they had always experienced the conviction that apart from certain constitutional difficulties in the way of this work, it would involve an additional expenditure of, perhaps, \$200,000 or \$300,000. Now, it was not desirable they should obtain statistics unless they were reasonably accurate. He would like to know from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture if he had calculated, not what the expense would be in the first instance, but what it might be annually.

MR. POPE (Compton) said he had, at one time, gone into the subject fully, and considered the cost of those statistics. But the Bill before the House enabled the Government to enter into an arrangement with Provinces, individuals, or corporations, for the obtainment of such information.

AN HON. MEMBER: It goes beyond that.

MR. POPE said he did not expect this Bill to prove a final and satisfactory measure. But he did think it important that, in taking the census, they should have power to utilize those agencies, if thought best. They might receive power to collect statistics, Ministers having to come down to the House for a vote, when all information could be given as to the object and probable expense. He hoped the work would be done for much less than some supposed. The importance of correct information, with regard to the resources and important interests of the country, could not be over-estimated. This was nothing more or less than national stock-taking, and giving information that every man in and out of the country ought to have, with respect to the public health, and every matter affecting the public interest. He now, however, only asked power, should it be thought advisable, after the House was prorogued, to make such arrangements with corporations and Provinces as was contemplated. This

measure was intended as the commencement of a system of correct statistics.

MR. HOLTON said it was quite obvious that this subject was before the House for the first time, and, considering its importance, he thought it would be a mistake to pass those clauses through the Committee of the Whole that day. He thought they had better have a little time to consider those clauses in a full House, after they had received some attention. It was proposed to create a new Department.

MR. ANGLIN said that it was proposed to take power to make regulations, appoint officers, and confer the amplest powers on them for the objects in view. They really did not know how much power they should be conferring, which fact was a strong objection to a measure of that kind. He was very much opposed to clothing the Governor in Council with power of legislation in the extraordinary way now proposed. They had had too much of that already. They ought to define and limit such powers strictly and clearly in all cases. This Bill being new, they should have time to give it the consideration to which it was entitled. They were asked to pass a Bill, that, in a few clauses, would enable the Governor in Council, to create a system with regard to which the House had the very vaguest idea. If the hon. the Minister of Agriculture had but a few simple objects in view, let him express them in the simplest language, and hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side would meet him in a frank and liberal spirit.

MR. CARTWRIGHT called attention to clause 33, prescribing a penalty of \$200 for a breach of the Act. There was scarcely any conceivable subject of investigation, which would not come under the head of some special statistical investigation, and, although he did not think the powers of the Bill would be much abused, still such circumstance was possible. The Government knew that to ask for information respecting certain businesses and trades of private importance would affect the liberty of the subject; and, under this Bill, all manner of investigations could be ordered, and heavy penalties inflicted, simply by Order of the Governor in Council, in

any case of disobedience. That power, although granted under special cases, was one about which Parliament ought to be very jealous. He hoped the Government would consider carefully the danger of its abuse in certain cases. The Finance Minister might want information as to certain facts which Parliament might not be willing to grant him till he had fully explained his designs.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. member for Gloucester might have been right in objecting to extensive powers being given to the Governor in Council. Unfortunately, for the last five years, from his being Speaker, he had had no opportunity of raising the objection; for he would find, in almost every Statute passed by the late Administration, those powers taken to a greater degree than by any Government for ten years before. He thought that his hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) could not well ask for the postponement of business, because he had not read the Bill, which came from the Senate. Anybody could see from its title that it went further than an ordinary census measure. With regard to clause 33, he did not think there was any danger of information being asked, or of parties being punished unjustly. If they did not think the information asked came fairly within the line of ordinary statistics, they need not answer; but punishment was contemplated for false information. If a party chose to give any, he should speak correctly and truthfully. The penalty, however, might be reduced and those clauses be allowed to go through Committee with the right of discussion afterwards.

MR. MILLS said that the Government were not in possession of information to justify the legislation proposed. It seemed really that the probable expense would exceed any benefit desirable from that scheme. The Bill proposed more than the House had any legal or constitutional authority to accomplish. They ought not to authorise the creation of a machinery to deal directly with that particular subject as might be done under that Bill. If the hon. gentleman in charge of it were to confine its operation to a single year, his propo-

MR. POPE.

sition would be more reasonable; but he proposed, without giving the House sufficient notice, to establish a permanent system.

Section agreed to.

On section 33,

On the suggestion of Mr. CARTWRIGHT, SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD agreed to reduce the penalty to \$100.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 31.]

(Mr. Baby.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. ANGLIN asked if, where the note was drawn on stamped paper which was not of sufficient value, the defect could be cured by the use of an additional stamp.

MR. BABY said that objection was met with in the way mentioned. He proposed making an amendment in the 5th line, 3rd page, by striking out after the words "any cheque," the words "upon any chartered bank." In St. John, Halifax, and different parts of Upper Canada, private bankers were in the habit of using cheques, and, therefore, it was advisable to remove the restrictive words.

On section 8,

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he would like to amend this clause by inserting the words "promissory note." The exception made in favour of bills of exchange should be extended to promissory notes drawn out of Canada, and payable out of Canada. It frequently happened that large promissory notes were made in New York, payable, for instance, at Detroit, and these

notes finding their way to banks in Canada, were negotiated and passed on for collection. That was precisely the case of a bill of exchange, and notes should be exempted equally with bills of exchange, or else the clause should be struck out altogether.

MR. PLUMB asked how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) would deal with bills of exchange made outside the country by persons who had no stamps, and could not procure them.

MR. COCKBURN said bills were not collectable here at all. A bill drawn on New York, and payable, for instance, at Detroit, might come into the hands of a customer in Ottawa, and, if negotiated at a bank here, the bill was exempt from this tax. He thought promissory notes should stand on the same footing.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said a bill of exchange, drawn in the United States and payable there, might be accepted in Canada, and, therefore, it might be traded, and, in that case, it would be governed according to the laws of the country in which acceptance took place. It would be different with a promissory note. A promissory note made in the United States and paid there, although it might be assumed here, would be dealt with according to the law of the country in which it was made payable.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the hon. member for West Northumberland referred to a note made payable in Canada, although drawn out of Canada; this was provided for in section 14. If it was drawn out of Canada, and made payable out of Canada, he did not see what we had to do with it, but, if it was generally made payable, then it might be sued for in this country. For instance, he might be going through this country, and then he might be sued on it while passing.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said his amendment had reference to notes drawn out of Canada and paid out of Canada, whereas section 14 had reference to double duties, where, in the first instance, the note had not been properly stamped. The case of a promissory note very frequently occurred here, and the banks were at a loss to

know whether the same rule was to apply to promissory notes as to bills of exchange? Why make a difference? If the hon. gentleman wished a bill of exchange payable out of Canada to be exempted from duty, surely the same law should apply to a promissory note.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said a promissory note was only an inland bill of exchange. He could not advise the acceptance of the amendment, for the reason that it would conflict with another clause of the Act. The maker of a promissory note stood exactly in law in the same position as the maker of a bill of exchange. The relations of the two were identical. In fact the acceptor was the first promissor on the obligation. Under section 4, a bill of exchange made in New York, made payable there and accepted in Canada, was liable to stamps. The only way our laws could affect a promissory note made in the United States, was this: If the maker in the United States protested the Bill, and was in Canada where it became due, the note might be enforced in our Courts. He need not say that in such a case the absence of a stamp would not invalidate the contract.

MR. MILLS said a case happened some years ago in England, in a suit brought upon a note made in Dublin, when the English law did not extend to Ireland. A note made in Ireland, upon which there was no stamp, was sued in Westminster. The objection taken to it was that it was not stamped as required by the law, but it was held that, since this note was made abroad, was payable abroad, and since all the parties had come within the jurisdiction of the Court, the note might be properly collected in England, and stamps were not necessary. He thought that rule should be followed here, or else this section 8 ought to be entirely expunged from the Bill altogether.

Section agreed to.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

MR. COCKBURN.

Amendment read the first and second times, and agreed to.

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

After Recess.

TRURO AND PICTOU RAILWAY TRANSFER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 58.]

(Mr. Tupper.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. TUPPER said that a Bill had been passed for the purpose of transferring the Pictou Branch of the Government Railway to certain parties, in order to its extension eastward. Under the power given by the Act to the Government, an arrangement was made with a railway company to have the railroad prolonged as far east as the Gut of Canso, and for a ferry across that stream. The work was carried on under a contract made between the Government of Nova Scotia and a company called, he thought, the Cape Breton Railway Company. A difficulty arose between the Government of Nova Scotia and the contractors, in consequence of some alleged informality or illegality in the position of the company, in relation to their not having complied with the terms of incorporation. Although the matter was in controversy, a very serious difficulty presented itself in carrying out the arrangement between the Government of Nova Scotia and the railway company. The result was that negotiations took place between them and the Government at Ottawa for the purpose of adjusting that difference. One of the difficulties was that the Government of Nova Scotia claimed that the company had no legal status, and that, if they made them payments under the agreement made with their predecessors, they would not be able to exact the conditions of those payments. It was, therefore, proposed that an Act should pass the Legislature of Nova Scotia, for the purpose of removing all doubt as to the legality of the company's position, and of giving greater security than otherwise could be obtained; it was proposed an Act should pass here amending the Act under which

the Pictou Branch was transferred to the Company constructing the Eastern Extension Railway. The result was this Bill was founded upon a tripartite agreement between the Company, the Government of Nova Scotia and the Dominion Government. The effect of the Bill passed in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and which was in conformity with the agreement entered into between the three parties, and which the present Bill proposed to carry out, was this: all the legal and technical difficulties were removed, so far as the legality of the position of the Eastern Extension Railway Company was concerned, and greater security was given the public, because it substituted this Act for that under which the transfer of the Pictou Branch to the Government of Nova Scotia took place. There was no provision for the continued operation of the road under the Bill as it stood, or under the agreement, and this Bill provided that in case of the Company's failure to operate the road, it should revert to the Government of Nova Scotia; and in case of their failure to operate the road, the whole property of the Eastern Extension as well as the Pictou Branch, should revert to the Dominion Government. The Bill substantially gave effect to the Act which passed the House on a previous occasion, and to the contracts the Government made under that agreement.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would ask the hon. gentleman not to proceed with the Bill in Committee to-night. He thought it was unfortunate that in the 9th section there was practically an admission of some claim for compensation, because of the deterioration of the road since the Act was passed. That clause ought not to be there. It said, no doubt, that that should not be held to admit or waive the claim. The Company could not possibly claim anything under the previous Act, which provided that they were to obtain possession after the performance of certain conditions, when they had not been performed. They ought not, in this negative manner, to admit the possibility of any claim. He had declined absolutely to give them possession of the road till the terms were complied with, the railway stock provided, and

security given, that the road would be kept open. He thought it would be far better that that clause should be struck out, for it enabled them to say that the Government and the House must have had it in contemplation to consider some sort of claim on that ground. Then he did not like the provision that, under certain circumstances, the road should revert to the Nova Scotia Government, and under certain others, from the Nova Scotia Government to the Dominion Government. He was afraid, with that provision, it was tolerably certain that a road would be put into the hands of the Dominion Government that had never paid, and was not likely to pay till a distant day. One object of the late Government in the Act passed was this: it was considered that it was not desirable that the Government should retain any but the great trunk road leading to Halifax—that all the branch roads should be in the possession of independent companies, or some other authority. He regretted very much that any provision should be left in the Bill which rendered it probable they should again obtain possession of a property which could be better managed otherwise, and a property which could be of no earthly use to them, except as a means, perhaps, to enable the Government of the day to dispense certain patronage. He thought it exceedingly desirable to be, beyond all doubt, quit of it for ever. There should be nothing in the Act which would lead to, or allow any room for, an application by which it might be returned to the Government. There were some other matters in the Bill, to which he would like to refer, but he would ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works not to proceed with it to-night.

MR. TUPPER said he was very sorry the hon. gentleman was not prepared to have him (Mr. Tupper) go on with the measure to-night. It had been a very long time on the Order paper; had been printed and been in the hands of hon. members a considerable length of time. Under these circumstances, he thought the hon. gentleman was not in a position to ask a postponement of the Bill. The Session had advanced to a considerable length, and it was very desirable, he

thought every hon. member on both sides would admit, that progress should be made with public business as fast as possible. It was extremely inconvenient for the Government not to be able to proceed with measures at a time like the present, when they were prepared to do so. He did not think there could be any difficulty about it, because, if the House went into Committee, and passed through, the hon. gentleman could raise any question, or move any amendment he thought advisable, on the third reading, after he (Mr. Mackenzie) had had time to consider the measure. He would just say in regard to the point raised by the hon. gentleman, that this Bill, in his judgment, instead of conceding any right the Government had, was more favourable to the interests of the Government than the previous measure, because it provided for the continuous operation of the road. Anybody who knew anything of the trade and business of the country, knew that a greater disaster could scarcely occur in connection with any of the public works, than the cessation of the running of such railways. No person ever supposed that this Government was going to give away property, which cost the country very large sums of public money, unconditionally. It was very desirable, in the interest of the promotion of trade and business, that the road should continue to be operated; therefore the Government had no intention of parting with it, without a guarantee that the road should continue to be operated. He did not, however, think there was any danger, because the road was in the hands of a company who were expending their own money in constructing 80 miles of road beyond, and, of course, they would have to see that communication was kept open. In reference to the point raised by the hon. gentleman, he would admit that no claim existed, and the hon. gentleman would find in another clause of the Bill that the terms had been modified as to the railway itself. The Pictou Branch, as described in the Act which was passed by the late Government, was held to include that which was constructed under the Act providing for the construction of the branch railway to Pictou; but it so happened that, owing to a want of infor-

MR. TUPPER.

mation, the term Pictou Branch in the Act embraced a part of the Intercolonial Railway itself. The Intercolonial Railway had been constructed since the construction of the Pictou Branch. The Intercolonial railway left the road from Halifax to Pictou after it had passed the point where the Pictou Branch commenced. He had made provision in this Bill for certain amendments in relation to that, so as to leave the parties operating the road no possible claim to any part of what might be called the Intercolonial Railway. He was sure that the hon. gentleman would see that the Bill had been prepared with the greatest possible care, so as to prevent any claim being founded on it, and at the same time to protect, as far as possible, the public interests. The Government found that the legislation of the late Government was being frustrated, and an agreement, of which this Bill was the result, had been made with the Government of Nova Scotia, the railway company engaged in constructing the railway from New Glasgow to the Gut of Canso, some 80 miles, and the Government of the Dominion. He hoped the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) would not object to the Bill being put through Committee.

MR. MACKENZIE said, in reference to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, about the previous Bill conceding part of the Intercolonial Railway as being part of the Pictou and Truro Branch, that it was the first time he had heard anything of the kind. After he had prepared roughly the provisions of the Bill, it was sent to the law clerk with instructions to have the Bill so worded that it could not be interpreted as conveying anything more than the Pictou and Truro Branch Railway. It was not his (Mr. Mackenzie's) intention to give any statutory right to the company to come into the station; but their property was to remain ours to the extreme end of the switches, although the arrangement could be made to allow them accommodation in the yard, but only as a privilege. Now, this Bill conceded the statutory right of entrance to the station itself, the use of the sidings, and all the conveniences of the yard besides. He thought it would be much better that that should not be the case.

This Bill also provided that, in case of any dispute between the Governments of Canada and Nova Scotia, or the company, as to what property or rights were intended to be included in the description of the Pictou Branch, the matter should be submitted to arbitration. He thought that, to be explicit, a provision should be made, whereby the very point that the hon. the Minister of Public Works raised should be submitted to arbitration. As it was a fortnight since he had read the Bill, he admitted that he was unable to speak as explicitly in regard to it than he otherwise would. He did not expect the Bill to come up so soon. Therefore, he would have been prepared if the Bill had not been brought up before the House to-night. If it was important that the Bill should pass through Committee, he would not object to it, as he had no desire to impede business in the least, and hon. gentlemen opposite would admit that he never had any desire to impede public business. On the other hand, if the Bill was referred to Committee now, it would involve after-discussion, which would probably result in the reference of the Bill back to Committee again. On the understanding that, when the Bill was up for its third reading, he would have an opportunity of discussing any points of it if he so desired, he was willing it should be referred to Committee at once.

MR. TUPPER said that he did not wish to cast any reflection upon the administration of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) in reference to the point to which he had drawn the attention of the House. He was as much surprised as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) when the point had been raised about the Pictou Branch. It was only when this agreement had come up for consideration that the Government found it necessary to deal with that question. As far as conceding the rights of the use of the station sidings, etc., was concerned, the hon. the leader of the Opposition would find that it was entirely under the control of the Intercolonial Railway Department, and only such privileges as were in the interest of the Government could be granted. On the understanding that the hon. gentleman would have an opportunity of dealing

with any point of this Bill he (Mr. Mackenzie) might think necessary, he would move that the Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole, reserving the third reading until another time.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

RECEIVER GENERAL AND MINISTER
OF PUBLIC WORKS BILL.—[BILL 66.]

(Mr. Tupper.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

MR. MACKENZIE asked what were the other works referred to? If the railways and canals were taken up, there would not be much left.

MR. TUPPER said there were a great many other public works which required the supervision of the Government. There were the harbour improvements at different ports, the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec and Montreal, the Commissioners of the graving dock at Quebec, public buildings in the different Provinces, the dredging service, slides and booms on the Saguenay and Ottawa rivers and tributaries, the Military College at Kingston, the construction of lighthouses, the fortifications at Quebec and elsewhere, and many other works, which demanded a great deal of time and attention.

MR. HOLTON said this division was decidedly a step in the wrong direction. The whole responsibility should be borne by the Minister of Public Works, with subordinate bureaus forming part of the one great Department. This Bill would introduce one more secondary Minister

into our system of Departmental Government.

MR. TUPPER said quite the reverse of the hon. gentleman's proposition was true. Were he charged with having neglected his duty in connection with this enormous service, under the present system, his answer would be precisely the same answer as his predecessor would have made, that he was so overweighted with the work that it was impossible to attend to it thoroughly. Whereas, by placing the railways and canals under his supervision, and the various other services under another Minister, each would be held equally responsible in his Department, able to answer all questions authoritatively, from personal supervision, and the work more satisfactorily attended to. If the hon. gentleman would visit him (Mr. Tupper) at his office, he would find his ante-rooms filled with persons from all parts of the Dominion, on public business connected with piers and harbours, and other works extending over our enormous territory, which precluded him from giving the necessary attention to the more important questions of railways and canals. The hon. member for Lambton would confirm what he (Mr. Tupper) said with respect to the work of the Department.

MR. HOLTON said he had always believed that responsibility was best preserved by concentration. His hon friend had discovered that the way to hold Ministers responsible, was by multiplying them, thus, if the thirteen were made twenty-six, there would be a much greater responsibility in Parliament than at present. He held that the very highest kind of responsibility lay in having very few Ministers at the head of the great Departments and the subordinate Departments held by heads of bureaus and not by Ministers at all.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Why not have one Minister only ?

MR. HOLTON said that would be carrying the thing to the extreme. There was no analogy, for instance, between the Law Department and the Board of Works Department,—between the Finance Department and the Post-Office Department ; but there was no reason why we should have a Minister of Customs

MR. HOLTON.

when we had a Minister of Finance. There was no reason whatever why a head of a bureau should not execute the work of both, nor why we should have a Minister of Inland Revenue. He had never heard his hon. friend the member for Lambton complain of the excessive work of the Department of Public Works, and in addition he performed the duties of First Minister. While he might have his own opinion as to the expediency of uniting the political leadership with so laborious an office as the Public Works, his hon. friend had acquitted himself, as they all knew, well ; yet he never complained of an excess of work in his Department. He never hinted at a division of the duties of that Department ; therefore, so far as his experience went, so far as his authority could be invoked, it might safely be assumed he would not have advised, had he continued in that office, a division of its duties. He had no desire to prolong the debate. He merely desired to emphasise his conviction on this occasion, as he did thirteen years ago, when the various Departments were constituted, that the fewer Ministers we had within certain limits—having Ministers at the head of each of the natural and separate Departments of State—the better our affairs would be administered. They would be administered not only more economically—for he regarded the salaries of four or five men as of little account—but more efficiently, and with a greater regard to the concentration of responsibility. He believed that, if this country were governed by seven Ministers, it would be more efficiently governed than by thirteen. He believed that his hon. friend, whose administrative ability and great assiduity they fully appreciated, could administer the Board of Works more satisfactorily, and with a deeper sense of responsibility with the Department united as it was, than divided as was proposed.

MR. MASSON : What about the division of the Department of the Minister of Justice last year ?

MR. MACKENZIE said the reasons for that were given last year, and were patent to everyone. There was nothing that had been more felt than the want of assistance in preparing the legislation

for the House. The Department of Justice practically supervised and examined the whole legislation of the whole Dominion, including the North-West, and the other territories which might be established. The work of the Department was very great, and he had no reason to believe that it was any less now, and, while one of the ablest men they had (Mr. Blake) was in the Department, it was well known no one was so hard worked as he was in the entire Government. The hon. gentleman seemed to treat the matter as a joke.

MR. MASSON: I was speaking of the question of responsibility the hon. gentleman referred to.

MR. MACKENZIE said that responsibility would still devolve upon the Minister of Justice. Then, with regard to the division of the Public Works Department, the hon. mover said that the Bill stated that one Minister was to be charged with railways and canals,—that was, he presumed, after the construction of railways and canals was completed—with the working of the railways and canals. It was proposed by himself at one time that the collection of the revenues of all our public works should be in the hands of the Inland Revenue Department, as a natural corollary to the duties imposed on that Department. It could not be said, if the Department were to be presided over by another Minister, that he would have work enough to do in merely appointing and supervising the staffs. The Intercolonial was now constructed. The main portion of our canal system was constructed, or would be this season. Four or five years ago the Intercolonial was but half finished. The surveys of the Pacific Railway were but practically commenced, and questions arising in connection with the route had to be determined. This imposed a large amount of work on those at the head of that Department. These canals were finished. The Intercolonial Railway was finished. The construction of the Pacific Railway was in progress; how fast it would be proceeded with depended, no doubt, upon the financial condition of the country. There was no reason why the work for the next five years should approach what had been done during the last five

years. It could not be that it should be so, because the principal points were already determined—unless some new and unheard-of policy was to be developed by the present Administration. He did not, therefore, think the Minister would find it difficult to superintend the entire work of the Public Works Department. He concluded, long ago, as they announced last year to Parliament, that it was of much more importance to divide the office of Minister of Justice than any other Department in the service. There was no doubt what the hon. gentleman said was correct, that there was a vast amount of work to be done, vast amount of papers to be read; but still, when the Minister devoted his whole time to one Department, a good deal of work could be overcome. The technical work of the Public Works Department must, after all, be left to engineers. No ordinary Minister could venture to undertake to supervise the technical work of the Department, that must be done, in any case, by engineers responsible to the political head. He could conceive that, if the head of the Department was also an engineer, and so technically responsible for technical errors, it would make a great difference. But that was not the case, and there was a good deal in what the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) said, that it was exceedingly desirable that every Department should embrace all branches of that particular Department, under one responsible head. It was always his opinion that it was a mistake to have a Receiver-General; it was always his opinion it was a mistake to have a Secretary of State, and a Secretary of State for the Provinces. The latter terms were unmeaning, and did not convey any clear idea what the duties were. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government came to the same conclusion after a brief experience. They came to the same conclusion about a year and a-half ago about the Receiver-General's Department, viz: that there was no kind of necessity for maintaining a Minister in that branch of the Finance Department; therefore, they determined to re-unite them with the Finance Department proper. He was glad that the Government in power had followed their steps in that regard. He thought it would have been better if they had left

the Public Works Department under the management of the hon. gentleman opposite, including all its branches. He did not suppose it was the intention or desire of any member to retain the Government railways if they could be otherwise managed. The hon. gentleman, in regard to the Pacific Railway, invited tenders for its construction and working, for the purpose of endeavouring to get rid of that undertaking. He (Mr. Mackenzie) regretted so little success had attended their efforts in that direction. He did not think the Government should undertake the conduct of commercial or mercantile enterprises. But the division of labour here pre-supposed the intention of the Government to manage the great railways which, by the aid of the State, or wholly by the State, had been constructed, or were to be constructed. He thought that was a mistake, and, similarly, with regard to our canal system, which would soon be completed so far as to carry the trade of the country to the ocean. On that subject, of course, he had views of his own, which he would develop at the proper time; but, in the meantime, the two great canals, the Welland and Lachine, were approaching completion, and there would be no serious work to be encountered there of any account in the future. The only thing that could possibly arise was that there might be some difficulty in the settlement of the contractors' claims. But that was a legal matter, with which the Department of Public Works had comparatively little to do. He thought, as the hon. member for Chateauguay had said, that it was useless for them to discuss this matter with a view of successfully opposing the Bill. The Government had determined to do it, and that was the end of the matter, as far as the House was concerned; but he felt it right to give his own views on the subject, because he believed the view they took last year was right, though, at the same time, he conceived it would be desirable to make some extensive alterations. He remembered he proposed himself, when the hon. gentlemen in 1873 readjusted the salaries of public officers, of Judges, civil servants and others, that it would be better to have a number of principal Ministers like the English

MR. MACKENZIE.

Secretaries of State, and that the other Departments should be managed by inferior Ministers, that was by Ministers holding a rather inferior position to the others, such as the President of the Board of Trade of England, and the Postmaster-General of England—that they should have a smaller salary, and, in a corresponding degree, less responsibility. In other words, that we should follow the example set by England in regard to the distribution of Cabinet offices. He was still of opinion it would be the best course to pursue, and that the concentration of power and responsibility to Parliament and the country would be obtained in a greater degree in that way than by maintaining thirteen Ministers of equal position in the House. That was his view of the entire position; but, as he said, it was of no use attempting to enforce their opinions in the House, because their views were only sustained by a comparative small minority. He could only express the hope that hon. gentlemen would find that the views he had expressed that evening would be, at the end of a few years, the right views on which to construct the departmental offices of the Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was not unlikely that the prophecy of his hon. friend who had just spoken would come to pass. Some years hence, no doubt, there would be another distribution of offices, just as the readjustment of offices was being considered now. It was not unlikely that in the rapid development of this country other changes might be called for. Continual changes had taken place in the organisation of the Departments in the old and well established Government of England, and, therefore, they might expect changes occasionally in the varying wants, and increasing size and importance of this country. At present, it seemed to him to be absolutely necessary that the Department under consideration should be relieved of its superabundant work by a division of labour. They were all agreed as to the abolition of the Receiver-Generalship. It was no new thing, with himself, and the gentlemen who acted with him on that occasion, the

division of the Department of Public Works. The idea of dividing this office was entertained in 1873. Hon. gentlemen then in Parliament would remember the readjustment of the Departments was shadowed in the Speech from the Throne. It was then their intention, had they continued in power, to take this step of dividing the Department of Public Works. The hon. gentlemen who sat together opposite—the hon. member for Chateaugay and the hon. member for Lambton—had differed in opinion as to the comparative importance of the two branches which were to form two separate Departments, although closely allied in their nature. His hon. friend from Chateaugay said that the only office that was worth having was in the Department of Railways and Canals, while the hon. member for Lambton said that that Minister would have but very little to do; that it was otherwise when the Intercolonial was unfinished, and the Pacific Railway surveys just commenced; that then it was an important Department, and that now the Minister would have nothing to do except look after the maintenance and revenue of these railways and canals. His own opinion was that, whether for good or for evil, for a long time the railways and canals which were Government property would remain Government property. It would be a very considerable period before they could, no matter how desirable it would be, get rid of these public works and put them into private hands or corporations. He believed the Government would not be able to allow enormous sacrifices of public property in order to transfer them and get rid of the responsibility; because they had not only to get rid of the labour and cost of management, but they had to see that the parties in whose names these works were transferred gave substantial guarantees to the country that they would be worked for the advantage of the country and not for the advantage of the corporation, and that they should always maintain their position as great public highways and great arteries of commerce. He thought it would be a considerable time before they could get companies with the requisite capital and solvency to give the required guarantee that these works should continue to be the great public highways for which they were constructed. He thought, for a

long time to come, that could only be secured by their being under the management of a responsible Department of the Government. Then, as regarded the other office of Minister of Public Works as distinguished from Railways and Canals. It was true there was not a single work of the miscellaneous public works, which was of the same importance or the same public value as any given railway or any given canal. But that was not the question. There was a multiplicity of public works of all kinds which would require an active, earnest and able man to manage. Without making any remark disrespectful of his hon. friend's predecessor, who had a great power for work, one could not help seeing, during the last three years of the last Parliament, that the hon. gentleman was overworked, and that he again and again had to throw himself on the indulgence of the House, and said that, owing to the multiplicity of the duties thrown upon him, politically as well as departmentally, he could not be expected at all times, and on all occasions, to be fully up to his work. If any man could do it, he believed, from all he had heard of the hon. gentleman, that he could do it. But he believed it was not for the advantage of the public that one single man, however able, should be overcharged and overworked, as the hon. gentleman certainly was. They had become so accustomed to look at large figures and large works, that they began to despise the day of small things, and to consider that all the rest of the public works were comparatively of little importance. Why, he remembered the time, when Upper and Lower Canada were united under Lord Sydenham, they had only the Welland Canal, and not much progress made in the Beauharnois Canal; but these works were considered of so much importance that they had two Ministers of Public Works, which were continued for a long time. His hon. friend from Chateaugay would remember that the Board of Works was then governed by a Commissioner and an Assistant, but they were a joint board, and both members of Parliament, and of the Cabinet.

MR. MACKENZIE: The assistant was not required to be even a member of Parliament.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman was mistaken, they were both required to be members of Parliament, and both members of the Cabinet. The first Minister of Public Works was the Hon. Hamilton H. Killy, who was a member of the Cabinet, and the Hon. William B. Robinson was Assistant Commissioner for a time, and was also in Parliament. Afterwards that was altered, and the Board of Works was under one Commissioner, with an Assistant Commissioner, who had not a seat in Parliament. The public works now were so numerous as fully to occupy two responsible Ministers. The hon. gentleman said he would like to see but certain Ministers. That would be surcharging a responsible Minister with more than he could do. He would have to throw himself, as the hon. member for Lambton remarked, upon his engineers. He must be really the mouthpiece of his engineers without any real responsibility, because he could not give the necessary time and labour to manage the subdivisions of these bureaux properly. The bureau system in the United States had proved a thorough failure. Many of the complaints that had been made against, not only the good management, but the honest management of public affairs in different Departments in that country had arisen from there being too few responsible Ministers. In England, the Public Works Department was subdivided into many sub-departments. The Admiralty had charge of ships, the Secretary of War looked after everything like military fortifications and defences, and the Commissioners of Woods and Forests attended to all public buildings except those under the Commissioners of Trade and the Post Office Department. In almost every one of these Departments they had got separate officers. Besides that, they had got Junior Lords of the Treasury, and the Junior Lord of Trade, to assist Members of Parliament and Members of the Government, and although not in the Cabinet, they were responsible to Parliament, and each one was able to answer for his own Department. Every Minister knew what he was talking about, and was not obliged to be posted and crammed by the head of his bureau below. In order to have

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

real substantial responsibility, the responsible man must know all about his own Department, and be able to speak from personal knowledge. The fact of having these two Ministers in this House would be of great assistance to the House, and he was quite clear that it was for the advantage of the public service that this sub-division should take place. In the last Parliament he took the liberty of opposing the sub-division of the Department of the Minister of Justice. He would not go over that matter again, as he had good and sufficient reasons for opposing the proposed change. He believed it was important that the Minister of Justice should always be the Attorney-General, who should advise the several Departments, and be the responsible administrator of the criminal law of the land, according to the laws of the Dominion, so far as they came within a scope of his duties. His opinion was that the one Minister could well perform all that work. In the debate of last Parliament, he suggested that there might be a subordinate officer to look after the exchequer, and to contest the litigated business of the Crown. He thought that, by funding the fees collected from these cases, that subordinate officer might well be paid, and would not become an additional burden upon the country. He was strongly in favour of having the public service thoroughly performed, and believed this change would conduce to that end, and the health of the Minister of Railways and Public Works would be greatly improved by the sub-division of the Department.

Section agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS)
PREVENTION BILL.—[BILL 55.]

(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

On section 2,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this clause was not in the old Act, and was inserted to provide what the duties of owners of cattle should be. The moment a stock-owner was aware of a disease breaking out among his herd, he must give notice to the proper department in order that the disease might be at once stamped out. It was highly reprehensible and worthy of punishment for a stock-owner to try to conceal diseases in his herd for fear he might be called upon to kill them, or might not be able to dispose of them. In all such cases the slaughter of diseased animals was for the general benefit. If animals were ordered to be slaughtered for the public good, compensation should be given the owners; and, therefore, as compensation was provided in the case of the compulsory slaughter of infected cattle, it would be the greater offence to fraudulently conceal the existence of disease. This clause was adopted from the English statute, in order to give the authorities every means for stamping out the disease.

MR. MILLS said the clause was open to very serious objection. In the first place it exceeded their powers of legislation. He did not see how the Government could proceed, unless they intended to make the retention of diseased animals a crime. Such matters came within the domain of civil rights, with which it was competent for Local Legislatures to deal. But, if this Parliament had the power, he did not see that the clause in question would be efficacious. It would give an immense amount of work to the Minister of Agriculture, were every case of a diseased animal, such as a horse with a sore throat, reported to him. If the epizootic were to appear among horses, as four or five years ago, there would be as many communications sent to that Minister as there were horses in the country, and he would require a double staff to read his correspondence.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, as to the Constitutional question, he thought the power claimed was in the purview of Parliament, and that the Local Legislatures could pass no Act of that kind. Under the general powers given Parliament for the peace and good

government of the country, those clauses were, in every way, within its power, and it would be an unfortunate thing were they not—that, in case of cattle disease breaking out, they should have to apply to the separate Local Legislatures for a remedy. It would be equivalent to saying that this Parliament could not stamp out such disease. It would be almost impossible to have a cordon or interior line surrounding every one of the separate Provinces. The Act must be read reasonably, as meaning the reporting of every infectious, or contagious disease, not every common disease. They used the same language as was used in the English Act to check the same evil. He did not think they could exaggerate the growing importance of their live cattle trade with England, which they ought to take more than ordinary care to encourage, and especially, by the stringency of their legislation, to show the British Government that they were really taking steps, by legislation and administration, to prevent disease in Canada. They had secured the keeping of Canada out of the diseased schedule, into which they were near being put by England some time ago. It was by the strongest and promptest exertions of the Canadian Government, and friends of the country in England, that Canada was prevented from being classed like the United States.

MR. PLUMB said he was extremely surprised at the argument of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) — that there would be no right to prevent the farmer, for instance, from sowing grain that might spread disease among his neighbours' crops.

MR. MILLS: I did not say that, but that the right did not lie in this Parliament.

MR. PLUMB said that the hon. gentleman must know perfectly well that, if contagious diseases of any kind broke out, it was the duty of the authorities to prevent their spread. If a man brought diseased wheat into the country, it was the duty of the proper authorities to punish him. The hon. Premier stated that the power lay with the Dominion Government, and that, where cattle had to be carried over all the railways of the

Dominion, the subject of the prevention of disease must be under the purview of its Government, because it was impossible to create local surveillance of such matters or make it effectual. He thought that every gentleman in the House should feel it his first duty to so legislate as to retain, if possible, to Canada her cattle trade with England, by taking every precaution to prevent any suspicion in England as to the state of Canadian herds. He thought that any legislation in that direction, although it might seem severe, or involve a few letters to the Agriculture Department, should not be questioned in a captious spirit, but that they should do everything possible to retain and extend a trade so profitable by endeavouring to shut out contagion, which was spreading over the United States, and had created such alarm in England as almost to induce the authorities there to shut out importation of stock from the Republic.

MR. MILLS said that he had not raised any captious objections, but he had endeavoured to show the inoperative character of the first clause. He repeated, that this House had no power to deal with this question, but only the Local Legislatures. The First Minister had overlooked the special provisions of the Act giving Parliament power to legislate for the peace, order, and good government of the country, under which might be embraced, according to his view, every subject of legislation, whether vested here or elsewhere. It was a well settled rule of interpretation that they could not interpret general provisions in such a way as to render nugatory the express provisions of the same Statute. Local Governments were authorised to legislate on subjects of property and civil rights. Was it not perfectly clear that this clause touched private property? So long as articles were not articles of commerce, but held as private property, legislation affecting them devolved elsewhere. There was no disease to which an animal might be subject, contagious or otherwise, but which it would be necessary, under the Bill, to report to the Minister of Agriculture.

Section agreed to.

MR. PLUMB.

On section 2,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the word "depasture" was struck out in favour of the word "graze," and an amendment was introduced into the third line in favour of still greater stringency and protection. The penalty would apply to persons who had exposed animals knowingly to contagion, for which it was raised from \$100 to \$200. The old clause was unreasonably severe. Anyone that depastured any such animal, should be liable to a penalty—but not unless he had known it to be infected, or to have been exposed to infection.

MR. RYMAL said that he thought the clause was rather harsh, as it would prevent a man from turning out his colts, for example, if distempered, when that was the thing most beneficial for them, the penalty for so doing being \$200.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this clause tended to relieve the stringency of the old Act. It was a new clause, and provided that if any cattle were diseased, young or old, they should not be allowed to run on the roadside or in an unenclosed forest, wood, plain or country. They must be kept on their owner's property, and herded there.

Section agreed to.

On Section 4,

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said, if, after a vessel had cleared one of our ports, say Quebec, any of the cattle were found diseased and slaughtered, it would be found impossible to dispose of the carcasses.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the carcass could be stowed away until the vessel got ten miles out, and then be thrown overboard.

MR. WHITE said in the meantime the carcass might communicate the disease.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said no difficulty would be felt on that score.

Section agreed to.

On Section 19,

MR. BERGIN said he would like to know whether the inspectors were to be

regularly qualified veterinary surgeons, as unlearned persons would be apt to pronounce diseases dangerous, which were not so at all.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the matter was left to the option of the Minister, who would see that competent persons were appointed, though not necessarily all veterinary surgeons. A farmer who had been herding cattle all his lifetime, or an experienced cattle dealer, would be practically as good judges as veterinary surgeons.

MR. BERGIN said he was obliged to differ from the right hon. gentleman. Those people were not competent to decide whether a disease was contagious or not.

Section agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

POST-OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.
[BILL 39.]

(Mr. Langevin.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, read the third time and passed.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes after
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 16th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISMISSAL OF D. H. WATERLEY, OF ST. JOHN.

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to pay Mr. D. H. Waterley, late clerk in the post-office in St. John, the damages awarded him by a St. John jury for improper dismissal and defamation of character.

MR. McDONALD (Picton): In that case, it was an action brought by Mr. Waterley against Mr. Dewy, the Inspector of post-offices, for an alleged improper discharge from the public service. The jury found a verdict for the plaintiff for \$4,000 or \$5,000, I think it was; the counsel for the Crown obtained a rule nisi to set aside that verdict, which rule nisi is still pending.

DREDGING OF CHETICAMP HARBOUR.

QUESTION.

MR. MACDONNELL enquired, Whether the Government intends to perform any further dredging of the harbour of Cheticamp, in the county of Inverness, during the coming season.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government to provide for dredging this season in the harbour of Cheticamp.

PIER AT McNAIR'S COVE.

QUESTION.

MR. McISAAC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to repair the pier at McNair's Cove, Antigonish County.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention to place any sum in the Supplementary Estimates for repairs to McNair's Cove.

STEAMSHIP LINE BETWEEN HALIFAX AND BRAZIL.

QUESTION.

MR. GILLMOR enquired, Whether the Government have, or intend to enter into any arrangement with any parties with respect to subsidising a line of steamers to ply between Halifax and Brazil, by which it is hoped to develop a direct trade with that country.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government have entered into negotiations with a view to the establishment of a monthly line of steamers to carry the mails between Canada and Brazil, and, if possible, to extend the service to the River Platte.

FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT ON
THE ST. JOHN RIVER.

QUESTION.

MR. KING enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for a fish-breeding establishment on the St. John River or any of its tributaries this year.

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

DREDGING OF THE WASHADEMOAK
RIVER.

QUESTION.

MR. KING enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete the work of dredging the Washademoak River this year.

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

REMOVAL OF MAIL CONTRACT
FROM VICTOR LECLERC.

QUESTION.

MR. RINFRET enquired, Whether the Government has taken away the contract for conveying the mails between the North Shore Railway and the St. Basile post-office from Victor Leclerc, and, if so, why.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Victor Leclerc had not the contract for conveying the mails. When it was necessary to change the service, and connect St. Basile post-office with the North Shore Railway, another arrangement had to be made.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST ULRIC DUVAL.

QUESTION.

MR. OLIVIER enquired, Whether the Government have received any complaints against Ulric Duval, postmaster of St. Nicholas, county of Lévis; and, if so, by whom such complaints were made.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Complaints have been received against this postmaster, which are now under investigation. Complaint was made by the curé of St. Nicholas.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

POST OFFICE AT BRODIE'S, COUNTY
MEGANTIC.

QUESTION.

MR. OLIVIER enquired, Whether the Government have received the Report of W. Sheppard, Post-Office Inspector, as to the advisability of establishing a post-office at Brodie's, in Inverness, county of Megantic; and whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a post-office in that place.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That report has been received, and is now under consideration.

CANAL ON THE EAST COAST OF VAN-
COUVER ISLAND.

QUESTION.

MR. BUNSTER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the construction of a canal (some three hundred feet in length) in rear of the property of John Langholt, in order that the settlers on the east coast of Vancouver Island, B.C., may reach Nanaimo city with their produce, and purchase supplies.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose.

MONUMENT TO SIR GEORGE CARTIER.

QUESTION.

MR. DESJARDINS, in the absence of Mr. TASSÉ, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out (so soon as the state of the public finances shall permit) the resolution adopted by the House of Commons on the 23rd May, 1873, setting forth that, in consideration of the great services rendered to the country by the lamented Sir George E. Cartier, a monument shall be erected to the memory of that excellent statesman.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is the intention of the Government to carry out that resolution so soon as the state of the public finances shall permit.

THE TARIFF DIVISION.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. DOULL said he rose to a question of privilege. In a late issue of the

Toronto *Globe*, as well as in other papers on the same political side, he had seen a statement to the effect that he had shirked the vote on the tariff, in consequence of the vote of the Pictou Board of Trade being adverse to it. That was not correct. He was absent on that occasion from indisposition, and, had he been in his place, would certainly have voted for the tariff. The statement that he was in his place a few minutes before the vote was taken was also untrue. With regard to the vote of the Pictou Board of Trade, he had a telegram stating that there were only seven members of that Board present.

MR. MACKENZIE: That statement does not belong to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman may make personal explanations, but cannot go into other explanations.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That statement about the Board of Trade is a part of the explanation. The hon. gentleman has been charged with shirking a vote in consequence of a resolution of the Board of Trade, and he must speak about it in order to vindicate himself from an unjust attack.

MR. HOLTON: Clearly not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You want to prevent the hon. gentleman from making the explanation he desires.

MR. HOLTON: I want to preserve the regularity of our proceedings. For a gentleman to claim the right to open a debate on a question of privilege is quite absurd; but he has a perfect right to vindicate himself. The hon. gentleman's statement that, if he had been in the House he would have voted for the tariff, concludes the explanation he can properly make as to a question of privilege.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman must surely be heard out. He should not be muzzled. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not know what the hon. gentleman is going to say.

MR. HOLTON: We do not care.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We do care. It is due to his own honour that he should be heard out. I am quite surprised at the action of hon. gentlemen

opposite in striving to prevent this explanation.

MR. HOLTON: The hon. Premier need not get so excited. I say it is no question of privilege to refer to the proceedings of the Pictou Board of Trade. I desire the ruling of the Speaker on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) is following the general practice in rectifying an incorrect statement as to his shirking the vote in question. He is not exactly confining his remarks to what we call a question of privilege; but he has a right to explain why he was not in the House when the division was taken.

MR. DOULL said that the reason given by the papers mentioned, for his absence, was the vote of the Pictou Board of Trade, which it was stated had influenced him to absent himself from his place. He wanted to show that what took place at that Board of Trade was in the absence of a quorum, there being only seven members present, six of whom were Grits. The only Conservative present was in the chair, and the meeting, of course, carried the vote.

MR. HOLTON: I should like to know whether the hon. Premier regards that explanation as privileged?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I can quite understand, after that explanation, why my hon. friend the member for Chateauguay did not wish the hon. member to make it.

THE CHINESE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION.

MR. DECOSMOS said, with reference to his notice of motion for the consideration of the petition of Noah Shakespeare and others respecting Chinese labour, in Committee of the Whole, that, with a view to arrive, in all probability, at a more practical conclusion than might be obtained in Committee, he would ask the House to allow him to substitute for the resolution, of which notice had been given, the following resolution, and by that means, refer the petition to a Special Committee:—

"That the petition of Noah Shakespeare and others, of the Province of British Columbia, praying for the passing of an Act to re-

strict further immigration of Chinamen; also, that in the construction of the Inter-Colonial Railway, the employment of Chinese labour may be prohibited; and that the Act of the Provincial Government of British Columbia in placing the local rate upon the Chinese in the country, may be confirmed, be referred to a Select Committee, to report on the same, and generally on Chinese labour and immigration affecting the Dominion, with power to send for persons and papers; said Committee to consist of Messrs. DeCosmos, Williams, Charlton, Bunster, Bannerman, Trow, Brooks, Thompson (Cariboo) and Connell."

The petition of Noah Shakespeare and some 1,500 of the labouring classes and people of British Columbia drew the attention of Parliament, for the first time, to one of the most important questions affecting the labourer of the Pacific coast that had ever been brought under consideration. The petition stated that the petitioners, experiencing the injurious effects of the competition of Chinese labour so largely prevailing in British Columbia, to the detriment of the general welfare, respectfully asked Parliament, with a view to affording the needed relief, to pass a measure similar to that of Queensland, placing restrictions upon the further immigration of Chinese. It was noticed, as far as that point was concerned, that the Queensland Act had not received the final sanction of Her Majesty; and further, they asked that, in the construction of the Canada Pacific Railway, Chinese labour should not be employed, and that the Act of British Columbia, imposing a heavy tax on Chinese, should be passed. He would leave that matter in the hands of the Minister of Justice. There was also an appendix to this measure, setting forth a number of facts and reasons, for the granting of the prayer of the subscribers. Those papers contained a full and reliable statement of their case. Since their composition, however, the same Working Men's Society had sent a petition to the Provincial Legislature, effectively describing the character of their grievance, with the reasons for its removal. He would now direct the attention of this House to a few statements, based upon a population of six thousand Chinese, as a comparison of their value to the Dominion, contrasted with that of an equal number of Canadians. 6,000 Chinese, male adults, earning \$300 each a year, gave an

aggregate income of \$1,800,000, less their cost of living, \$60 per year, \$360,000, leaving a net saving of \$1,440,000, which amount was sent to China. 6,000 Canadians, earning \$400 per year each, gave an amount of \$2,400,000, the entire amount of which was kept in the country. He would say, further, that nearly the entire earnings of the Chinese left the country, for the reason that they lived on rice almost completely, and imported their rice, sugar and clothes from China, thus leaving a very small modicum to be expended in our territory. With regard to the population, the total Chinese were taken as 6,000 male adults. Supposing they all had families, each numbering five persons, that would give 30,000 people as a substitute for the 6,000 Chinamen in British Columbia. The profit and loss of this transaction would stand, therefore, as follows:—The loss by Chinese in population—the 6,000 Chinamen having taken the place which would otherwise be occupied by 6,000 Canadians, with families averaging five each—was 24,000; the annual loss of earnings, by keeping out these 6,000 Canadian labourers, whose earnings would be expended in the country, \$2,400,000, and, if were added to this loss, the increase of wealth which would accrue from the population of 30,000 Canadians, which would amount to at least another \$2,400,000, the total amount lost to the country, through the residence of the Chinese, would be \$5,000,000. He had stated the case so far as British Columbia was concerned; but to show the wide range this question had taken, he would draw the attention of the House to a recent extract from one of the leading journals in San Francisco, showing that the white population in all the country washed by the Pacific Ocean, which was the country where the Chinese immigration had principally set in, were opposed to their admission. This paper stated that:

"In Australia, the anti-Chinese agitation gains in strength every day. The Parliament of Queensland has passed various Bills to restrict the immigration, but, as they conflicted with the treaty between Great Britain and China, they have been practically disallowed by the home Government, although, subsequently, the latter stretched a point so far as to assent to a measure which is prohibitory to

A certain extent. The feeling of opposition has extended to all the colonies in the group. In Victoria, the Government now inserts in all contracts for public works, a clause against the employment of the Chinese. In South Australia there is talk of restricting, by law, the income of Chinamen into the southern portion of the colony, though their services are gladly welcomed in the tropical climate of the northern territory. The influx of the Chinese to the Sandwich Islands is so great that much alarm is felt lest the Mongolians secure such a foothold that it would be difficult to control them. This alarm is felt also by King Kalakua, who asserts that the policy of the Hawaiian Government at present is to discourage any general immigration of the Chinese or Coolie element."

When they added to that the fact that the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, Washington Territory, and contiguous territories, were entirely, as was British Columbia, in favour of excluding all the Chinese from their respective territories, it would be seen that nearly the entire English-speaking population bordering on the Pacific Ocean, were opposed to Chinese immigration. But, in order to make a step further, he would inform the House of the statement made by Baron Schouvaloff, at the Berlin Congress. He asked that Congress to make a provision against permitting Chinese and other Asiatic nations from obtaining, by purchase, modern and improved implements of warfare. Now, the complaint had been made, not merely at the Berlin Congress, but by the colonies of Great Britain, who asked for some repressive measure to be introduced against Chinese immigration. The States of California, Oregon, and other territories contiguous, had asked the Congress of the United States to make provision against Chinese immigration. British Columbia had also acted in this direction, particularly by enacting a law which was sent over here last year. Now, the Dominion Parliament was asked by this petition to take some action in the matter. It had become really a world's question. It might be asked why were the English-speaking population of the Pacific coast opposed to Chinese immigration. In the first place, they were opposed to it because their labour was brought into competition with Mongolian labour, and because the latter lived at such a low rate that he could work for wages on which it was impossible for the former to support himself and

family. There were other reasons as important, if not more important, than the immediate question of labour. There was the difference of race. The Chinese were a race who did not assimilate, and could never assimilate with the white race. Then there was the question of religion, the Chinese being probably the greatest pagans on the earth, and could by no other possibility than a miracle be induced to accept a more enlightened religion like that of Christianity. A few here and there might be brought under missionary influence for a time, but their associations were such that, in a very brief period, they relapsed into their old habits, and became worse than they previously were. In order that he might draw the attention of this House, and, through it, the country, to the character of these people, and the importance of this Government taking action to prevent Chinese immigration, he would ask the indulgence of the House while he quoted a few extracts from the report made by the Special Committee of the Senate of California, two years ago, upon which the moral character and bearing of the Chinese upon white labour, and the danger to the free institutions of this continent through their presence, were fully and fairly set forth:—

"To the investigation with which we were charged—quasi judicial in its character, and in the unsettled state of the country of the highest importance—we addressed ourselves, having but one object in view, the ascertainment of truth.

"In the State of California there are over 100,000 subjects of the Empire of China. Of this number, all but about 3,000 are male adults, and that 3,000 are females held in slavery by their own people for the basest purposes."

The next extract to which he would call attention was this:

"The Chinese came without any special invitation. They came before we had time to consider the propriety of their admission. If anyone had ever hoped that they would assimilate with our people, that hope has long since been dispelled. They have now lived among us in considerable numbers for a quarter of a century, and yet they remain separate, distinct from and antagonistic to our people in thinking, mode of life, tastes and principles, and are as far from assimilation as when they first arrived. They fail to comprehend our system of Government; they perform no duties of citizenship; they are not available as

jurymen; they cannot be called upon as a *posse comitatus* to preserve order, nor be relied upon as soldiers. They bring no children with them, and there is, therefore, no possibility of influencing them by our ordinary educational appliances. There is, indeed, no point of contact between the Chinese and our people through which we can Americanise them. The rigidity which characterises these people forbids the hope of any essential change in their relations to our own people or our Government. We respectfully submit the admitted proposition that no nation, much less a Republic, can safely permit the presence of a large and increasing element among its people which cannot be assimilated or made to comprehend the responsibilities of citizenship."

What was said of the Chinese in California might be said also of them in our country.

"The great mass of the Chinese residents in California are not amenable to our laws. It is almost impossible to procure the conviction of Chinese criminals, and we are never sure that a conviction, even when obtained, is in accordance with justice."

He would beg to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to this point.

"This difficulty arises out of our ignorance of the Chinese language, and the fact that their moral ideas are wholly distinct from our own. They do not recognise the sanctity of an oath, and utterly fail to comprehend the crime of perjury. Bribery, intimidation, and other methods of baffling justice, are considered by them as perfectly legitimate. It is an established fact that the administration of justice among the Chinese is almost impossible, and we are, therefore, unable to protect them against the persecutions of their own countrymen, or punish them for offences against our own people. This anomalous condition, in which the authority of law is so generally vacated, imperils the existence of our Republican institutions to a degree hitherto unknown among us. This race of aliens are not only not amenable to law, but they are governed by secret tribunals, unrecognised and unauthorised by law. The records of these tribunals have been discovered, and are found to be antagonistic to our legal system. These tribunals are formed by the several Chinese companies or guilds, and are recognised as legitimate authorities by the Chinese population. They levy taxes, command masses of men, intimidate interpreters and witnesses, enforce perjury, regulate trade, punish the refractory, remove witnesses beyond the reach of our Courts, control liberty of action, and prevent the return of Chinese to their homes in China without their consent. In short, they exercise a despotic sway over one-seventh of the population of the State of California. They invoke the process of law only to punish the independent action of their subjects, and it is claimed that they execute the

death penalty upon those who refuse obedience to their decrees."

The government of these seven companies constituted a foreign government within the boundaries of California. They were represented on Canadian territory, and in the Province of British Columbia might exercise, and did exercise, as he (Mr. DeCosmos) had evidence last year, their influence in controlling their own people. He would draw attention to another point also in the direction of justice. Dr. J. Murphy, District Attorney of the city and county of San Francisco, one of the most able and experienced lawyers on the Pacific coast, reported as follows:—

"I have looked on my docket for two years, and I find that of seven hundred cases that I examined before the Grand Jury, one hundred and twenty were Chinese, principally burglaries, grand larcenies, and murders. They are very adroit and expert thieves. I have not had time to examine, for the last two and a-half years, but the proportion has largely increased during that time."

That was evidence which, he dared say, had never been brought under the notice of the Canadian Parliament, or the people of the eastern section, who were remote from the Chinese, and had not been disturbed by the question hitherto. Here was a statement given to the Committee referred to, by Mr. Karcher, Chief of Police, at Sacramento, in reply to the question: "Do you know anything about their putting up offers of reward upon walls and street corners, written in Chinese, for the murder or assassination of given Chinamen?"

"Yes. Of course, I could not read Chinese, but I secured some of these posters, and had an interpreter from San Francisco come up here and interpret them. There were rewards for the murder of some Chinamen who did something contrary to their laws. They have their own tribunals, where they try Chinamen, and their own laws to govern them. In this way the administration of justice is often defeated entirely, or, at least, to a very great extent. I know this, because I was present at a meeting of one of their tribunals about seven years ago. There were some thirty or forty Chinamen there, one appearing to act as Judge. Finally the fellow on trial was convicted, and had to pay so much money as a fine for the commission of the offence with which he was charged. Generally, their punishments are in the nature of fines, but sometimes they sentence the defendant to death. In cases in the Police Court we have often found it difficult to make interpre-

ters act. They would tell us that they would be killed if they spoke the truth; that their tribunals would sentence them to death, and pay assassins to dispatch them. About two years and a half or three years ago, Ah Quong was killed. During the trial, at which he was interpreter, there were a great many Chinamen. I stationed officers at the doors, and then caused each one to be searched as he came out of the room, the interpreter having told me that he feared they would murder him. Upon these Chinamen I found all sorts of weapons—hatchets, pistols, bowie-knives, Chinese swords, and many others. There were forty-five weapons in all, I think, concealed about their persons in all kinds of ways. The interpreter testified in that case, and half an hour after leaving the Court-room he was brought back, shot, and cut with hatchets. He was terribly mutilated, and lived only a few moments after being brought to the station-house. The murderers were arrested, but attempted to prove an alibi, and had a host of Chinese witnesses present for that purpose. Although there were some hundreds of Chinese present at the time of the murder, the prosecution was forced to rely upon the evidence of a few white men, who chanced to see the deed committed. We were opposed at every turn by the Chinamen, and the Chinese companies. As a general thing it is utterly impossible to enforce the laws with any certainty against those people, while they will themselves use our laws to persecute innocent men who have gained their enmity. They seem to have no ideas concerning the moral obligation of an oath, and care not for our form of swearing."

That was one illustration of the manner in which the Secret Tribunal of the Chinese was managed in California. Then another point :

"The Chinese have, through certain guilds or companies, established a peculiar, but revolting, kind of slavery upon the Pacific coast. Hundreds of Chinese women are bought and sold at prices ranging from three to eight hundred dollars. These women are compelled to live as prostitutes, for the pecuniary profit of their owners; they are under constant and unceasing surveillance; they are cruelly beaten if they fail to make money for their owners; and they are left to starve and die uncared for when they become sick or unprofitable. The great majority of these slaves do not know that they have rights, though they would be glad to escape if they could. Sometimes they wish to marry, and escape with their chosen husband, but they are speedily kidnapped and returned to their owners."

The Rev. Mr. Otis Gibson, a clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, testified as follows:—

"The women, as a general thing, are held as slaves. They are bought or stolen in

China, and brought here. They have a sort of agreement to cover up the slavery business, but it is all a sham. That paper makes the girl say that she owes you four hundred dollars or so passage money, and outfit from China, and has nothing to pay."

That was the way in which female slavery existed in British Columbia, in Dominion territory, as well as in the United States. Here was testimony on another point:—

"The Pacific coast has become a Botany Bay, to which the criminal classes of China are brought in large numbers, and the people of this coast are compelled to endure this affliction. We do not claim that all the Chinese belong to the criminal classes, for many well-behaved people are among them. There are various grades of character among these people: The merchants and business-men, who are often worthy of high esteem; the cooks and house servants, who are often bright and trustworthy; a class of labourers who are diligent; a class of labourers who are extremely dishonest, and a large number of professional thieves and fighters. We are confident that the criminal class outnumber the others in the proportion of seven to one."

The following extract, from the evidence of Mr. F. F. Low, a distinguished citizen who had held many positions of honour and trust under the State and Federal Government, among which had been that of Governor of California, Representative in Congress, and Minister to China, showed the character of the Chinese:—

"That the immigration comes, with but slight exceptions, from the single Province of Canton, and that it is of the lowest class."

The following description of the Chinese character was from a very eminent authority, whose name was a household word—Bayard Taylor, who said of them, in his work entitled, "India, China, and Japan:—

"It is my deliberate opinion that the Chinese are, morally, the most debased people on the face of the earth. Forms of vice, which in other countries are barely named, are, in China, so common that they excite no comment among the natives. They constitute the surface level, and below them are deeps and deeps of depravity so shocking and horrible that their character cannot be hinted. There are some dark shadows in human nature which we naturally shrink from penetrating, and I made no attempt to collect information of this kind; but there was enough in the things which I could not avoid seeing and hearing—which are brought almost daily to the notice of every foreign resident—to inspire me with a powerful aversion to the Chinese race. Their touch is pollution,

and, harsh as the opinion may seem, justice to our own race demands that they should not be allowed to settle on our soil. Science may have lost something, but mankind has gained by the exclusive policy which has governed China during the past centuries."

The Chinese paid a very small share of the taxation, and if the policy of this country turned out to be in favour of encouraging Chinese immigration, free white labour would be ousted, and, at the same time, the Chinese who would replace them would not pay their regular proportion of taxation *per capita*. Here was what the report stated on that point:—

"The Chinese population, amounting to at least one-sixth of the whole population, pays less than one four-hundredth part of the revenue required to support the State Government."

Then, with regard to the personal expenses of this class:

"It will be seen that the net cost to the State for each prisoner is about thirty cents per day; and this without taking into consideration the cost of the prison buildings. The net cost to the State of keeping 198 Chinese prisoners in the State Prison is not less than \$21,600 per annum, a sum \$12,000 in excess of the whole amount of the property tax collected from the Chinese population of the State."

At the present time, British Columbia had a Chinese population of about 6,000. The city of Winnipeg, in Manitoba, already had its Chinese laundry, so had Toronto and Montreal. A few years ago he (Mr. DeCosmos) noticed that in Texas, all along the Pacific Railway, they could be seen. The Chinese were on the move; if they were not stopped in their march, they were bound to settle everywhere, and they would reduce labour to so low a rate that the youth of both sexes would have no opportunity of getting employment. At least, here was the evidence of Mr. Duffy on that point:

"Q. Why can they (the Chinese) afford to do work cheaper than white men?"

A. They can work cheaper than the white men because they have no families to support, and, therefore, live much cheaper. Their living does not cost them over 15c. per day. Take a labouring man here who has a wife and two children dependent upon him, and his expenses, at the very least, are \$2.50 a day, and he must live very economically to make that amount do. Where a labouring man has no family, his necessary expenses will be from \$1.75 to \$2 a day. He can board

for \$20 a month, and his washing, clothing, etc., will make up the balance. Most of the Chinese here wear clothes of Chinese manufacture, consume goods imported from China, and all their dealings are against the American interests. Where they do not board themselves, they can be accommodated—boarded and lodged—at houses in Chinatown for \$1.50 a week, and less."

They found that, in the Province of British Columbia, the employment of Chinese labourers and servants was operating most unfavourably against the youth of that Province. Mr. Karcher, ex-Chief of Police, gave evidence as follows in regard to the effect of Chinese labour in California:

"Q. In San Francisco, at an early day, and in Sacramento, there were few boys 14, 15 and 16 years of age in the country?"

A. Yes, Sir.

Q. And the places occupied by boys in other countries were filled by the Chinese?"

A. Yes, Sir.

Q. So that the result was that, when boys came along in the natural growth of the country, there was no work for them to do?"

A. That is correct?"

Then, again, the following evidence was given on this point:—

"The State of California has a population variously estimated at from 700,000 to 800,000, of which 125,000 are Chinese. The additions to this class have been very rapid since the organisation of the State, but have been caused almost entirely by immigration, and scarcely at all by natural increase."

Here was another extract to which he wished to draw the attention of the House as to this competition between Chinese and white labour:—

"The male element of this population, where not criminal, comes into a painful competition with the most needy and most deserving of our people—those who are engaged, or entitled to be engaged, in industrial pursuits in our midst. The common labourer, the farm hand, the shoemaker, the cigarmaker, the domestic male and female, and workmen of all descriptions, find their various occupations monopolised by Chinese labour, employed at a compensation upon which white labour cannot possibly exist."

He (Mr. DeCosmos) had read all the extracts he proposed to give in respect to the Chinese character, and the effect of the competition between the two races, from the report of the Committee referred to. He held in his hands a volume printed by the United States Congress, being a report of the Joint Special Committee of

both Houses of Congress on this Chinese immigration. He would call the attention of the House to a few extracts from that report. It said :

"Among the testimony will be found that of some 20 operatives, numbering nearly as many trades, in which details are given in relation to different industrial pursuits which are either monopolised by the Chinese or are fast becoming so. This evidence shows that the Chinese have reduced wages to what would be starvation prices for white men and women, and engrossed so much of the labour in the various callings, that there is a lack of employment for whites; and young men are growing up in idleness, while young women, willing to work, are compelled to resort to doubtful means of support. The hardships resulting from these causes bear with especial weight upon women."

He had another brief extract from the report of the same Committee which was as follows :—

"The presence of the Chinese discourages and retards white emigration to the Pacific States. This clearly appeared in evidence, and probably arises from their monopoly of farm and mechanical work through the low price of their labour, making subsistence difficult to procure by the poorer class of emigrants."

From these two sources, as well as from the two petitions he had read, they might discover the opinion that prevailed both in British Columbia and California, and by the Joint Committee of the House of Congress in respect to the Chinese. The Australian Provinces were also opposed to them, and he had showed conclusively that the experience everywhere among the English-speaking race was that the Chinese were not a people that it was desirable to encourage in coming to this country. As this was quite a new question in this country, at least in this part of the Dominion, he would simply draw the attention of the House mainly to China. China fronted the Dominion on the east, and she had a frontage of some 3,000 miles and a population of over 425,000,000. Now, with that population, they might very readily spare a very small percentage of it, and by that means they might not only overrun our territory, but also the adjacent territory of the United States. After they once obtained a strong foothold in the United States, they might naturally expect that they would not stop there, but come to Canada. There had been a great deal said about the admission of the British

into China, and that, the British being admitted into China, the British ought to admit the Chinese everywhere within the British Empire. It would astonish anyone who would take the trouble to look into the fact to discover that there were scarcely any foreigners at all in China. He would draw attention to the Statesman's Year Book for 1878, and he would read the figures giving the number of resident foreigners in China :

"According to a return of the Imperial Customs authorities, the total number of foreigners resident in China at the end of 1872 was 3,661; among them were 1,771 natives of Great Britain and Ireland, 541 of the United States, 481 of Germany, 239 of France—all other nationalities being represented by a very few members. More than one-half of the total number of foreigners, viz.: 2,047, resided at Shanghai, and 308 at Canton, the remainder being scattered in small numbers over the ports open to foreign commerce."

That was in China proper; but there was an English colony adjacent to China, known as Hong Kong. That colony, also, had a very small European population. The total number of the resident population of the colony in 1871 was 1,381 men, 468 women, 407 boys, and 264 girls. This showed that the entire foreign population of European origin in China proper, as well as in Hong Kong, did not in the aggregate equal the total Chinese population, as alleged in the appendix to the petition, now living in British Columbia. It appeared to him there must be a great degree of unwisdom in allowing a people like the Chinese to flow into our country in those numbers, without giving us a corresponding return. He would next enquire, from whence do these Chinese come? It might be imagined they came from China direct to Canada, or direct from China to the Australian Colonies, or direct from China to the United States. But such was not the case. The Chinese went directly from China to the British port of Hong Kong, and there they took ship, and moved to the various countries around the Pacific Ocean. Sometimes they were taken to the port of Havana, or to some of the sugar-growing countries in South America. Occasionally, some Chinese passengers came direct from Hong Kong to British Columbia; but they generally came to British Columbia *via* San Francisco. They had, therefore, these facts before

them, that they were suffering from the immigration of Chinese that reached them from the United States, and from Hong Kong. He took it that they required some repressive measure to keep out the Chinese, as they were a low class of the population, whose immigration they did not desire to encourage. They desired to encourage the immigration of first-class men and women. He would read to the House the kind of repressive measures they required, and the suggestions of the Committee of the Senate of California, which were as follows :—

“The duty devolves upon us to suggest a remedy for the suppression of this immigration. The Chinese now here are protected by our treaty obligations and laws, and that they will continue to receive that protection the people and Government of this State will be responsible. If further immigration is prevented they will gradually return to their own country, and the occupations in which they are now engaged will be supplied with labourers and immigrants of our own race. The temper of the people of California is such, that the employment of Chinese will be, as it has, to a considerable extent, already been, discouraged, and this will effectually compel their departure. As to future immigration, neither a total, nor partial, abrogation of the Burlingame Treaty will afford relief. The mass of, indeed the entire, immigration comes from the port of Hong Kong, a British colony. No alteration in our treaty stipulations with China could have the slightest effect upon the passenger trade of that port. The British Colonies of Australia have, like us, suffered under the incubus, and have recently endeavoured, by hostile legislation, and, in some instances, by force, to effect the exclusion, and obstruct the further ingress, of Chinese. Those agitations, coupled with the earnest and uniform policy of Great Britain, of suppressing any traffic resembling the slave trade, convince us that an appeal to that country would lead to the desired result. Indeed, we may well assume, in view of the amicable relations existing between the English Cabinet and people and the United States, that, in the absence of any urgent reasons, addressing themselves peculiarly to Her Majesty's Government, it would, upon proper diplomatic representation, cordially co-operate with our own Government in arriving at a satisfactory remedy.”

They concluded in this way :

“We would, therefore, most respectfully suggest as the means of a final solution of this grave and ever-increasing difficulty :

“*First*.—An appeal to the Government of Great Britain to co-operate with our own Government in the absolute prohibition of this trade in men and women ; and

“*Second*.—The joint and friendly action of the two countries with the Empire of China,

in the abrogation of all treaties between the three nations, permitting the emigration of Chinese to the United States.

“And, in the meantime, we earnestly recommend legislation by Congress, limiting the number of Chinese allowed to be landed from any vessel entering the ports of the United States, to, say, not more than ten.

“This policy would, in a great degree, tend to a redress of the grievances that now sorely afflict our State, and threaten to overshadow her prosperity.”

He would next read for the information of the House—and he prayed its indulgence for taking up so much of its time, but this was the paramount question in the Pacific Province, he would only urge that as his excuse—from another report ; that was, the report of the Joint Special Committee of the United States Congress. They said :

“This problem is too important to be treated with indifference. Congress should solve it, having due regard to any rights already accrued under existing treaties, and to humanity. But it must be solved in the judgment of the Committee, unless our Pacific possessions are to be ultimately given over to a race alien in all its tendencies, which will make of it, practically, Provinces of China rather than States of the Union. The Committee recommend that measures be taken by the Executive, looking toward a modification of the existing treaty with China, confining it to strictly commercial purposes ; and that Congress legislate to restrain the great influx of Asiatics into this country. It is not believed that either of these measures would be looked upon with disfavour by the Chinese Government. Whether this is so or not, a duty is owing to the Pacific States and Territories which are suffering under this terrible scourge, but are patiently waiting for relief from Congress.”

He might add that the concluding portion of this report, which said that the States of the Pacific were suffering from this terrible scourge, applied also to British Columbia as much as it did to California or Oregon. He came now to what he regarded as something a little more practical, namely, what could Canada do if she were willing? He was glad to know that Canada, in his judgment, could do something. And, as the hon. the Minister of Public Works was in his seat, and proposed to construct a railway across this continent—a gigantic undertaking—which would employ a large number of men for many years, the petitioners, whose petition was before the House, asked that no Chinese should be employed upon the public works. This was strictly

within their own jurisdiction, and under their own control. They would not be violating any treaty. They might simply exercise their own undoubted right, and say whether they would employ Canadian born, or alien, or Asiatic labour. If the Government would pass a resolution or import provisions of this character into the contracts, respecting the Pacific Railway, or any other public work of the Dominion, either on the Pacific coast or elsewhere, it would act as a repressive measure. It would be the means of preventing Chinese labour taking the place of the white man's labour. It would be the means of inducing the white man to come with his family and settle down in the country. It would result in introducing five persons into the country, of our own race, where only one was introduced before. If the Government were willing to do this, the Government would act as benefactors of the country. There was another point wherein the Government might put a stop to the Chinese obtaining a foothold in this country. The Government had vast territories; this territory included Keewatin, the unsold portion of Manitoba, and the North-West Territory, and within a very short time millions of acres of land in British Columbia would be passed over to the Dominion, on account of the construction of the Pacific Railway. Now, he took it that the Government might, by the amendment of the Lands Act, make such a provision that no Mongolian should be allowed to purchase land, that no Chinaman should be allowed to lease land belonging to the Dominion, and the tenure might be so fixed that even those who bought land would be prohibited from selling or leasing their lands to Chinamen. By this means they might introduce a repressive measure that would operate against such a low class of immigrants as he had shown by extracts read to-day. To prevent the Chinese immigrating to this country, we ought to amend our Naturalisation Law, so that they could not be naturalised. In the United States they were prohibited from exercising the rights of American citizens, according to recent renderings of the Courts. In Canada, also, they should not be allowed to be naturalised, and, if any such were already naturalised, they should be dis-

franchised. Another point was that our Shipping Acts should be so amended that no Chinamen should be allowed to act on board our ships or our steamers within our waters as sailor, as stoker, as cook, or as waiter. They should be entirely excluded from any opportunity whatever to gain employment in a Canadian bottom. He had been on board American ships on the Pacific coast, where out of a complement of 100 persons there were only 15 English, and the rest were Chinese, with whom it was impossible to communicate except by a few words. Another point was that our Immigration Acts should be amended in such a manner as to restrict the importation of Chinese, and more particularly in regard to those detained in quarantine on account of diseases, because it was a notorious fact that they brought the leprosy with them, not only moral, but physical. All these repressive measures Canada could adopt without the consent of England or any other country; but when it came to the question of keeping the Chinese out of our territory, we should have to amend the treaty between Great Britain and China. The British Government might make an arrangement by which the Custom-house at Hong Kong might prohibit ships from taking Chinese passengers to this country. The Chinese might then, and no doubt would object, that, as they allowed us to go any where through their territory, they should have the right to pass through our territory, and they would urge that such an attempt would be a violation of the treaty. If we made an arrangement with the United States, asking them to prohibit any of their vessels from taking Chinese passengers to our ports, they would then call up the Burlingame Treaty, which said:

"The United States of America, and the Emperor of China cordially recognise the inherent and insalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects, respectively, from the one country to the other, for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents. Citizens of the United States visiting or residing in China shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, or exemptions in respect to travel or residence, as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favoured nations. And reciprocally, Chinese subjects visiting or residing in the United

States, shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, and exemptions, in respect to travel or residence, as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favoured nations. But nothing herein contained shall be held to confer naturalisation upon citizens of the United States in China, nor upon the subjects of China in the United States."

Hence, the only means he could see by which we might stop this immigration of Chinese to Canada was by the United States Government acting in concert with the Government of Great Britain, to modify their treaties with China, and to confine them simply to commercial transactions, instead of allowing them to move their people into our country, to remain here, and to engage in any industry. Thanking the House for its indulgence, he moved the adoption of the substantive motion, hoping that the Committee would be able to arrive at some practical conclusion, which would assist the Government in doing something to relieve the Western Province from the terrible scourge from which it was now suffering in the way of Chinese immigration.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would like to know what course the Government proposed to take in reference to this matter. The hon. gentleman had indicated what he desired, which was the expulsion of a certain class of people from the continent, and the prevention of that class from coming to the continent in future, in any capacity whatever, whether as servants or on board vessels. He (Mr. Mackenzie) would like to know what course the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government proposed to take before he said anything on the subject.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could see no objection to the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into this subject. The Committee should be very impartial, in order to look at all phases of the question. This was a matter that interested not only Canada, but the whole of this continent. As his hon. friend had shown very carefully, it also interested our sister colonies in Australia. It was well that this whole subject should be carefully studied before the overwhelming Chinese population came upon us, and, we ought, as early as possible, to enquire into the whole matter. He

MR. DECOSMOS.

knew no better mode of doing this than by having a very carefully-selected Committee examine all the evidence, and study the case as it had been presented in California, and along the Pacific coast, and also in the various colonies of Australia. There could be no better course than by taking it up at once, and having it fully studied for the future action of Parliament. He presumed, if a Committee were granted in a matter of such importance, all they could do would be to collect evidence, and to ask leave, as was the custom in England, to report at a future Session.

MR. ANGLIN said he observed power was asked to send for persons and papers; if persons came all the way from British Columbia as witnesses, it would cost a great deal of money.

MR. DECOSMOS said there was no intention to send to British Columbia for persons or papers. If there was any necessity to examine witnesses in British Columbia, the Government would, doubtless, appoint a Commission to do so.

MR. BUNSTER said he had this motion as a duty he owed to the Province from which he came; and he did so with pleasure, since he believed it to be in the interest of the whole Dominion. It afforded him great gratification to witness the kindly spirit in which the House had received the motion. When, a year ago, he brought a similar motion before the House, the members did not seem to know as much of the Chinese question as they did to-day. He thought the present House had given more attention to this great and growing evil, which was gradually working its way eastward from the Pacific coast. The people on the Pacific coast were better judges than gentlemen in the Eastern Provinces of what the results of this great evil was likely to be upon the human family. If he could use language to describe how injurious was the importation of the Chinese to our country, it would make every hon. gentleman's blood in this House run cold, and particularly every hon. gentleman who had the responsibility on his shoulders of raising a family in any part of this Dominion, when he considered the evil influence which was likely to befall any member

of that family. For his part he would say that he never would have made British Columbia his home, had he thought that country was to be visited by such an intolerable nuisance and curse. It was the bounden duty of every public man in the Dominion to consider carefully how we could protect a race that had prospered so well, and had been so much admired by the rest of the world as the Canadian people. And he would tell them that, if Canadians did not set their face firmly against the importation of the Chinese, they would regret it once and for ever. In years to come they would regret that they did not give more attention to the subject. This matter was one of interest to the whole English-speaking race; it had attracted great attention in Australia, and in all British colonies, who, with the people of British Columbia, viewed with great suspicion and alarm the danger which threatened us from the incursion of a surplus population of 400,000,000 of people in China. We saw them coming here in little bands, but they were sent as agents to report on what they saw and experienced, and how much money they could make by keeping laundries and other industries, to the prejudice of our own people. This Chinese immigration had proved, as he had said, a great curse to his Province, because, instead of having 30,000 or 40,000 white people in that Province, the Chinese had come and taken the place of the European immigrants that would have come in as miners, or as agriculturists. He knew that International treaties stood in the way of the removal of this obnoxious race, but he could not help thinking that Great Britain would consent to alter or amend those treaties, and that she would send a commissioner to China, who would say to the Government of that country that our people and theirs could not agree, and that there was likely to be bloodshed between them, unless immigration was stopped. These treaties must be annulled, and it was better to annul it with British gold than with British blood. He did not think the proposed Committee would be expensive, because, as had been well said by the hon. mover of the resolution, they did not intend to send to British Columbia for any more evidence than they already

had. When the report came down to this House, he was satisfied it would meet with the consideration it deserved.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said that, after the lucid manner in which this question had been presented to the House by the hon. mover of the resolution, and after the exhaustive details he had brought forward, it would not be necessary for him to say anything further than that he entirely concurred in the motion. He believed, when this Committee collected evidence and submitted it to the House and to the people of Canada, they would agree that Chinese immigration to the Pacific coast was a curse to the Dominion and to the world at large. That immigration to the Pacific coast meant the settlement of the Chinese not there alone, but everywhere from the plains of the North-West to Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. If this evil was allowed to go on unchecked, in time it would subvert the whole white race on this continent. When they should have thousands and millions of barbarians pouring forth from their empire in the East in hordes that would overrun Canadian territories, they might expect to see them supplant western civilization, as the northern hordes overturned that of the Roman Empire. They would fill our country with their descendants and impose on it their manners, morality, or rather immorality, and religion. Everyone who had come in contact with that race must know its blighting influence on civilization, and that its presence on a large scale was an evil which it was necessary to crush out, if they wished to see their country flourish and progress. He thought that this matter could be dealt with in no better manner than by the appointing of such a Committee as that now proposed. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) had correctly described the feeling on the Pacific coast. He (Mr. Thompson) knew that in every part of it, from British Columbia to Arizona, every white man felt that Chinese were a nuisance and a curse, and that getting rid of them, by any means, was an end that must be accomplished. If they did not get rid of the Chinese, the Chinese would get rid of them. They did not bring their families to America,

but sent everything they could save to China, and even their bones. It was part of the bargain with the companies who hired them that their bones should be sent back, after death, to China. They had their secret societies, as described, wherein even their own countrymen were murdered on disobeying their rules. The proceedings of those societies were undiscoverable. Was it right that such a race should be encouraged to come among us and be allowed all the privileges of whites—that the corrupting and blighting influence of the Chinese should be allowed to overwhelm the land, and every good and glorious thing it possessed? The jails on the Pacific coast were filled with them; they were capable of every iniquity under the sun; they could not be believed on oath, and their interpreters often contradicted each other in Court. How was it possible for anybody to get any information as to the secrets or doings of such men? As to the statement that British Columbia was doing a large business with China, he might state that during the last six months of 1878, they exported to foreign countries goods to the amount of \$1,878,803, of which amount only \$34,720, or one and four-fifths per cent., went to China. All that they exported to China was occasionally a cargo of lumber. He trusted that the House would see the wisdom of taking this serious subject into consideration, and, if possible, of devising some means by which that great evil which threatened to overwhelm their country, namely, the unlimited immigration, might be averted.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that to avow the principle that some classes of the human family were not fit to be residents in this Dominion would be dangerous and contrary to the law of nations and the policy which controlled Canada. They usually spoke of all British countries as being a home for all who came to them, and it was at present perfectly well known that Canadians were not competent to exclude the Chinese. He quite sympathised with a good deal that the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia had said about the unpleasantness of the neighbourhood of a great mass of Chinese. But what remedy was pro-

Mr. THOMPSON.

posed? If it was a mere question of how the Chinese were to be governed in Canada, the Government might take the matter up; but the whole aim of the British Columbians was to devise the speediest means of excluding them from the country. That was a measure he could not, on principle, accede to, as he believed the principle would be surely abused in the worst possible manner, were such power committed to any officials. He believed that it would be contrary to the principle on which their community was based. While the Chinese had bad, they had, no doubt, also good qualities. The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Thompson) had stated that there were many criminals among the Chinese, including perjurers; he might get equally bad cases in Canada without going to the Chinese. His impression was, from all he had heard, that the mass of the Chinese in California were better behaved as regarded the observance of the law of the land than the same number of whites. He feared that the same was the case in British Columbia; and, however unpleasant the neighbourhood of the Chinese might be, he did not see how it was possible to accede to the proposition to expel them without at once giving up all they held sacred as to the rights of man in their own as in other countries.

Mr. MILLS said he thought the motion was very objectionable, and that the mover's observations were not consistent with each other. He said that the Chinese scattered on this continent nearly all came from one Province; that they did not make America their home, but desired to return to China, to which they sent their earnings, and that they in no wise dissociated themselves from their native land. That was true; then what became of all the hon. gentleman had said for the last hour? He told them that the Chinese ought not to acquire property or rights here; that they should take special care that the Chinese did not supplant the white population. Where was the danger if they belonged, and intended to return, to China? Where was the necessity of taking the proposed action against people who sent their earnings to China, with the intention of, some day, returning thither? The

hon. mover proposed to deal with these people as their Christian ancestors, to their dishonour, did with the Jews. It was only necessary to give those people a bad name, to represent their peculiarities as crimes. They recognised the particular practices and customs of the Indians, and did not experience any inconvenience from them. The Indians were Tartars, or members of the same Mongolian race, against whom might be said all that had been alleged against the Chinese. The proposition now advocated was not creditable to this age or country—that they should propose to attach odium to a nation with whom their Mother Country carried on trade, and had treaty relations. They should not give the Chinese a bad name, and then hunt them down like rabid dogs.

MR. SCRIVER said that, while he sympathised with some of the views of the hon. gentleman who just sat down, and of the leader of the Opposition, he thought the House should not shut its eyes to the importance of that subject, nor to the importance it had assumed in the neighbouring country. They were all aware of what had taken place in the American Congress, where they had passed a law embodying substantially the principle for which the members for British Columbia had contended; and, although the law was vetoed by the President, it came near being passed over his veto. That was in consequence of the agitation on the Western Pacific slope. The people of California, he thought, were almost unanimous in the belief that the evils which had already come to them in consequence of the Chinese emigration were insufferable. He did not attach very great importance to the economic aspect of the question, but the moral aspect was one which they must not ignore. For his own part he was quite willing—while not prepared to go as far as the mover—to see a Committee appointed to investigate the question so far as the interests of the Dominion were, or were likely to be, concerned.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that he thought the difficulty in California was not altogether on the moral aspect of the question. They were living in an age which witnessed a great embarrass-

ment among the workmen as regarded the making of a living. The severity of the competition had entered into the discussion of the question in that country; the course pursued in which should not surprise them, as it was largely given over to the doctrines of Protection to everything but labour. The Government of the States were called upon to protect the native labour as they had hitherto protected the native manufactures, which was a phase of the question that Canadians ought not to lose sight of. When the senior member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald) had no opinions to express at present, he (Mr. Huntington) would be inclined to wait until he heard from him. Still he thought it well they should understand this was what the Minister of Public Works would call inserting the thin edge of Protection in reference to the labour question, and the time was not so far distant when the Chinese would not be the only people who would be regarded as standing in the sunlight of the great labour interest of this country. When the hon. gentlemen had studied the moral aspect of the question, they must extend their view and take the economic aspect into consideration. He did not undertake to say that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Decosmos) was at all influenced by other than the high moral consideration he had mentioned. The hon. gentleman would agree with him that the labour question in British Columbia was intimately connected with the apprehension that the great danger was hanging like a cloud over the country. They knew that was the case in the United States. He would simply remark that they were hearing the first murmurs, but the system they were adopting was likely to multiply them as time went on.

MR. DECOSMOS said he could not help feeling amused at the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite. They appeared to be something like anglers, throwing out a fly with the expectation of catching a trout. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) said he did not wish to say anything against this motion, and was disposed to wait. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was disposed to indulge in a little logic

of very poor quality. And as to the leader of the Opposition, he was the personification of the old-fashioned notion that the moment a slave touched British soil he was free; that Britain, to-day, was an asylum where everyone could at once gain a foothold, and be recognised as living under the protection of the British flag. A country with such vast territory as Canada possessed to-day, must take larger views than obtained a few years ago, when it was but a few scattered isolated Provinces, and had not grown up into a vast nationality. It was the duty of a statesman to meet this question, not merely in a narrow spirit, with a view to find fault with the Government of the hour, but to take a patriotic stand, and endeavour to probe the subject to the bottom, and discover whether there were any real grounds for an enquiry into the question of Chinese labour and immigration. But to stifle its discussion at the outset was unfair, injudicious, and not following the ordinarily deliberate course that obtained in the Imperial Parliament. He would merely refer to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Shefford. He stated this was entering the thin end of the wedge of Protection with reference to labour. It had no connection with Protection, except that due protection we all ought to give, irrespective of politics, to our race in our own country against an Asiatic and pagan horde that would overrun and crush us whenever opportunity was afforded. If hon. gentlemen opposite studied the various aspects of the Chinese question, whether it were on the Russian border, in the neighbourhood of Afghanistan, or on the Pacific coast; if they would take up the Consular reports of the United States, read the letters of correspondents, look into the volume of trade, study the ambitious projects of the Chinese, they might discover that we were standing to-day in peril as to our future from a country with 400 millions of inhabitants, within forty days' sail by sailing vessels, that was buying steamers, and driving the flag of the United States from the waters of China, that could reach the shores of British Columbia, and gain a foothold in California, within 25 or 28 days by steamship. If it were to acquire a thorough

knowledge of the use of modern implements of warfare and skill in the management of ships, and they had one built on the European model, and to send their fleets to the Pacific, our wives might yet hush their children to sleep by whispering to them: "The Chinese are coming." Just as sure as the sun shone to-day, there would be a conflict between the Mongolian race and our own. They were on the move as in times past, when Tamerlane and Ganges Khan moved with their horrid masses from the banks of the Amoor and its tributaries until they landed in European Turkey. What had occurred in the past would occur again. History repeated itself, and he warned hon. gentlemen that they should not ride this hobby of theirs to death. When a great people like the people of California, when a great Congress like the Congress of the United States, took up this question, and dealt with it as they had, when a Schouvaloff rose at the World's Congress and warned European nationalities, it would become hon. gentlemen opposite to look more seriously into this question, and not in any carping way. They should place this question above party interests, and consider it in the interests of common humanity, in the interests of that race which gave the best religion and laws to mankind.

MR. MACDONNELL said he quite sympathised with the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. It would, however, be a very unprecedented act on the part of the Dominion, and at variance with the policy of other nations, to pass a law to prevent the immigration of people from any portion of the world. If some people came into this country, bringing with them practices or habits of immorality, or any other peculiarities which we could not tolerate, we should rather suppress such peculiarities by legislation than legislate for the exclusion of such people. It might be the duty of this Dominion, as it had been of other countries, to send missionaries into other countries in order to ameliorate the condition of the morals of inhabitants, and, if we passed a law to exclude the Chinese, if we closed our ports to any people of any portions of the world, such countries could retaliate, and close their ports

against us. He could not agree to any proposition which would have for effect the exclusion from this wide Dominion of any nationality whatsoever. It was well known that people were improved by intermixture, and the greater variety of nationalities we had in this country, the more vigorous and intelligent would our population become.

Motion agreed to on a division.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT ST. SIMON.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. FISET moved for a statement showing all complaints, if any, made against J. D. Bouchard, station master at St. Simon Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, and the reason for which he was discharged from his office.

MR. TUPPER: I presume my hon. friend will give some reason to the House for making this motion.

MR. FISET said he believed Mr. Bouchard had been discharged without reason, and wished to ascertain the facts.

MR. TUPPER said, when an hon. member asked for a return for papers, he should show some cause for complaint. He was prepared to give the fullest information, but the time of the House should not be uselessly occupied and expense created, in preparing papers such as those asked for, unless the hon. member who moved for them was prepared to advance some reason for making the motion.

MR. MACKENZIE said he differed from the hon. the Minister of Public Works. Any hon. member was entitled to the information he asked for in a matter of this kind, without stating further reason than that he believed the officer had been unjustly dismissed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the invariable rule, and it could be found in May's Parliamentary Practice, was that every hon. member moving for papers, and putting the country to the expense of getting up a return, was bound to give his reasons. It would be a clog on the administration of affairs if every act of the Administration could be

made a matter of legislative discussion at the simple request of any hon. member, not backed by reasons of any kind.

MR. FISET enquired whether, in his capacity of member for the county of Rimouski, he had not the right of asking for the reasons which had rendered necessary the dismissal of Mr. Bouchard, as well as the dismissal of all those concerning whom he had asked for papers. He would say more, and that was that, in the county of Rimouski, that he had the honour of representing, dismissals were the order of the day. It was sufficient that such and such an employé had supported him (Mr. Fiset) during the late election, in order to institute an enquiry into his conduct and dismiss him. He could well understand why hon. members on the other side were opposed to his motion, for if it carried the public would know that these men had been dismissed unjustly and without any other reason than that they had voted for him. At all events, he would enter his protest against the line of conduct pursued with regard to officials in the county of Rimouski, who had supported the Liberal party during the late election.

MR. TUPPER said the House could not have a better illustration of the impropriety of making such motions than in the case of the motion of the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset). He was not at all surprised that the mover of the motion did not venture to offer to the House any complaint in reference to the matter under consideration. The hon. the leader of the Opposition said that every member of the House had the right to ask for any papers he chose, or to ask for an investigation.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not say investigation.

MR. TUPPER said he understood the hon. gentleman to say that any member could ask for anything he chose. He (Mr. Tupper) would not say that a Minister, or the Ministry, should be the judge, but that the House should be the judge as to whether a *prima facie* case had been made for the production of correspondence, or the bringing down of returns. He had brought down this Session, most voluminous returns upon

the most frivolous motions—returns which had taken up the time of officers, who otherwise would have been employed at important work, and which eventually found their way into some waste-paper basket. He did not think that was in the interest of the House or country. He thought that, where there was reason to believe that the slightest injustice had been done by the Government to the humblest public servant, then any hon. member was fairly entitled to demand the production of any papers on the subject, after he had made a statement of the facts to the House, and, although the grounds given might be regarded as insufficient, he (Mr. Tupper) did not think the House would be disposed to arrive at a conclusion in the case without having the papers before them. What he complained of was that the hon. member had not uttered a single word to show that there had been any injustice in this case, but simply left it to be publicly recorded that such a return had been asked for, and, if the motion was allowed to pass, it would lead the country to think that the House assumed that some injustice had been done. The hon. gentleman knew that the services of the party mentioned in the motion had been dispensed with, along with those of a great many other parties, in order to reduce the public expenditure. The hon. gentleman must know that a reduction of \$40,000 could not be made in the expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway, in salaries of officials alone, and the parties whose services were not necessary be retained. The fact that he (Mr. Tupper), though it was a painful duty on his part, had to dispense with the services of a great many officers of the highest character and standing, who had discharged their duties faithfully, ought to be sufficient reason for the discharging of the party referred to in this motion. He might add that a large number of the persons whose services had been dispensed with had been life long political friends and supporters of his. He would say further in reference to this particular case that, even if the services of this party had not been dispensed with on account of the reorganisation of the Intercolonial Railway, he would have been discharged on account of its having

MR. TUPPER.

been proved by evidence brought out in another investigation that this official had gone into a railway car and insulted passengers. Not only was that the case, but he had refused to perform work which it was his duty to perform. He thought that, under these circumstances, the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) would have consulted the interest of the party concerned if he had left this motion in abeyance.

MR. HOLTON said it appeared to him that the hon. the Minister of Public Works had given every good reason why these papers should be brought down. He (Mr. Tupper) told the House that this party had acted improperly, and a statement of that kind would be most injurious to the party referred to, and the hon. gentlemen should not withhold the papers.

MR. TUPPER said he was not going to refuse the papers. He merely wished to show the impropriety of making motions of this kind, without a statement of facts being made, or some grounds given for granting the papers.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 50) Respecting *La Banque Jacques Cartier*.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

Bill (No. 28) To amend an Act, intitled: "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the 39th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.—(Mr. Girouard Jacques Cartier.)

CIVIL SERVICE BILL.—(BILL 8.)

(Mr. Casey.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for second reading read.

MR. CASEY said this Bill related to a subject which he had been agitating more or less for about four Sessions.

and no doubt his persistent agitation of this matter called down upon him a certain amount of ridicule from those who did not think the subject was of sufficient importance to require an investigation, or that the evils which had been discovered were of sufficient consequence to demand a remedy. He felt, however, that the more this matter was discussed the more it would be seen there was reason for investigation and reform. He was emboldened in this proceeding by the fact that the press of the country had very largely agreed with the views he had taken in this matter. They seemed to agree that something was wrong in the Civil Service, that some remedy was required, though there was not a universal agreement on the remedy he proposed. He was happy to see that it received approval from those who had so much to do in influencing public opinion. If it were not that there were so many new members in the House who were not acquainted with the past history of this agitation, he would not enter again into any lengthened discussion of the subject, but he felt bound to do so to a certain extent, on account of that fact. It began by his having a discussion in the House four years ago. Two years ago he followed up the matter by moving the appointment of a Committee composed of gentlemen from both sides of the House, to investigate the present state of the Civil Service, and to suggest a remedy. After examining the heads of all the Departments, he thought—he did not know that they missed one—and several officers under those gentlemen, the Committee unanimously, after considering the scheme laid before them, the system at present in force in England and some of the other colonies—Victoria, for instance—agreed on a report, pointing out a great number of evils they found to exist in the Civil Service, and the remedy which they would recommend. He would, in passing, refer to a few clauses of the report which they then presented. They found, in the first place, that there did exist an Act which purported to regulate the officers of the Civil Service, and which had been on the Statute-book since 1857; but they found that that Act was practically a dead letter. There was no check to the appointments, except the check which existed in the conscientiousness of the member recommending

the candidate, or of the Government which received the recommendation. The Committee found, in effect, that the present law provided only a means of excluding the totally ignorant, and, that even this means was not put in operation. He thought, speaking from memory, that, within the six or seven years preceding the sitting of this Committee, only ten examinations had been held, and they found by looking at the papers, that the examination for admission into the high schools of Ontario was more rigid than that to which Civil Service candidates were submitted. And, even then, they found the examination had been the exception rather than the rule. The deputy head of the Post Office Department told them that the average class of men which they obtained in the post-office was not as good as that obtained by banks and insurance companies, or other similar private institutions. This evidence was confirmed by most of those who were examined before the Committee. He thought there was only one deputy head who told them he was perfectly satisfied with the material supplied to him. It seemed to him (Mr. Casey) that this was a very anomalous and improper state of things. He did not think it was too much to ask the Government that this country should be served by young men, who were not only equal to those obtained by private institutions, but superior. He thought it was reasonable to say that the Government required better servants than any private institutions, and he thought it was reasonable to suppose that the Government could obtain better servants than those private institutions. They paid higher salaries to their clerks upon entering, and it was consequently natural to suppose that they could get the best men. Yet, according to the heads of the Departments, the Government did not get as good men as commercial institutions which paid smaller salaries. He desired to know what could be the reason of this. Without going any further, he might as well take the evidence of those gentlemen who were examined before the Committee. They said the cause of his inferiority was the manner in which the appointments were made. It arose from the system of appointment by political patronage instead of selection

in some way for merit. If a private institution wished to select an employé, they did not ask some of their personal friends to recommend a young man and then take him on trust. They wished to be satisfied that the young man was capable of discharging the duties which would be imposed upon him, and that he was honest and had the physical ability to withstand the strain of the work he had to do. But the Government did nothing of the kind. When an officer was required, or a vacancy occurred, the most influential friend of the Government who had a friend to nominate for the vacancy was sure of having his friend appointed without any scrutiny whatever in regard to his antecedents or qualifications. He hoped hon. gentlemen would not think he referred entirely to the present Government. He was quite aware that the system of patronage had gone on without any efficient checks under all the Governments that had existed in Canada. He did not blame any particular Government, but he condemned the system under which these appointments were made. The argument in favour of the present system was that we had a responsible government, and that somebody must be responsible for the appointments, and that the gentleman who recommended and the Minister who made the appointments were responsible. He thought there could be nothing more hollow than this sham of responsibility. Had they ever heard of an instance in this House of a member being called upon to give the reason for an appointment which he had recommended? They had sometimes found a Minister called upon to make an explanation in such an exigency, but the man who had actually made the nomination was never called upon. There was no direct responsibility of a member. If he was responsible to anybody it must be to his constituents; but his constituents were not always especially well qualified to judge of the fitness of an appointment. They might judge of its popularity or unpopularity, and this would lead the member to appoint the man who was most popular, and not the man whom he knew to be most fitted for the position. He desired to glance at a member's quali-

fications for making a selection, supposing him to be a conscientious man. What did the member know of those who applied to him for office? It was perfectly preposterous to expect every member to know the antecedents, private character, education and qualifications of one-tenth of those who applied to him for appointments. Now the only argument in favour of political patronage, was that somebody was responsible; but he thought it appeared, as a matter of fact, that no one was really responsible. And, if any one was even nominally responsible, it was not one who was qualified to make a proper selection of officers for the public service. Passing from the mere question of appointments, he would consider the effects of these appointments upon the service. In the first place, the influence which made the appointment did not cease there. It regulated the promotion and discipline of the service. It was a matter of notoriety that it was impossible to enforce discipline upon those who had a powerful protector in the House or in the Ministry, and it was impossible to dismiss an officer who had a friend in the Government, no matter how inefficient that official might be. Then, it was impossible for young men to obtain the promotion they would obtain in any other branch of life in which they used their talents. It was a matter of fact also that this insecurity of obtaining promotion injured the service and discouraged the ambitious. Indolent men, who hung on long enough, obtained their promotion without deserving it. He could cite instances in which good men had been discouraged, and the head of the Post Office Department told them that this was the reason he obtained such poor men in his Department. One of his deputies gave them an instance of a gentleman who, at present, held a seat on the floor of this House, and who was once in the Post Office Department (the hon. member for Essex). He was ambitious to make his work tell for himself, but, finding that his work did not tell very well in the Post Office Department, he resigned, studied, and entered his profession, and he now sat in this House, though still a young man. There was no doubt that other instances

occurred, though perhaps not so striking as this ; but, so long as this system continued, young ambitious men would drop out of the service, in which hard work and application went for nothing. He would next consider how political appointments worked when they came to the higher grades of the service. They all knew there were a great many employes in the public service who were in confidential positions, and who knew a great deal of what was going on. Many of them had knowledge of Government secrets. Supposing these gentlemen to have been appointed by political patronage ; supposing they were ardent friends of the Government under which they were appointed ; supposing one of them was a relative of a Minister, and that they remained in office after that Minister went out ; and supposing these gentlemen generally to be in confidential positions under the incoming Government, he thought it placed both the officials and the Government in false positions. The knowledge that they were appointed for political reasons, could not fail to give rise to a coldness and a want of confidence in them. This lack of confidence did not stop there ; it extended over the whole service. A Minister was impeded at every step by employes who had no sympathy with his politics, or who, perhaps, disliked him. It impeded, also, the business of the country. He thought still further that the system of political appointments had a most damaging effect upon the self-respect of the service generally, and upon persons who wished to obtain positions in that service. If the service were an honorable profession such as law, medicine, or any other occupation in which gentlemen engaged, it would be an inducement for gentlemen of ability to seek entrance into the service. But under the present circumstances, it would never become anything better than a refuge for those friends of the Ministry, or of the Ministry's friends who had no other career open to them. Of course he did not intend these remarks to apply to the higher grades of the service, because it was obvious there must be a large number of clever men in these grades. These gentlemen had to make up by extra exertions for the very poor quality of assistance given to them by the Government. It was demoralising

not only to those who received or expected the patronage, but to those who exercised it. Gentlemen now on the Opposition side of the House had had their turn, and now the gentlemen on the Ministerial side were having their turn, and, if the latter hon. gentlemen did not feel, as many of them who supported the late Government did, that the exercise of patronage was very unpleasant in the sense he had indicated, his (Mr. Casey's) ideas were greatly mistaken. It was unnecessary to point out that such a system offered means to the Government of the day of influencing or gaining supporters by the distribution of offices ; but it was not, perhaps, unworthy of notice that it was a real danger at the present time. That brought him, however illogically, to another branch of his attack in the present system. He should have stated before coming to this point that the present system led inevitably to what was called the American system, but which might, in a few years, be designated as the Canadian system. It was very reasonable to contend that a man who owed his appointment solely to political reasons, should go out with the party he supported. It was quite natural for the incoming Administration to feel that they had friends of their own as well qualified to discharge their duties as those that were employed. It always seemed to him (Mr. Casey) that a system of political appointments must, sooner or later, lead to political dismissals. It was not a very long time since the United States system was the same as that of Canada. One Government after another coming into power gradually fell into the present system, until the time of Andrew Jackson, when a clean sweep was made. He contended some years ago that the same result was inevitable here, and late events showed that it was coming pretty near. If the present Government had not distinctly initiated the American system of dismissing their political opponents, they had at least dismissed a great many—an unusually large proportion of them. He was not in a position to speak positively on that point, because the report moved for a long time ago had not yet come down ; but he was inclined to think the number of dismissals must have been very great, since the clerks of the Departments had not yet been able to foot

them all up. But even more significant than the mere number was the fact that members of this House had been found, for the first time, prepared to stand up here and demand the introduction of the American system—demand the dismissal of all those who were opposed to them at the late elections, and the substitution of their political friends. When the House had reached that point, and when Ministers could hear such language without rebuking it, he thought the time had come when they might look for the introduction of the American system as something in the near future. If the present Ministers did not carry it out in all its entirety, who knew but that their successors might? Who knew but that the ill feeling engendered by these wrangles might lead to some exasperated Ministry determining on a clean sweep on coming into power? It was simply a question of time; when party feeling had become sufficiently excited and public opinion sufficiently debauched, some Ministry or other would make a clean sweep of all the appointments made by their predecessors, and substitute their own friends. Nothing could be more detrimental to the public service than the relations between Ministers and their followers, which the American system induced. They knew that office-holders on the other side of the line were not only an organised band of workers in defence of the Government which appointed them, but they were taxed to provide an election fund for the support of the party to which they belonged; and a newspaper in Canada had even gone so far as to suggest that such a thing was proper here. They had seen, lately, what a storm was evoked in this House, by the fact that here and there some country postmaster, a lighthouse-keeper, or something of that sort, who had been appointed by the late Premier, had had the audacity to support his friends at the election then pending. These complaints were just; these men should not have been so pronounced in their political feelings. But, if they looked upon these casual interferences with disapproval, what must they expect when the whole Civil Service of the country should have become an organised institution for the purpose of supporting those who had the power in their hands for the time being?

MR. CASEY.

Not only would the Civil Service be an organised party for the purpose of maintaining themselves in position, but those who desired to obtain their places would be organised to put them out, and so the country would more than ever be divided into the "ins and outs," fighting for the possession of the spoils. Was this a prospect which those who had clamoured for the introduction of the American system would like to face. He would now refer to what appeared to him to be an efficient remedy for these evils. The remedy he proposed was not a theoretical one originated by himself, but it was a system which had been for many years in operation, among one of the most practical people in the world—he referred to the English system. The principle of the Bill was the same as the principle prevailing in the English Civil Service, but the details had been changed to suit our circumstances. The system was first tried in the Indian Service, and, being found to work satisfactorily there, it was extended step by step to the different Departments, and at present the appointments were made in accordance with it, to nearly all the Departments. The principle on which the English Civil Service was worked was what he might designate as the business principle. Men were not chosen at all for their political sympathies, but for their fitness for the position, ascertained as far as this could be done without actual experiment. The power of nominating to offices under the Government had been almost entirely taken away from members of Parliament, and was entrusted to a Civil Service Board, composed of a number of gentlemen not connected with politics, but distinguished from their scientific or other attainments. Applicants for position in the Civil Service were subjected to a primary examination, which showed their general fitness for the positions, and proved their possession of an ordinary English education. All who passed this were supposed to be fit for employment in the service; but the problem remained how to choose some amongst this number for the vacancies which existed. The Civil Service Commissioners made this choice by means of a subsequent competitive examination, which was much more severe than the first one, comprising a great variety of

subjects. Those who passed the competitive examination were graded in the order of their standing, and the vacant positions were distributed among them in the same order. The idea was simply the abolition of political patronage, and the substitution of merit. He did not pretend that this system had worked perfectly in England; but he did maintain, from the report of the Commissioners he had seen, that it worked much better than the old scheme. Moreover, no Government had ever attempted any relaxation of this plan, though both parties in the country had made it stricter and more abiding. A system which had thus stood the trial of many years' experience among such a practical people, which had stood the scrutiny of the press, and overcome the opposition of the privileged classes, had certainly proved its utility and excellence. There were errors in it, no doubt. No examination, however carefully conducted, could be an accurate test of a man's fitness to fill an important position. It could only be proved that he had the requisites necessary for all positions. A special fitness for a practical situation could only be ascertained by actual experiment. This had been made a ground of objection against the system. It had been said you cannot choose a proper Civil Service officer by an examination any more than you can choose a distinguished officer for the army. A friend of his told him the other day that the fact of a distinguished commander in the Zulu war having been almost plucked in the examination was a point against this system. He did not think it was by any means; he did not think the fact that an uneducated man occasionally made a very good officer was an argument against the position that educated men generally made the best officers, either in the Civil Service or the army. The Civil Service Commissioners maintained it had been found by experience that those who were the best educated generally made the best officials. He did not limit that to England; he found that point had been decided to a small extent among ourselves. The Department of Inland Revenue had been for some years an exception to the rule that examination was not enforced upon public officers in

Canada. They had in that Department instituted something like a competitive examination on a small scale. He would quote from the evidence of Mr. Miall, Assistant Commissioner of Inland Revenue, to show that examination had there been found not only a good test of efficiency for the service, but a good means for testing a man's fitness for promotion:—

“ Mr. Miall detailed the experience of the Department, and stated that those who passed the best examinations proved to be the best officers on actual trial, while those who failed were altogether useless.”

The House would take for granted that the best educated men would make the best public servants, other things being equal. He was sure that men chosen by competitive examination would be better in other respects, including character, than uneducated men of the same age. A thorough education implied an amount of steadiness and application, and a proper use of time, with which less educated persons could not be credited. In his scheme something more than that presumption was afforded, because here, as in England, no young man would be admitted to examination until he had obtained the best certificates as to moral character, physical condition, and fitness of age. The system of choice by competitive examination would secure primarily the best educated young men, and presumably, therefore, men of as good character as any others. The Bill was founded almost entirely on the English system, and, on report of a Committee of 13 or 14, chosen from both sides, unanimously agreed to. The Bill, in the first place defined the Civil Service, which included all those occupying positions in the public employ, whose whole time was required, at salaries of not less than \$360 a year, and the occupants of such others as might be added thereto. The system was not to apply to country postmasters or employes at small salaries, whose whole time was not required. He proposed also to establish a Board of five persons, not members of the service, to administer all existing legislation in regard to it—to enforce discipline, and make such new rules and regulations as might be necessary—appointed by the Governor in Council, and holding office on the same

terms as Judges. The administration of the service would be safer in the hands of such a Board than in those of any political Committee whatever, and the Board would have a much better opportunity for ascertaining the qualifications of applicants than now existed. All the regulations and executive actions of the Board would be immediately announced in the *Canada Gazette*. Executive acts should only be annulled by Order in Council approved by Parliament; the Ministry of the day not to interfere with its management, except for grave cause; the Board to be, in some degree, responsible to the Ministry, who should have some power to oversee and direct their work in serious cases. The Ministry could overrule their acts only by an Order in Council, which would be brought down to the House and defended there. He had taken a leaf out of the book of Professor Lyon Playfair, Chairman of the Civil Service Committee in England, in dividing the Civil Service into two classes; the first consisting of permanent employes of different grades, and the second of temporary clerks and others employed during a press of work only. The lower division of temporary clerks were classified in the same way as the higher, getting their places by competitive examinations, the Government not being bound to employ them but when and for what periods it chose. After a certain date, all appointments were to be made as the Bill provided. There should be an examination to decide the attainments of applicants, nobody to be admitted without producing satisfactory certificates; competitors to be graded according to attainments. The Board should decide as to the subjects of examination. He had only provided that the qualifying examinations should be a test of ordinary education in English or French. The competitive examinations should afford a wide choice of subjects. The examination should produce educated, trained men, to obtain whom they should enlarge the scope of the examination, so that no mere smattering should count for anything. A candidate showing a thorough acquaintance with any subject, should receive a bonus of marks over another who got the same number of marks by knowing a little of several subjects. Had they the class of young men fit for office

MR. CASEY.

under that system? Considering the number of professional men, school teachers included, annually trained in their public schools, there would be an abundance of raw material. About 1,000 school teachers were annually turned out in Ontario alone; Dr. Hodgins having stated that the second-class men would be superior in education to the ordinary class of civil servants, and that three or four hundred civil servants might well be obtained from among these school teachers yearly. He (Mr. Casey) had provided that certificates should only entitle the holder to be taken on trial for a year, when, should they have failed to obtain a certificate from their Departmental superior, they would be immediately discharged; if successful, they would be permanently appointed, their time to count from the beginning of their trial. It had been stated by the deputy heads of the Departments, that selection by examination, combined with trial, was the best system of appointment. Scientific subjects should be kept separate from general, special papers being prepared for them. Only engineers who had gone through a special preparation required should be appointed. Mr. Sandford Fleming had stated in evidence that the old engineers' service had been very bad, and that he had frequent reason to protest against appointments forced upon him. Indeed, in the building of the Intercolonial Railway, serious loss had resulted from the appointment of engineers, without consulting him. In justice to his political friends, he (Mr. Casey) must observe that Mr. Fleming had informed him that the late Government had adopted many of his suggestions, and, among others, that a certain curriculum should be passed before any engineer should be appointed, and that for the last few years nobody had been appointed of whom he did not approve. What he provided in regard to promotion was this:

"Vacancies shall be filled by promoting the next qualified officer in order of seniority, unless the head of the Department makes a special report to the Board, giving reasons satisfactory to the Board for the promotion of some other qualified officer."

On this point, a great deal of indecision existed in his mind, before he made this arrangement, and he was still in doubt

as to whether this clause was the best means of meeting the difficulty. He felt undecided between the opposing claims of seniority and merit ; but he thought, on the whole, this clause met the difficulty. He would next notice section 15 :

“ The Governor in Council shall specify certain higher officers, to the number of not more than fifteen in each Department, who shall constitute the staff of such Department. All appointments of staff officers shall be made by the Governor in Council, on recommendation of the Minister for the Department in which they are made, and such staff officers shall be exempt from the regulations as to promotion and discipline contained in this Act.”

He inserted this clause in order that a Minister might surround himself with men, in whom he could have confidence in every way. He thought that the Ministers were entitled to a free choice in this respect. There were a number of minor details into which it was unnecessary to enter. This Bill was not a production of his own, but rather a condensation of all the best suggestions which could be obtained from authorities on this question, and if the Government allowed this Bill to pass its second reading, they would thereby assert only that they disapproved of the general tendency and effect of unlimited political patronage in making appointments to the Civil Service, and were in favour of allowing certain restrictions to be imposed on the present system, which would tend to securing, in general, a more highly intelligent class of men. The service would become, by this measure, a most honourable profession, into which young men of ambition and industry would seek admission, in which they would have the same chance of earning the reward their abilities entitled them to as they would in any other profession or business, and as more efficient servants would be obtained, a less number would be required than at present to do the work. The salaries, owing to a smaller number of men being required, could be raised in proportion. He left the matter in the hands of the House, reserving the right to reply to any objections that might be made.

MR. TILLEY said the subject was certainly a very important one, and he

felt the force of a great many of the statements of the hon. member. He differed with him with reference to some of his propositions, though he agreed with him with reference to others. For instance, the hon. member suggested that it would be desirable for a Minister to surround himself, in the most important offices, with persons in whom he had entire confidence. Were those men to be removed when a change of Administration occurred? That would be a violation of the principle his hon. friend contended for.

MR. CASEY : What I intended to say was that a Minister should have liberty, if he found it absolutely necessary, to place in these positions men in whom he had entire confidence. I do not refer to importations from outside the service so much as to promote people to these positions out of the ordinary course of seniority. It is not advisable that these gentlemen should be changed at every change of Government, but circumstances might arise in which it would be absolutely necessary to make some changes of the kind. This provision, also, is from the English system.

MR. TILLEY said still the objection remained, that for political reasons—because it was clearly indicated it would be for political reasons—a member of a second or third class might be placed in first class because his politics were in sympathy with those of the head of the Department. The subject had engaged the attention of the Government, and they proposed, during recess, to take up this whole subject, and, at the next Session, they purposed amending the present system in a manner which would meet some of the propositions contained in the Bill of his hon. friend, and meet also others to which he had not referred. He trusted, therefore, the hon. member would withdraw this Bill.

MR. CASEY said he felt gratified at the statement of his hon. friend, and deemed it his duty, under the circumstances, to withdraw the Bill.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS
ENQUIRY ACT AMENDMENT

BILL.—[BILL 32.]

(Mr. Ives.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. IVES said that, according to the Act in the Statute-book, the House could grant permission for an enquiry into corrupt practices in any constituency in the Dominion in either of two cases. The first case was where a Judge had reported to the House that, in his opinion, corrupt practices had prevailed to a considerable extent in the constituency. Secondly, where twenty-five electors presented a petition to the House, setting forth that, in their opinion, corrupt practices had prevailed, and asking permission of the House to investigate the matter. The object of the amendment, which he now moved the second reading of, was to require that, when a Commission was asked for by twenty-five electors, the petitioners should deposit with the Accountant of the House the same sum of money which was deposited with an election petition; that this sum should be retained to defray the expenses of the investigation in case the Commissioner appointed by the House reported that there was no ground for issuing a Commission, and that it should be returned to the petitioners in case the Commissioner reported that there was ground for issuing a Commission. He did not propose by this amendment to require that a sum be deposited in the case where a Judge had recommended the issuing of a Commission or further investigation. It was only in the case where a Commission was asked for on the petition of twenty-five electors. He did not believe the House would listen to any proposition to alter or lessen the stringency of the present Election Law; but it seemed to him that this Act did not form an essential part of the Election Law, as administered in this Dominion. He thought that the machinery of the law was quite perfect enough without it. It appeared to him also that the possibility of this Commission being applied for and granted to a considerable extent, without any risk on the part of the petitioners, but throwing the whole expense on the country, was a danger which it would be

MR. CASEY.

well to provide against. The extent to which this provision of the law could be abused could be easily imagined. Parties who knew of no corrupt practices having taken place, and were unwilling to risk their own money in an election contest, might be found very willing to give the opposite candidate and the constituency annoyance, particularly if they could do it at the expense of the country at large. And they could also easily imagine that a majority in the House could be found sometimes willing to grant this Commission for the purpose of giving annoyance to political opponents. It appeared to him that this Act was, as it were, objectless, also. He could not see, from the present law, that a sitting member could be affected, even after a Commission had said that corrupt practices did prevail. He could not see any advantage to be derived from this particular law, while it remained as it now did on the Statute-book. He did not understand either that the House could exercise any reasonable or sound discretion in the matter. The present Act said in general terms that the petition was to be presented by twenty-five electors. There was no provision that any evidence had to be produced before Parliament, as to the advisability or otherwise of granting the Commission. It was evident that the House must grant this Commission as a matter of course. Therefore, it seemed to him that it would be no serious blow to the stringency of this Election Law to adopt this amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (South Huron) said the hon. gentleman who had just moved the second reading of this Bill, might just as well, perhaps better, have moved for the repeal of the Statute he proposed to amend, because it was quite evident that, if this Bill passed, the Act passed in 1876 upon this subject would be practically repealed, and no attempt would be made to enforce it, if the enforcement of this Bill was to be conditioned on the payment of a certain sum of money. His hon. friend proposed by his Bill to amend the Statute by providing that clause No. 3 should be amended in such a way as to prevent parties from petitioning Parliament, un-

less they had, prior to presenting the petition, deposited the sum of \$1,000 as security, assuming that the petitioners acted in perfect good faith, and honestly intended to proceed with their petition. But after all, if it should turn out, after a petition had been presented, and a commission granted, that no corrupt practices, in fact, prevailed, then the parties who presented the petition and deposited the \$1,000, should forfeit that sum, or so much of it as was necessary to cover the expenses of the Commission. This appeared to him a hardship not contemplated when the Act was passed, and if enacted it would make the Act a dead letter—no one would proceed under its provisions. The hon. gentleman's Bill provided that, when corrupt practices were established, the \$1,000 was, in that case, and in that only, to be refunded to the petitioners. It appeared to him that that would be practically a repeal of the Statute proposed to be amended. A man who was returned as member for a constituency, would in no way be affected by the result of this inquiry, and, therefore, there was no inducement for any person to go to the expense or trouble to run the risk of depositing this large sum of money. The hon. gentleman's Bill, he (Mr. Cameron) apprehended, had relation to the third alternative under which this power of Parliament could be invoked. There were three clauses under which a commission could be granted. The first was where the Judge, who tried an election petition, reported that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed in the constituency; then upon that report being presented to Parliament, a resolution might be moved and carried, directing the issue of a Commission to make further enquiry, and a Commission might thereupon issue for such further enquiry as to the correctness of the report. The second was where a Judge reported that in his opinion further enquiry was necessary, because the first enquiry was rendered incomplete by reason of the action of parties interested in the election petition. The third clause, as he understood it, was intended to provide that, where 25 electors of a constituency presented a petition, duly verified, to Parliament, alleging that corrupt practices extensively

prevailed, or that there was reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed, then, upon an address of Parliament, a Commission might issue to make this enquiry, provided for in the third section of the old Act. His hon. friend proposed that no petition should be presented to Parliament under the third alternative of this section unless this deposit had been made. He (Mr. Cameron) could not see any reason why twenty-five electors should have the power on their own mere motion of invoking by petition this extraordinary power of Parliament. The House knew how easy it was to get up a petition to Parliament for this or any other purpose. The Bill which this Bill proposed to amend allowed the presenting of a petition to Parliament by twenty-five electors who had thus the power of invoking this extraordinary jurisdiction, and sending abroad over a constituency a sort of roaming commission, with a species of inquisitorial powers to examine everybody, put the country to an immense expense, and when that was accomplished there did not appear to be any provision in the Statute by which effect could be given to the report of the Commission. In this respect the old Act was defective, and this Bill did not propose to cure defect. No doubt, if Parliament were satisfied that corrupt practices did extensively prevail in any constituency, Parliament had the right to disfranchise such a constituency, and that in one sense might effect the sitting member, but even then only indirectly. But that would be an extreme measure not likely to be resorted to; especially as, under the present Election Law, where it was alleged that corrupt practices prevailed, the parties interested in presenting a petition to the Courts could have a proper investigation, when the facts could be submitted to the Courts and the proper remedy applied. He thought the hon. gentleman's idea that, if a verified petition, signed by twenty-five electors, were presented to Parliament under this third alternative, the House had no discretion in the matter, but was bound to grant the Commission asked for, was a mistaken one. He (Mr. Cameron) did not understand that to be the law, although he must admit that the Statute

in this respect was exceedingly vague. He thought it was discretionary with the House to say whether or not a Commission should be granted, even if the provisions of that clause with respect to the preliminary proceedings were complied with. If the view of the hon. gentleman, in this respect, was correct, it appeared to him that there was a serious defect in that portion of the Statute, as, in that view of it, on the presentation of a petition, signed by 25 electors, to Parliament, a Commission must issue, as a matter of course. He (Mr. Cameron) did not so read the law. Upon looking into the practice that prevailed in England under a Statute, not exactly the same as this, but similar in many of its provisions, it would be found that there Parliament was not bound to act, and, in many cases, refused to act, unless upon evidence being adduced to justify the interference of Parliament in this extraordinary way. They found that, in several cases, that course had been taken. The Canadian Statute was, to some extent, a transcript of the Imperial Act, from which many of its laws were borrowed. He did not think that the clause he was discussing, the third alternative, was to be found in any of the English Acts. The first two clauses, upon which a Commission might issue upon an Address of Parliament, were practically taken from the English Act. The first English Statute upon that subject, passed in 1840, provided that, if an Election Committee recommended further enquiry into alleged corrupt practices in any constituency, it became the duty of the House, or the Speaker, to set the machinery of the law in motion, for the purpose of punishing that constituency for the corrupt practices that prevailed. He was not aware that any case arose under that Statute. The next Statute was passed in 1850. It provided that, upon the report of an Election Committee that corrupt practices did prevail in any constituency, a Commission issued, as a matter of course. That Statute was superseded by one passed in 1851, which provided that, if a Committee reported that corrupt practices prevailed, then, upon a joint Address of both Houses of Parliament, a Commission might issue. But, even in that case, where a Committee,

charged with the investigation of alleged corrupt practices, in so far as a candidate was concerned, reported that corrupt practices did extensively prevail, or that it had good reason to believe that corrupt practices prevailed, Parliament did not issue a Commission as a matter of course. There was the Canterbury case, where the House hesitated a long time whether a Commission of that kind should be issued, and in the Clitheroe case the House refused to issue a commission, because the House was not satisfied that the facts were sufficient to justify the issuing of a Commission, giving such extraordinary powers as were granted by the English Statute, and as were given by the Statute in Canada, so that he thought his hon. friend was wrong on that point. He (Mr. Cameron) thought that, if the only object of the Bill of the member for Richmond (Mr. Ives) was to provide that the machinery of the law should not be set in motion upon the mere presentation of a petition, the arguments of the hon. gentleman did not hold good; because, though a petition might be presented, Parliament still had the right to enquire whether or not there was sufficient ground for the issuing of the Commission asked for. It was with that view of the law that the Grenville case had been referred to the Committee on Elections and Privileges, so that proper enquiry might be made with a view of ascertaining if there was any reasonable ground for the issue of a Commission. He supposed that Committee would make the necessary enquiries, and ascertain whether there was sufficient evidence or not to justify the issuing of a Commission, and putting the country to a very large expense. He might say he would be very glad if his hon. friend had introduced a Bill to repeal that portion of the Statute that enabled twenty-five electors of their own mere motion to petition Parliament for an investigation into corrupt practices, and thereupon ask Parliament for such a Commission. He thought it was an extraordinary power, and he was not a little surprised that that clause should have been allowed to pass through Parliament, with hardly any comment on it. Upon referring to the debate which occurred when that Bill was before Parliament, he found that it was

agreed to almost unanimously. The only hon. gentleman who expressed any dissent was the right hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald), who seemed to have serious doubts as to whether that portion of the Bill was not putting an extraordinary power into the hands of twenty-five electors. He hoped the right hon. gentleman was of the same opinion still. He could see no reason for the repeal of the whole of the Act, but he was in favour of the repeal of the third alternative in section 3 of the Act. He apprehended that the other provisions of the Act would very seldom be invoked, because, under the other sections of the Act, the House would only be asked to act on a report of Judges appointed to try these controverted elections. He thought they could with safety rely on these Judges. They would not make a report that corrupt practices extensively prevailed in a constituency unless they had prevailed. If they had extensively prevailed it would then be advisable that an enquiry of the kind contemplated by the Act should be made, and that enquiry would be based on the report of the Judges. But as to the other alternative of leaving it in the power of any 25 men who saw fit to get up a petition of this kind, perhaps from spite, political animosity, or any other cause, and thus invoke the power of Parliament to issue a Commission and set the machinery of the law in motion at an enormous expense to the country, it appeared to him that such a power should not exist, and he was entirely opposed to it. The objection he had to his hon. friend's Bill was that it practically repealed the objectionable clause he had been discussing, and he thought it would be far better to do so in so many plain words than put it in the way his hon. friend had put it. He thought his purpose would be served by the repeal of the third alternative in Section 3, and if that was the hon. gentleman's object, he was prepared to give him every assistance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he agreed with very much that had been said by his hon. friend who had just spoken with respect to this particular portion of the Bill of 1876. He then thought, and he thought still, that it was

an unusual and rather dangerous power, because it meant the power of annoyance to every sitting member by twenty-five men rightly or wrongly guided, by making a statement that they believed that corrupt practices prevailed in a given constituency. The sitting member's seat, under such circumstances, would be morally affected. He did not see how the member, although he was not petitioned against individually, although his seat might be fully protected, he did not see how he could keep his seat before Parliament and the public, if there was a solemn decision that extensive corrupt practices had obtained in his constituency, and that such practices had operated in his favour. He thought it would place the sitting member in a position in which he could not keep his place; therefore, he thought, it was a dangerous power, and that they might well keep within the lines of English legislation on the same subject. However, now they had the measure, he thought it would not be well to repeal it just now. He thought that, inasmuch as it was once on the Statute-book, they ought to pay sufficient respect to the Parliament who passed it to give it a fair opportunity of being worked. If it were a dead letter, as his hon. friend said it was, it would do no harm. It would be time enough to repeal it when it was proved to work oppressively. He did not agree with his hon. friend from South Huron, in regard to the repeal of the clause respecting the power of petitioning. He thought that, if 25 men were guided by patriotic or party motives, to make a petition to deprive the constituency, in which they lived, of their franchise or representative, their feelings of patriotism would enable them to raise this sum of money. It acted as a very considerable check, and, in that sense, he would prefer the Bill of his hon. friend to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Huron. He had no objection that the Bill should go to its second reading, but he would ask his hon. friend to postpone going into Committee till another day, as he would like the House to be fuller, and he would like to see some of his friends on the matter.

MR. GUTHRIE said that, when the Bill of 1876 was before the House, it was

pointed out by the right hon. gentleman that they ought to have some guarantee of the *bonâ fide* character of the petition. The Grenville case had in a practical way called their attention to the fact that the Act of 1876 did apparently put it in the power of twenty-five men to demand a general investigation at the expense of the country, when, perhaps, the petitioners had not sufficient confidence in their own case to file an ordinary election petition.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Act does not do so.

MR. GUTHRIE said he thought, therefore, that some such measure as was introduced by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe should be adopted. He did not think they should strike out that provision enabling twenty-five electors to call for an investigation, but should add a condition to it. It might be that the electors who petitioned this House had not the information in time to file an ordinary petition. Where twenty-five electors certified that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed, and where they showed their honesty in that belief by a *bonâ fide* deposit of a considerable sum of money, thereby risking the loss of that money, he thought that ought to be sufficient, and that they would be justified in retaining the measure on the Statute-book. It had been observed by the right hon. gentleman that, although it did not affect the member's seat directly, it certainly did indirectly, because if a Commission appointed at the instance of the House were to find corrupt practices extensively prevailed, the whole election would be vitiated. The only object of this intervention appeared to be either to disfranchise or punish the constituency, or to punish the electors and others who had been found to be guilty of corrupt practices. He hoped the Bill would be read the second time, and that the question would be seriously considered as to whether they should leave the amount as proposed by the hon. member for Richmond at \$1,000, or put it at \$500, or some lower sum. He believed that, with the addition of some guarantee, such as the deposit of a large amount of money, the Act of 1876 should be retained.

MR. GUTHRIE.

MR. IVES said he did not mean the House to understand, as his hon. friend from South Huron appeared to have understood, that, in his opinion, the House had no discretion as to the issuing of this Commission. What he meant to say was that they had no proof before them, except the fact of the petition, and that they must either make a rule to grant all such applications or to refuse them, or to do as they saw fit about it, or as their feelings might induce them to act. If they took the latter course, they could easily understand that the majority would issue a Commission or would refuse it, as the parties likely to be affected were political friends or opponents. The Bill made no provision whatever for the House or any Committee to make an *enquête* as to whether the petition was well founded or not before issuing the Commission. If they were to do so, why issue any Commission at all? Why not leave the whole matter to Parliament or to a Committee of Parliament? As he understood the South Grenville case, it was referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections simply to report whether the petition was in the form required by the Act. If they reported that it was, then this House certainly would have discretion to grant the Commission or not, but they would have to act in the the dark more or less, and would have to decide whether to refuse or grant it without any proof to go upon.

Bill read the second time.

MARINE ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS ACT
REPEAL BILL.—[BILL 44.]

(Mr. McCarthy.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MCCARTHY said that, in moving the second reading of this Bill, it was proper to give some of the reasons which induced him to bring in this measure. The Act was passed in 1875, with the apparent object of striking at the vested rights, or the rights the Anglo-American Company considered they had under the charter obtained from the Government of Newfoundland. The Bill, however, had not been a success; it had not in any

way carried out the intention of the Government that introduced it. It had not in any way affected the rights so far of the Anglo-American Company; but, instead of that, it was found to be a hindrance to other companies, and particularly to the Direct Cable Company, which was the only other company which now had a cable across the Atlantic. The Bill was particularly objectionable in the 14th, 15th and 16th clauses. By the 14th clause it was directly enacted that no company not incorporated under the Act should have the right of communicating with the Dominion of Canada, or should have the right in any way to use any telegraph wire or a cable connecting either the Dominion or two or more Provinces of the Dominion. It was true there was a proviso to this section, and by this proviso the Anglo-American Company were permitted, in fact, to continue transacting their business until an Order in Council was passed determining that some other cable company, or companies, had been established able to transact the business required in this Dominion. Now that appeared to him to be a very unfair and unjust provision. Its only effect was this: so long as we required to use the Anglo-American Company's cable, we should permit the Anglo-American Company to do the business which had been hitherto done between this country and the old country, but as soon as we could dispense with the service of that Company, then Council might pass an Order, and their vested rights and property might be totally and completely destroyed.

MR. MACKENZIE: Their vested rights?

MR. MCCARTHY said his hon. friend sneered at his statements that they had vested rights, but any company who had expended such enormous sums as the Anglo-American Company did in laying their cable across the Atlantic had some rights that ought to be respected. As a matter of law he understood they obtained rights from the Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company, but that was an exclusive right to land upon the shores of Newfoundland for a period of fifty years, and an exclusive right to communicate between Newfoundland and this Dominion for a like period.

That was what he called a vested right. It had been argued, he believed, that, by the transfer from the Newfoundland Company to the Anglo-American Company, without the consent of the Legislature of Newfoundland, the right of the former company was lost—their vested right was lost. If that was so, then there was no necessity for this Act at all. If they had no vested rights, if they had no right at Newfoundland, then this Act was not necessary, because that it was wholly directed against that company was beyond all question. Then there was another provision which, to his mind, was extremely objectionable. Clause 16 enacted that "Any company which may be incorporated under the provisions of this Act, or may become incorporated by general Act of Parliament, shall not be at liberty to enter into, or to making any arrangement with the Anglo-American Company;" it should not be permitted to make any tariff arrangements or to make any such arrangements as might be needful for the proper working of these different cable companies. What was the result? The result, as the facts at present showed, was this: There were but two companies, the Anglo-American and the Direct United States Companies, and the most important thing for the directors of either of these Companies to provide for was that, in case of the breakage of either cable, their business would be carried on by the other line. According to this clause of the Act, that was rendered illegal and impossible. The object of that must have been to affect in some way or another the Anglo-American Company. Now, he did not see the necessity for it at all; he did not see why this Act was passed originally, and, having been passed, he did not see why it should not be repealed. It could not be injurious to the public interest that as many cable companies should be established as possible. It was a direct benefit to the public to break down any monopoly, if monopoly existed; to reduce the charges that these companies were making, if those charges were more than proper, and to that end that more companies and more cables might be established and laid. In order to do that, he thought it was plain that every facility should be afforded to establish them. This was a

disability, not merely to the Anglo-American Company, but it was a disability affecting every other company to enact that it should not be lawful for it to enter into an agreement with the Anglo-American Company. If these views did not commend themselves to hon. gentlemen then, he would say this: The Statute was practically a dead-letter. There was now—as was perfectly well known to everyone—an agreement between the Direct Cable Company of the Anglo-American Company, by which they had agreed as to the tariff rates, and by which they had arranged to do one another's business in case of breakage, and that in direct violation of this Act of Parliament, and yet they were powerless to prevent it. It was impossible to prevent it, so that the Act had failed to secure the object that was intended. In his judgment that object was not a good one; in his humble opinion the Act was an unjust one and had a tendency to fetter and to prevent the establishment of other cables between here and the old countries, and in that way was a direct and positive injury to the public. Then Section 15 was, in his opinion, also a mistake. It provided that any company established by Act of Parliament of Great Britain, or otherwise incorporated in Great Britain, might obtain a charter here. Now, what was the effect of that when you put it into practical operation? The effect was, that you had two companies. A company which owned a cable, and had been incorporated in Great Britain, applied here and got a charter, but that made another company here, and the only difference was, that there was one company owning a cable and having the means, and there was another company without the cable and without means. There were two separate and distinct corporations running in parallel lines. That, of course, was not the intention. The intention was to have given an English company, incorporated in Great Britain, rights which the Parliament of Great Britain was powerless to give, that is, to work a cable from this end. For these reasons, he thought this Act should be repealed; first, because it was unjust, and struck at a company to whom we all owed so much—that is, the Anglo-

American Company. It was interfering, to some extent, with their vested rights, or it purported to do so. It was, moreover, an unnecessary fettering and interference with the rights of English companies that might be hereafter established. They should be left perfectly free to make such arrangements and to enter into such terms and agreements as, to these different companies, might seem right. The more companies there were the less the charges would be. He believed the intention of the hon. gentleman opposite, who introduced the Bill, was to do away with what he called the monopoly of the Anglo-American Company. What was that monopoly? The only pretence to a monopoly was the right to land upon Newfoundland—the exclusive right to land there for fifty years. But the Direct Cable Company did not land at Newfoundland, it passed by and came here to the Dominion.

MR. MACKENZIE: It was not allowed to land.

MR. MCCARTHY asked what difference it made whether it landed there or not. This was an instance of a company which could be worked without landing there. Then it was contended that the Anglo-American Company had no right to land upon Newfoundland any more than any other company. In fact, the right which the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company obtained had been lost. If so, there were no vested rights to be interfered with and there was no necessity for the law. So, from whatever point we looked at it, it appeared that the Act was misconceived, that it was mischievous and ought to be removed from the Statute-book. He, therefore, moved, seconded by the hon. member for Cardwell, that it be repealed.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was a little singular that the movement for the repeal of the Act was coincident with the arrival in this town and country of the agent of the Anglo-American Company. When the Bill was passed in 1875, the Anglo-American Company was seeking to absorb the entire telegraph business. It had obtained a monopoly of the use of Newfoundland, which colony was, so to speak, the great telegraph post

MR. MCCARTHY.

in the middle of the Atlantic. It was seeking to absorb the entire trade of the continent, and to retain the absolute use of this privilege. The Direct Company was established with the express purpose and with the express condition of maintaining an independent position, apart from that of any other company established. The Act which the Canadian Parliament passed enabled that company to defend its position. Now, it was a little singular that this agent, this gentleman who is here for the purpose of stimulating the repeal of that Act, affected to be the agent of the Direct Cable Company, instead of the Anglo-American Company. It was well known, however, that Mr. Pender and his associates, nearly two years ago, purchased into the Direct Company enough shares to control its action, and it was at this moment practically under the control of the other company. That company was also under the control of the Globe Company, the whole forming one of the most gigantic monopolies that was ever known in the world, and which sought to control not merely the telegraphic business of this continent through the Atlantic Ocean, but also the marine telegraphy of every part of the world. Now, if ever there was a just Bill passed by Parliament, it was the Bill of 1875, which established proper relations as regarded the two companies, and proper regulations which all companies would have to observe doing business in Canada. He felt himself at that time obliged, as head of the Government, to warn Mr. Pender, through Sir John Rose, the day before the meeting at which this transaction was consummated, by which he and his associates obtained control of that company. The United States Government, coincident with this movement, also sent a similar warning, and the business of the corporation had since been carried on by sufferance, the Government of the Dominion having it in its power at any time to adopt regulations under this Act which would effectually squelch the whole attempted monopoly and maintain an independent telegraph system for Canada. The hon. gentleman said all this was mischievous, and he proposed to repeal the Act in order to repair the mischief of preventing this giant monopoly from absorbing the business of the

country and the continent. The hon. gentleman proposed to repeal this enactment, in order to place Canada at the feet of this giant monopoly, and he (Mr. Mackenzie) was amazed that the Government should have allowed the Bill to proceed to its second reading without even expressing any opinion as to the course they thought best to take in reference to this Bill. He was very sorry to be obliged—as he was obliged as a public man—to refer to individuals in connection with this movement, but he had enquired what was the exact truth, and he was stating the exact truth in declaring that the movement was promoted and stimulated by an agent of Mr. Pender and his monopoly, in order to obtain control of the telegraphic business of this continent. He trusted that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government would, in the public interest, prevent this mischievous movement of the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe from proceeding any further.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) said if the object of this Act passed in 1875 had been, as was stated by the hon. member for Lambton, to do away with a gigantic monopoly, it was quite clear that object had not been realised, according to his present statement, seeing that to-day we had this "gigantic monopoly" in spite of this Act. He (Mr. White) believed that a moment's consideration would show that the Act, instead of doing away with monopolies, must prove exceedingly injurious in relation to the ordinary telegraphic system of Canada. Under the 14th clause of the Act sought to be repealed, no telegraphic land system uniting any Provinces in the Dominion, or, as he thought, any land system in the Dominion itself, could unite with any telegraphic cable system having relations with the Anglo-American Company. Now what was the position in which they stood to-day? The Direct Cable Company had, by the admission of the hon. member for Lambton, relations with the Anglo-American Company.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman misunderstood him. What he had said was that Mr. Pender and his associates had bought into the Direct Cable Company enough stock to control its opera-

tions, and though nominally a separate company, it was under the control of the other company.

MR. WHITE: Precisely; the Direct Cable Company was under the control of the Anglo-American. But such a relation of those two companies was forbidden, and if this law were enforced in Canada the Direct Company could have no relation with the Anglo-American Company, because it was the latter which was sought to be destroyed by this Statute.

MR. MILLS: Not destroyed.

MR. WHITE said it was sought to be practically destroyed, so far as the relations of the Direct Cable Company with it was concerned. The object, as stated by the hon. member for Lambton, was to destroy the monopoly which the Anglo-American enjoyed in the island of Newfoundland, by rendering illegal, so long as it was maintained, any connection with it of any cable landing on the Canadian shores. Supposing that that this Act had any effect whatever, what would be the result? That as those two companies were practically one to-day—as the Direct Cable Company had really violated this law, by practical union with the Anglo-American Company, they could have no connection by any land telegraph company with either of those cables. What was the position in which they stood? It was well known that the connection with the Anglo-American Company was, although nominally through the Western Union, or with a Nova Scotia Company controlled by the Western Union, in reality with the Montréal Telegraph Company. But as the 14th clause of the Act forbade any such connection, it could at any moment be stopped, and the most serious embarrassment to the telegraph system must result. Again, at this moment, as he was informed, and had no doubt correctly informed, an arrangement had been made or was about being made by the Dominion Telegraph Company with a direct cable company, but such an arrangement must also be illegal, because of the union between the Direct and the Anglo-American cables in violation of this Act. Was it to the interest of this

Mr. MACKENZIE.

country that they should have an Act on the Statute book which produced such results, while, as had been admitted by the hon. member for Lambton, it had not, in the slightest degree, operated as it was intended, to prevent that amalgamation and the monopoly resulting from it.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had made no such admission.

MR. WHITE said that if the hon. gentleman had not admitted it, he had an extraordinary way of expressing himself. He had opened his remarks by an attack on a gentleman who could not answer him on the floor of the House, by suggesting that there was in the city, nominally, an agent of the Direct Cable Company, but, in reality, the agent of the Anglo-American, the controlling interest in the former having been purchased by the latter; and yet, now, he wished the House to understand that he never suggested there was any connection between them. If the statement of that hon. gentleman was correct, the amalgamation was one of the most practical kind, and the result was, that in consequence of that Act, the Dominion and Montréal Telegraph Companies could legally have no connection with the cable companies; that is, assuming that the Act was to be enforced. Was an Act like that to remain on the Statute-book? Clearly, by the statement of the late Premier himself, who never sought to enforce the terms of the Act against the companies, it was a dead letter, its only effect being to force companies to do illegally, or by some roundabout process, what they ought to be permitted to do in the interest of the country, as well as of themselves, as an open business arrangement. The statement of the hon. member for Lambton was, in reality, the strongest reason for the repeal of that Act, and he sincerely hoped that the present Bill would pass.

MR. McCUAIG said he assumed that the country required cable connection with Great Britain, and that they needed some protection against monopoly, which meant, of course, heavy prices. This Act did not control the prices, that might be changed after a monopoly was secured. If any previous Act limited prices, he should be quite willing to have

this Act repealed, because the public were entitled to some protection against extravagant charges by the monopoly before they repealed this Act.

MR. MILLS said he did not think that the hon. gentleman who had moved the repeal of the Act, or the hon. gentleman who had supported him had made out a case against the law. One hon. gentleman had said that there was now a practical monopoly. Well, if the stock of two independent companies happened to be in the hands of the same stockholders, a monopoly might be temporarily established; but that was quite different from consolidating or amalgamating them and permitting them to become one company. The stock in the hands of Mr. Pender to-day might be in the hands of some one else to-morrow, and the man who controlled both companies to-day might be able to control but one to-morrow. The existing evil, if let alone, would cure itself. What was now practically proposed was the establishment of a monopoly by doing away with any possibility of rivalry, and making those two companies one for all time to come. If there was established the principle of freetrade and inter-oceanic competition, so that any company might be established without Government interference, legislation of this sort might not be so necessary; companies might be left free to consolidate or not. At present, parties had to come to Parliament for powers of telegraphic communication. The proposition of the hon. mover was not in the public interest, but in that of certain parties who had for the moment a controlling influence in the two companies.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, when the Bill was before the House of Commons, last Parliament, he had opposed it both in the House and Committee, but it was carried. He opposed it on several grounds, but chiefly because it was improper by legislation to prevent companies which had invested their means in great works of that kind from making arrangements by amalgamation, or otherwise to render their enterprise more profitable. Any attempts by legislation to stop monopolies in the present day were absurd and useless. It was prophesied that they would be ineffectual,

which it was admitted they had been. The only way to check a monopoly was by the use of capital to fight it; and then so soon as it was shown that this united company—for it might be called a united company—had got a good thing, to use a common expression, or a profitable successful investment, capitalists would construct other lines across the Atlantic. The success of the Direct Cable had shown that it was not necessary to have a resting place in Newfoundland. There might be an infinity of lines between Europe and America almost anywhere to the north. He thought it was unjust and an interference in a vested right—a right established by the expenditure of a very large sum in regard to renewing the great risk that the first cable company ran—an immortalised risk—in the laying of the first cable. It was a vested right taken with the universal consent and by the expenditure which was under-acclaim of two continents, and the use of which by them met with their glad and ready acceptance. It was therefore infringing the ordinary rights of the company to prevent an amalgamation. The intention was a good one, but, as it had failed altogether, and as the two Companies were one, why should they keep that Act on the Statute-book and declare that to be illegal which, if they wanted the use of cable connection with England, must be carried out? As his hon. friends the mover and seconder had shown, the Montreal and Dominion Telegraph Companies were both acting illegally at this moment by acting in combination with either of those lines.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the Statute had the effect of preventing them. It was illegal in them to have any combination with companies which had acted in combination against the terms of the Statute. They knew perfectly well it was understood that the Montreal and Dominion Companies had now formed connections with the two lines. Those land lines, running from one end of the continent to the other, through Canada, and in which so many Canadians were interested, were placed in a disadvantageous position so long as this Act remained on the

Statute-book. His hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) had said truly that they should attempt to limit the charges or rates as much as possible. If they found, hereafter, undue or oppressive rates, they could, as in 1875, legislate against them. Meanwhile, he thought it was not for the interest of their own land companies, and their free and full use of the telegraph cables, that that Act should not be repealed.

MR. MACKENZIE said that of course he had none but the public interest in view in maintaining that Act. He was surprised that the hon. gentleman should be so ready to give a legal opinion on the subject. Had he considered it more carefully he would not have stated that the Bill prevented the Dominion or Montreal companies from making arrangements with the companies landing their cables in Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman in the Committee which considered the former Bill, had made a struggle to maintain that the Anglo-American company had vested rights. Cyrus W. Field was here then, and imagined he could control the Legislature of Canada, as he did some others, and the leader of the present Government presented his views to the Committee. He would remember, that when it was represented, as similarly represented to-night, that the Anglo-American Company had vested rights—and it would puzzle him to state what they were—the Committee of legal gentlemen, who were appointed to draft a clause to protect any possible interests existing, drew up the clause in the Act as it stood. He (Mr. Mackenzie) put it to any member of the House, to the whole House and people of Canada—was there ever any provision more just than that, if they had any vested interest or rights infringed by that Act. But the hon. the Premier knew that they had no such rights; and the gentlemen here, representing the Anglo-American Company, had never, from that time to this, attempted to establish any such rights; and it was in the power of the hon. gentleman opposite now, by taking the Act existing to prevent the amalgamation. As the head of the Government, it was in his power to prevent the amalgamation, practical or otherwise, which these two companies were striving to effect at

the present time. He might say, in reply to the taunt that he took no action under this, he did take action. He warned the parties in due time that the Government would not permit the proceedings they were entering upon to be carried to completion, and these parties were in communication with the late Government. The secretary of the company called about a year ago—during the last Session—to arrange for an interview, to endeavour to come to some understanding. It was then arranged between that gentleman and himself (Mr. Mackenzie), that Mr. Pender, if possible, or, if not, another director, should come to Canada in May or June. That gentleman only arrived late in September, and another event which happened in that month induced him (Mr. Mackenzie) to come to the conclusion that he should not enter into any negotiations in a matter of so much importance, during the last days of the existence of his Administration. But for that it would have been attended to last season. It was the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to undertake that work, instead of passing a Bill of this kind to take it out of their power to do what was right. It was their duty to see that right was done to their country, and an independent telegraphic communication across the Atlantic maintained. He deeply regretted, apart from all other considerations, that the Government should advocate a telegraphic combination such as that formed by Mr. Cyrus Field.

Question put and motion for second reading (Mr. McCarthy) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Baby	Drew
Bergin	Dubuc
Boulton	Elliott
Bourbeau	Farrow
Bowell	Ferguson
Brecken	Gault
Bunater	Gill
Cimon	Girouard (J. Cartier)
Cockburn (W Nthbrld)	Girouard (Kent)
Colby	Hooper
Connell	Jones
Coursol	Landry
Cuthbert	Lantier
Daoust	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Desjardins	McDonald (C. Breton)
Domville	McCallum

McCarthy	Ryan (Marquette)
McKay	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
McLennan	Rykert
McLeod	Sproule
McRory	Thompson (Caritoo)
Mousseau	Tilley
Perrault	Wade
Pope (Compton)	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Poupore	White (Cardwell)
Ross (Dundas)	Williams
Routhier	Wright.—54

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain	Houde
Borden	Kaulback
Burk	King
Cameron (S. Huron)	Mackenzie
Casey	McCuaig
Chandler	Mills
Coupal	Oliver
Fleming	Paterson (S. Brant)
Flynn	Rogers
Galbraith	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Gillies	Smith (Westmoreland)
Guthrie	Snowball
Haddow	Thompson (Haldimand)
Holton	Trow.—28

Bill read the second time.

MR. MCCARTHY moved that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

MR. MACKENZIE said the Bill should go before the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, as it provided for many contingencies connected with telegraph work, and the Committee would have to consider whether the repeal would be an absolute one or only a repeal of certain provisions of the Act.

SIR JOHN A MACDONALD said no public Bill need go to the Railway Committee, which was for the purpose of discussing Railway and Telegraphic Bills, Acts of incorporation and things of that kind, unless the mover of the Bill chose to send it to that Committee. But the mover did not ask this to be done; therefore, the rule did not apply.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said the rule was to deal with a public Bill in the House, unless on motion it was referred to one of the Standing Committees.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no doubt, whatever, that a public Bill should be considered in Committee of the Whole House, unless the mover asked the House

to refer it to a Select Committee for some particular purpose.

Bill referred to Committee of the Whole:

STATUTORY HOLIDAYS BILL.—[BILL 5.]

(Mr. Domville.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. DOMVILLE said the Bill proposed to give four holidays to the banking community. Bank officials had very few holidays, and they asked to have certain Mondays set aside in order that they might have a little relaxation from the strain imposed upon them by the present uninterrupted labour they were subject to. By granting this request they would be enabled to go away on Saturday to a distance, for a short time. In addition to that, bank managers and clerks could now get no time to attend to any private business, and they desired to have some relief in that direction. Since the Bill had been printed those gentlemen of the banking world, who asked for the passage of this Bill, stated that for some reasons it would be better to have the holidays occur on the second Monday in June, July and August. Of course that could be arranged in Committee.

Bill read the second time.

STOCK GAMBLING SUPPRESSION BILL.—

[BILL 61.]

(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT INTERPRETATION BILL.—[BILL 70.]

(Mr. McCuaig.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MCCUAIG said this Bill was sent down by the County Council of Prince Edward county. It appeared that the Scott Act repealed the Duncan Act, except in cases where by-laws were

in force. The Act was in force in the county of Prince Edward, but it appeared it could not take effect until the month of March, after the voting took place. The voting had taken place in that county on the 13th of March last, and the repeal was carried by a large majority. They had had the Dunkin Act in force in that county for two years, and during that period never before had there been so much drinking done. They were now asking to have a doubt removed, as to whether they could grant licenses or not. The law stated expressly that licenses could not be granted until the following March, after the voting took place, and this Bill was to enable them to grant licenses immediately after the voting took place.

Bill read the second time

DOMINION DAY HOLIDAY BILL.

[BILL 72.]

(*Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said this Bill had come from the Senate and had received the support of that body. He recollected that some years ago a similar Bill was introduced, but failed to receive the approval of the House. Since then, he believed, some desire had been expressed in different quarters that the 1st of July should be treated as a holiday in the Dominion, and, fortunately, the Senate had thought so too. He did know that the demand was very ardent for it. Still, it seemed to him it was a proper thing to do, to name the day of the birth of the Dominion as a public holiday.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would suggest to the hon. the mover of the Bill to refer it to the same Committee as that to which the Bill of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) had been referred, as it would be perfectly absurd to have two Bills upon the Statute-books this year respecting holidays. If it was intended to legislate in this direction, the statutory holidays would have to be made in the same Bill.

MR. McCUAIG.

MR. DOMVILLE said that the Bill before the House did not go as far as his did.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said it appeared to him there was a wide difference between the two Bills. In the first place, the Bill came from the Senate, and in the second place, it was for the purpose of establishing a national holiday. If he understood the Bill of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) it was merely in reference to holidays for the convenience of the banking community; therefore, he hoped the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) would not assent to the proposition of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie.)

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he hoped the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) would not press the question. This being a Bill from the Senate, it could not but be concurred in. It would be discourteous to the other Chamber to refer this Bill along with other Bills to a Standing Committee. This Bill proposed to create a national holiday, and certainly had nothing whatever to do with bank holidays.

MR. HOLTON: Supposing this House did not concur in the Bill, would that be any affront to the Senate?

MR. COCKBURN said of course the House had the right of assenting or not. But did the hon. member recollect any case where a Bill from the Senate had been sent to a Standing Committee to be considered along with other Bills?

MR. HOLTON said that, as the hon. gentleman had appealed to him, he would say that Bills from the Senate were treated precisely like Bills originating in this House. They went through the same stages, and were also subject to rejection very frequently. There could be no objection, therefore, in point of form. He thought there was a great deal of force in the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Justice, that this proposal rested on an entirely different footing from the proposal of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville).

MR. MILLS said he did not exactly see what was intended to be accomplished

by this Bill. As he understood the Bill of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), it dealt with matters which came within the jurisdiction of the House. He did not think this House had the right to say to a man in the employment of another man that he was discharged from any obligation to work on a particular day. Dominion Day was, he believed, universally kept as a holiday, at least, it was in Western Canada, but it was not kept under the authority of any Act of Parliament. He did not suppose that the passage of an Act of Parliament would, in any degree, render it a holiday in the sense in which the Bill of the hon. member for King's, N.B. made holidays for a certain purpose in reference to institutions under the control of Parliament. They could not establish a legal holiday of this kind.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): What is a legal holiday?

MR. MILLS said it was any day set apart which the people were at liberty to observe, and that was what the hon. gentleman could not do with regard to this Bill.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he would read the words of the Act itself—words which he hoped the hon. gentleman would not attempt to question as to what was the meaning of the Bill:

"Whereas it was on the first day of July that the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick became one Dominion, under the name of Canada; and whereas Rupert's Land and the North-Western Territory, and the Province of British Columbia became part of the Dominion in the month of July, and Prince Edward Island became part of the Dominion on the first day of July; and whereas it is expedient that such important events should be commemorated; therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

"1. Throughout the Dominion of Canada, in each and every year, the first day of July, not being a Sunday, shall be a legal holiday, and shall be kept and observed as such, under the name of Dominion Day."

Then the fourth clause said:

"4. Whenever the day which would otherwise be the day for the payment or the last day of grace for the payment of any bill of exchange or promissory note, payable at any place in the Dominion of Canada is Dominion Day, such bill or note shall be payable, and the days

of grace thereon shall expire on the day next thereafter, not being a legal holiday or non-judicial day, and not before."

He did not think this Bill should be classed with any other Bill, or sent to a Standing Committee, for mere legal purposes. He was quite sure that the public opinion of the country would justify the passing of the Bill sent down from the Senate.

Bill read the second time.

ONTARIO BUILDING SOCIETIES

BILL.—[BILL 79.]

(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

House adjourned at

Thirty-five minutes after

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 17th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TONNAGE DUES IN CANADIAN PORTS BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting tonnage dues.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said, under the Merchant's Shipping Act of 1876, ships carrying deckloads were charged not only tonnage dues on the registered tonnage of the ship, but also for dues on the space occupied by the cargo on deck. Under that Act that space had to be measured and included in the tonnage. This caused great delay, inconvenience, and expense. Last year a Bill was passed repealing the 23rd clause, but was refused assent at home, on the ground that this Parliament had no right to re-

peal an Imperial Statute. To remedy this, this resolution was introduced. In the despatch received, it was pointed out that whilst the measurement of the tonnage was an Imperial matter, local taxation was a colonial matter. Therefore, there could be no objection to this Bill. It would meet the case, and relieve the shipowners of the expense incurred.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he had doubts last Session as to whether the Act then passed would be allowed; but it was considered advisable to test the question. It was entirely wrong for the Imperial Parliament at all to interfere with the local taxation of this country; and the Bill last year was introduced for the purpose of exempting vessels in Canadian waters from the taxation imposed by an Imperial Statute. He did not see any practical distinction between the Bill now proposed and the Bill passed last Session, as both repealed, to a certain extent, the Imperial Statute. He should be glad to assist his successor, however, in any effort to relieve the shipping interest from the tax imposed by the Imperial Statute.

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolution *reported*, read the first and second times, and *agreed to*.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) introduced a Bill (No. 80) Respecting tonnage dues levied in Canadian ports under Canadian law.

Bill *read the first time*.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolutions:—

"1. That, whereas, by an Act passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia, in the year 1878, and known as 'The better Administration of Justice Act, 1878,' provision is made for the appointment of two Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, in addition to the number of Judges

new authorised to be appointed to that Court, it is expedient to make provision for the salaries of such additional Judges;

"2. That the salaries of each of the said two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, shall be \$4,000 per annum, and shall be payable out of any moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada."

MR. MACKENZIE said he desired to know if the Government considered this demand of the Legislature of British Columbia a reasonable one. At present the administration of justice there cost an amount immensely in excess of any other Province, according to population. In Nova Scotia, with a population of 400,000, the expenditure was slightly over \$50,000; in New Brunswick, with a population of 300,000, it was slightly over \$37,000; in Prince Edward Island, whose population was 100,000, it slightly exceeded \$15,000; in Manitoba, with a population three times that of British Columbia, the expenditure was not quite \$15,000; while, in British Columbia itself, the expenditure at present was over \$32,000, and this proposed an addition of over \$8,000, besides travelling expenses. There were in that Province, at present, three Judges in the Superior or Supreme Court, and six County Judges; and surely this array of judicial ability was sufficient for the wants of its small population. He did not think that because the Local Governments had the power to create courts, that we had nothing to do but fill these courts as soon as created. The Nova Scotia Government passed an Act establishing County Courts in that Province, which was brought to this House and passed by this House, and he did not think the Act was an unreasonable one, but it created great divergence of opinion, and the Bill was ultimately defeated in the Upper House, though it subsequently became law. This House should not agree to a proposition of this sort, merely because the Local Government of British Columbia thought it necessary to have two more Judges appointed to act in that Province. Some grounds should be given on which this House could exercise its wise discretion, and he looked to the Minister of Justice for further information.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this argument was taken before, when

this question arose, shortly after Confederation. Mr. Blake, he believed, then took the ground that it was not a matter of necessity that the Dominion Parliament should sanction the legislation of every Province with respect to the increase of Judges, and the consequent expense to the Administration of Justice. That was assented to as a general principle, but it was argued, and he had argued so himself, that when the whole responsibility of the Administration of Justice rested on the Local Governments and Legislatures, it would be a very grave responsibility for the Dominion Government to take to oppose a solemn Act of the Local Legislatures, declaring that additional Judges were required. Unless it were clearly proved that any Local Government making this demand had unjustly exercised its power, and would throw needless expense on the Dominion Government, we ought, as a general rule, to accept the solemn provision of a Local Legislature that it required additional Judges, as being correct. This principle was acted on in the establishment of additional Judges in Ontario and the new Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal was remodelled and three new Judges were appointed in the time of the late Government.

MR. MACKENZIE : The Bill passed in 1873.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Judges were appointed and salaries granted by the late Government. He had been and was still of opinion that the old Court was more efficient than the new one and less expensive. Still when the Act was solemnly adopted by the Local Legislature and the demand made here for the additional appointments and grant, these salaries were passed and the judges appointed, true to the principle that we should make a clear case against any Province before objecting to its claim in this respect. True, the population of British Columbia was small, and if the Chinese were kept out, it was not going to increase rapidly, still it was a territory of immense extent, and whether the population was sparse or numerous, the law had to be enforced in all its bounds, and, under the peculiar circumstances,

additional Judges might be required. Under the present system, all the Judges living in Vancouver Island, the travelling expenses were enormous. This measure, by providing that the Judges be settled individually, like county Judges, in their respective districts, would cause the additional salaries to be saved by the decrease in travelling expenses.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said as this question would be discussed at a further stage, he would not go into it at length at present. The Bill provided that the two Judges should reside on the mainland, specifying their districts ; also that they shall discharge the functions of the present County Court Judges, who were appointed when the Province was admitted into the Union, and who were not lawyers, and who administered justice perhaps roughly and cheaply. In the opinion of the Legislature, the Province had reached a condition when the administration of justice was not as satisfactory as could be desired. The increase of expense, from the report of the Attorney-General, and the Governor of the Province, would be very little, if any, in excess of previous expenditure, under this Bill. The persons who would retire would receive a much less remuneration than they did now, and, in addition, the enormous amount now paid for travelling expenses would be greatly curtailed. Irrespective of increase of expense, the Local Legislature gave very strong grounds on the point of necessity, showing that parties charged with crimes had to undergo, often, twelve months' imprisonment before they could be tried, and, in many cases, then proven innocent of the charges.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought if the doctrine laid down by the right hon. gentleman was accepted, they might look for a very large increase of the Judiciary. If the Legislatures of the Provinces were to have the absolute right of creating any number of new Judgeships they chose, or thought necessary, and throw the burden on the Dominion Treasury, such an increase would certainly be made. He was not at all disposed to accept that doctrine, and he contended that before they consented to provide the salaries, they should be satisfied of the

necessity that existed for the additional Judgeships. He did not think that they ought to be satisfied merely with the statement made by the local authorities, or make the provision because the Local Legislature created the office. The travelling expenses of Judges in British Columbia amounted, he believed, to nearly as much as their salaries. The question arose whether anything would be saved by Judges being compelled to reside in particular districts, as they must go occasionally to Victoria, perhaps, to sit *in banco*, the travelling expenses would, perhaps, still be as great as before. He thought they should have had as full information on this matter as could be furnished by the hon. gentleman when the Bill was introduced.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he should certainly give all the possible information, but the information would come from the source to which the hon. gentleman had access, the official authorities of the Province.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said the hon. member for Gloucester had stated the travelling expenses amounted to as much as their salaries. If the hon. gentleman would look at the Public Accounts he would find that that was not the case.

MR. MILLS said he did not see how there was to be any great saving in regard to travelling expenses, if the Judges were to sit *in banco* in Victoria. Would not the expense be the same going from a district in which they were located, to Victoria, as going from Victoria to the district? It seemed only to be a difference of starting point.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman would see there would be a great difference in the matter of travelling expenses by the Judges living in their various localities. They performed the duties of County Court Judges, as well as Superior Court Judges, and they would attend to the business of the Courts in their sections. They might go to Victoria, perhaps twice a year, he did not know how often. There was a difference between living in the district and going to Victoria twice a year, and living in Victoria and going into the districts when necessary.

MR. ANGLIN.

MR. MILLS: That is just the point.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

MOTION.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved

"That on every Wednesday hereafter, during the remainder of the Session, Government measures shall have precedence after routine business."

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 27.]

(Mr. Hooper.)

SENATE AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

MR. HOPER moved that the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill be concurred in.

MR. MACKENZIE said one of the amendments was a most important one, and was against the decision of the Railway Committee of this House, which decided that the broad gauge should be adopted. That also passed through the House, and he understood the contention was that they would not now be able to build the road with that gauge, and that if they were to obtain the right, they might be permitted to take the narrow gauge. While he personally regretted this should be necessary, he did not think the House would be justified in refusing to assent to the amendment if what they said was correct.

MR. TUPPER said he quite agreed with what had fallen from the hon. the leader of the Opposition. He thought it was very unfortunate the Senate had been obliged to make the amendment; but on representations being made to them, that the forcing of the broad gauge was tantamount to refusing sanction to the Bill, they had made the amendment. Although he thought it was a matter to be regretted, he was glad the hon. gentleman opposite did not feel inclined to press the views of the Railway Committee.

Amendments read the second time and agreed to.

OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS BILL.

(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

FIRST READING.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) introduced a Bill (No. 81) Respecting the official arbitrators. He said that the purport of the Bill had been communicated briefly by him to the Minister of Justice, and without that gentleman being committed in any way he proposed to introduce the Bill simply to remedy cases of arbitration that took place under the Board of Works Act, which were without any appeal whatever. The most valuable properties and interests of private persons might be taken away or totally destroyed by proceedings taken under the Public Works Department. References were made, under the Act, to the official arbitrators, who were to sit and determine the compensation which was to be allowed for property taken or damages sustained. There was no appeal from their decisions; and this, he believed, was the only country in the world where such an arbitrary power was permitted. The men into whose hands these references were committed were Government appointés—salaried officers of the Government of the day—and it was their interest to faithfully serve their masters. They had large private rights of property-holders, as well as claims of damages through public works done in connection or near to those properties; they had all these rights placed at the disposal of the official arbitrators. The object of the Bill was to do away with that anomaly of the law.

SIR A. J. SMITH: What do you propose?

MR. COCKBURN said he proposed, with the concurrence of the House, to make the Exchequer Court the Court of Appeal. Hon. gentlemen would have an opportunity of judging as to the propriety of the Bill, after it was printed and distributed. In the days of old Canada, when one of these cases arose, it was referred to a jury, which was called upon to assess damages. A change was made after Confederation, and this more arbitrary proceeding was established. It had been the law of the Do-

minion ever since, and he thought the time had now arrived for its amendment.

MR. MACKENZIE said he must object to the introduction of this Bill, which, if it were brought in at all, should be brought in by the Government. It was far too late in the Session to bring down a Bill which was to change so completely the system under which the greater amount of our disputed claims, in regard to public works, and for lands taken, had been settled, and settled, he was bound to say on the whole, and so far as his experience allowed him to pronounce an opinion, most satisfactorily. He knew something could be said in the way of argument against the present system. The hon. gentleman had striven to do so for a few moments on that occasion; but, on the other hand, they were to look at the public interest also. They had to see how the public could be best protected. There was a tendency even with arbitrators, as with Courts and Judges, perhaps, and certainly with juries, to amerce the Government with the heaviest possible damages. He had no doubt, however, from his knowledge of the present arbitration system, that claimants of all sorts had received full justice from that system. While the argument might be presented as the hon. gentleman had presented it, he thought it was a very serious matter indeed to interfere with the existing state of things, especially in the last days of the Session. He felt bound to oppose the Bill by every means in his power, and therefore he must object to its introduction.

MR. COCKBURN said he thought it would be a rather discourteous act to oppose it at this stage. If upon the second reading, after its contents were known, he were asked to postpone it, he would have no objection to yield.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he went very far with the hon. member for Lambton in his remarks. In the first place it was rather late in the Session to introduce the Bill, and a measure involving such great changes, he thought, should be introduced by the Government; but as there had been some discussion on the measure, and as the opportunity was insisted upon, he hoped

the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) would not press the point, because it would only postpone it a day or two.

MR. MACKENZIE said, as the Premier had intimated his intention of opposing the Bill, he would have to yield.

Bill read the first time.

STARVING INDIANS AT LA CHAPELLE,
N. W. T.

QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. MILLS,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD stated that information had been received to the effect that some 400 Indians in all, men, women and children, had gone to the Hudson Bay Station, at La Chapelle, on the Plains, in a state of semi-starvation, and compelled the officers of the company to give them food. The action was compulsory.

TRADE MARKS AND INDUSTRIAL
DESIGNS BILL.

(*Mr. Pope, Compton.*)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the fees to be paid on application for registering of trade marks or industrial designs.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Compton) said that the amounts paid, under the old law, were not sufficient to cover the expense of the work done. Besides, in the United States they charged a fee of \$30, and Americans registered as much in Canada as Canadians themselves. He did not see why foreigners should not pay as much in Canada as Canadians had to pay abroad. Moreover, they enjoyed the benefit of Canadian laws, and should contribute something towards their maintenance. Those trade marks were valuable, as they covered everything. The Canadian charge would only be \$25, the old fee being \$5.

MR. ANGLIN said that, as it seemed to be the policy of the Government to

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

make all they could out of the Americans, he did not see there was any objection to this change. If they were to frame all their laws to compel the people of the United States to sustain Canadian government, and pay the interest on its debt, the policy would be admitted to be a new one. But many Canadians registered trade marks, and if they found \$5 difficult to pay would certainly be embarrassed by \$25.

MR. POPE said that the rate was not very high when they considered the duration of the privilege—that the trade mark would last 25 years, during which the owner would receive the protection of Canadian laws. The law would affect the people of France and other foreign countries. Frenchmen now registered largely, and should do so here as they did under the English law.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought the Minister of Agriculture should furnish all the information the House was entitled to on such subjects, without having to be asked. He now began to see the reason for this radical change, Frenchmen would register trade marks more on account of the increased duties on wines.

MR. JONES said he thought the increase was enormous, and that the payments would be principally by its own people, and not by foreigners.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) asked was this law intended to apply to timber.

MR. POPE said it was not.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked was the expense connected in registering trade marks, under the old system, greater than the receipts.

MR. POPE: Yes.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said of course it would be quite proper that an adequate sum should be paid for this privilege, but the interest of the Canadian producer should be specially guarded.

MR. POPE said that, considering the protection afforded by their Courts, a dollar a year was not too much to pay.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said that as regards the Americans, a market of 44,000,000 would allow of a great many more trade marks than the Canadian markets, and might constitute a reason for the difference in cost. If the hon. gentleman was quite convinced that the change in the fee was not going to prevent the registration of trade marks, he did not know there was much to be said against it. It would be a misfortune to interfere seriously with that registration.

Mr. SNOWBALL asked if registration in Canada was binding in England.

Mr. POPE said that registration in England would only answer for that country. Englishmen doing business in Canada would have to register here.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I suppose the Finance Minister will be able to register his trade mark under this Bill. I am sure no civilised nation will attempt to forge it.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Mr. POPE (Compton) introduced a Bill (No. 82) Respecting trade marks and industrial designs.

Bill read the first time.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 31.]

(Mr. Baby.)

THIRD READING.

Bill read the third time and passed.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) PREVENTION BILL.—[BILL 55.]

(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading read.

Mr. POPE (Compton) moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee to make certain amendments.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. POPE (Compton) said that, at the time this Bill was introduced, he was not aware that a Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had been passed, in 1875, that did away with the necessity for the 7th clause of this Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON said that, at the time the Bill referred to by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) was passed, the arrangement in the United States with regard to the transport of cattle was, that cattle should not be allowed to be closed up in a railway car for more than twenty-eight hours without being watered and fed. In introducing that Bill, he (Mr. Charlton) thought it would be unfair to Canadian transport companies to impose greater restrictions on them than existed in the United States in this respect. Since then, the American law had been modified, and the number of hours reduced to twenty-four. He would suggest the propriety of this clause being changed so that cattle would not be carried for a greater length of time than twenty-four hours, the Canadian railway companies would then be on the same footing as the American companies. He thought the Bill before the House was a step in the right direction, and in the interest of humanity. But if it passed as it now stood, it would place Canadian roads at a disadvantage in the respect he had pointed out.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RECEIVER-GENERAL AND MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS BILL.—[BILL 58.]

(Mr. Tupper.)

THIRD READING.

Bill read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 54.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

THIRD READING.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.—[BILL 75.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the Bill was to amend chap. 35, Statutes of 1869. The Bill was submitted by one of the County Court Judges of Ontario, in order to secure greater facilities in the direction mentioned in the title of the Bill. It appeared to him that the Act was a desirable one, and likely to produce the object the learned Judge had in view.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said he would like to know whether the hon. gentleman had really considered the question at all or not.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had carefully looked over and compared the original Act and the proposed amended Act, and he saw nothing that he thought was not very desirable. The hon. gentleman, of course, was more familiar with the practices of the Ontario Courts, and it might occur to him that some of the amendments were not desirable. If so, he (Mr. McDonald) was quite sure the House and the Government would be willing to adopt any reasonable suggestions he might make on the subject.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that all the provisions of the Bill, with the exception of the fifth section, appeared to him to be unnecessary, and that section was undesirable and unreasonable. No doubt some doubt was expressed as to the power given the County Court Judges, under the Sandfield Macdonald Act, to try for a different offence to that in which a prisoner was committed for trial, and to convict of a different offence to that charged in the indictment; but the Judges of the County Courts in Ontario had universally held that, although committed on one offence, yet, being in custody, they had a perfect right to try him on any other charge, and to convict a prisoner of any other offence than that charged, to the same extent as a jury could, if tried by a jury. He was aware that was the way in which several of the County Judges had rendered the

law, and, in that case, sections three and four were wholly unnecessary. As regarded section five, the Judges had universally held that, when a prisoner elected to be tried summarily, the Judge who presided at the trial had no power to bail the prisoner. He was afraid the provision in this section was not a step in the right direction at all. The whole aim of the present Statute was, that prisoners should be tried with the least possible delay. As the law now stood, if a prisoner elected to be tried by jury, he had a perfect right to get bail, either by order at the trial, or by order in chambers.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) read the clauses of the old Act bearing on the point raised.

MR. CAMERON said he had read the Statute fifty times, and knew all about its provisions. The Judges had decided over and over again, that while a prisoner was in custody upon one charge, he could be tried under another charge. He did not think there was any doubt about that. As to section seven, it frequently happened that Judges adjourned the trial from day to day, as circumstances might require, and no doubt they had a perfect right to do so. These were all the provisions of his hon. friend's Bill that required any comment. Three of the sections were unnecessary, and the others appeared to him to be injudicious, and exceedingly objectionable. He would like to draw his hon. friend's attention to another matter. He noticed that in the Local Legislature of Ontario, the leader of the Opposition there drew the attention of the Local Government to the necessity of asking the Dominion Government to make an amendment in one of the Canadian Statutes in so far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned, and that was the one that had relation to appeals from summary convictions by Justices of the Peace. The Attorney-General of Ontario expressed his acquiescence in the request of the leader of the Opposition that the Dominion Government should be invited to amend the Statute 32-33 Vict., chap. 31, section 66. His hon. friend was aware that this section enabled the complainant or defendant, in a case of

summary trial before a Justice of the Peace, to appeal to the General Sessions of the Peace. This section also provided that in any case appealed to the Sessions no evidence should be adduced that was not adduced before the Justice of the Peace. The Ontario Legislature appeared to be of the opinion that that was an unwise provision. For instance, the Justice might, improperly and illegally, reject the testimony of a witness tendered for either side, but when the case was appealed to the Court of Quarter Sessions such witnesses could not be examined, and there was no remedy for the improper ruling of the Justice of the Peace, and thus gross injustice might be done to the litigants. It was suggested that this clause in the Act referred to should be struck out, so as to enable the appellant or respondent, when the trial was appealed before the Court of Quarter Sessions, to call other evidence than that which was called before the Justice of the Peace. So strong was the opinion upon that point in Ontario, that a law was passed some years ago, amending the old law in the sense he just indicated, so that in cases of offences against the laws passed by the Local Legislature or within the jurisdiction of the Local Parliament, and where there was an appeal from a conviction by a Justice of the Peace, respecting offences against local laws, either party might call any new testimony that may turn up in the meantime. What Ontario wanted now was a similar provision in respect to laws passed by this Parliament, when cases were appealed to the Sessions. He would also like the hon. gentleman to go a step further while he was amending the Criminal Law. Last Session an Act was passed allowing any party prosecuted for assault to testify in his own behalf, and also to adduce the evidence of his wife. He would like the hon. gentleman to consider whether the provisions of that law could not be amended, so as to extend the provisions of that Act to all criminal cases. He would like to see the law in such a shape that the accused in every case should be allowed to give evidence in his own behalf, and also to adduce the testimony of his wife. It might be too late this Session to deal with so important and large a question, but he trusted

his hon. friend would consider the question during the recess, and deal with it at the next Session of Parliament. As the right of an accused to be examined in his own behalf was now the law of the land in assault cases, there was no reason why it should not be extended to every case of misdemeanor at least, if not to all criminal cases. He would ask the hon. gentleman if his attention had not been drawn to the point he mentioned previously by the Attorney-General of Ontario. At all events, he desired the Minister of Justice to give that point his consideration, and incorporate it with his present Bill.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said, with reference to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Huron, his attention had not been called to it, but before the Bill passed through Committee, he would take occasion to look at the Act referred to, and if the amendment seemed desirable, he dared say the additional clause could be inserted. He could easily fancy the arguments which might be adduced against the amendment suggested by the hon. member. If that amendment should prevail, the practical result would be that no trial would take place before a Magistrate, because a party accused would simply stay away and make no defence. He would enter his appeal, and all that class of cases which it was intended by the Act should be tried in a summary manner would practically be tried before a higher Court. So it appeared to him it would be almost as well to take away the inferior jurisdiction and impose upon higher jurisdiction the burden of discharging the duties required by the Act. However, he would look into it and see what could be done. In reference to the suggestion as to extension of the law of evidence, of course that could not be entertained now. Nor was he sure, with his present views on the matter, that he should deal with it in a manner agreeable to his hon. friend. He had very serious doubts indeed, whether we had not already, both in civil and criminal jurisprudence, gone too far in that direction. He had very serious doubts as to the moral effect produced upon the people of the country by affording litigants the right of giving evidence in their own behalf.

However, they did not need to discuss that now. He did not think the criticisms of his hon. friend had in any way affected the Bill, and he thought the clauses might be allowed to pass as they stood.

Bill read the second time.

ANDREW MERCER ONTARIO REFORMATORY FOR FEMALES BILL.—[BILL 76.]

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said this was one of the Bills introduced at the request of the Attorney-General of Ontario. Under a Statute of Ontario a reformatory for females was established, called the Mercer Reformatory, and this Bill was for the purpose of enabling females convicted of crime in criminal Courts, to be transferred to this reformatory and to obtain the benefit of that institution.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

MANITOBA DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 72.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this Bill was brought in for the purpose of defining who were members of a family in its relation to the Act respecting the appropriation of Dominion lands in Manitoba. It extended to cases where the husband or the wife were half-breeds, so that in case of the decease of the head of the family, or of the wife, every member of the family should have his share of the division of the family property.

MR. MACKENZIE said he understood there were very serious objections to the passage of this Bill. If he understood the Bill aright, it would interfere with the law of succession, which prevailed in the Province of Manitoba, and would declare certain parties entitled to

MR. McDONALD.

lands who were not entitled to them under the Provincial law. If that was the drift of the Bill it belonged to a very extraordinary system of legislation. The matter was up before the late Government for discussion, and he was sorry his hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was not in the House at the moment, as he could give very full information in regard to the matter. If he understood the Bill, it would expropriate lands for parties who had no title to them under the law of the Province, and in the Provinces and Territories. He hoped, if the hon. gentleman proceeded with it now, he would, at all events, say whether these facts had come under his observation or not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman was mistaken in supposing this altered the law of succession. The law of succession out there had nothing to do with it. It was an amendment to an Act of this Dominion, dealing with the settlement of lands of the half-breeds.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the first clause of the Act of which this Bill was an amendment, provided that each half-breed head of a family resident in the Province on a certain day, should receive a certain grant of land. The second clause provided that, for the purpose of that Act, the term "half-breed heads of families" should be held to include mothers as well as fathers, as it was known that, in most Indian tribes, the descent was on the side of the mother and not on the side of the father. It also provided that, in the event of the death of any half-breed father or mother, or both, between the 15th July, 1870, and the granting of the land, or the issue of the scrip, the land, or scrip, to which such half-breed head of the family was entitled, should be granted or distributed to such members of the family, on such conditions as the Governor in Council might, from time to time, determine. As there was doubt as to the meaning of the term "members of the family," this Act provided that the words shall be consti-

tuted as having been intended to include the husband or wife of the half-breed head and the children of the deceased. It simply defined the words "members of the family," which was a new phrase, never before used in any Act he was aware of.

MR. MILLS said he supposed the definition of what was meant by a family, might be derived from the decisions of the Courts at various times in England and in this country. Of course, whoever these parties might be, whatever rights were created by the Statute which this Bill proposed to amend, if they were at all vested, were already personal rights; and, if a definition were now given not in strict consonance with the decisions heretofore arrived at by the Courts, certain parties might be divested of rights which they had already been vested with by the operation of the former Statute. With regard to what was to be done with the property of those who had died without leaving behind them any persons embraced in the term family, if the right was a vested right in the ordinary sense of the term, it had passed from our jurisdiction, and came under the law relating to property and civil rights of that Province in which it was situated. The view he had taken of the whole subject was this: that the rights created by this Statute were not vested rights in the sense in which that term was used, and that, where the family was extinct before the property which each was to receive was specifically marked out by the Crown, it, in fact, lapsed or escheated to the Crown. It was declared that certain parties should have certain grants of lands. These parties, or their families, might, at any time, ask for their grants under this provision; but, if none of the persons named in the Statute as beneficially entitled remained; if the family was extinct before the land was vested in them, their heirs or descendants could not claim it, and it reverted to the Crown. The right he regarded as an inchoate and limited right, limited strictly to the persons named in the Statute, and, until there was a specific grant, there were no heirs recognisable. It was a right confined to the family, and, in its immaturity, perished with them. That being the case, he did not see why we

should provide for the passing of the property to any other persons.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he agreed that no right which was at all vested under the Act of 1874 should be affected by this law, and in the fifth clause it was stated that all vested rights under the previous Acts should be observed. He agreed with the hon. gentleman, also, that the right obtained by the half-breeds, as a whole, was an inchoate right. It was quite clear that an Act of the Dominion Parliament could only be effectually amended or repealed by the Dominion Parliament. The first clause of this Bill defined what the meaning of "members of the family" was. In the original Act the meaning was very indefinite; there was no definition as to who the members of a family might be. The meaning in England, where there was no tribal system, could be scarcely applicable to the system in the North-West. The question was simply whether it was reasonable that the husband, head of the family, in case the wife were the head of the family, under the Act, or the wife, in case the husband were the head, should be included among the members of the family, and share in the estate. This question had been pressed on the Department, and, therefore, must have arisen in the Law Courts of Manitoba. It was greatly on the side of justice that this provision should be made.

On section 3,

MR. MILLS said he thought hon. gentlemen could not consistently receive this clause.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he recognised the point of the hon. gentleman's contention, and he would not proceed further until he had conferred with his colleagues.

Progress ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Progress reported.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.—[BILL 51.]

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the first clause merely amended section 4, sub-section 44 of 38 Victoria, chap. 44, and merely enabled the Warden to exercise his discretion in giving a gratuity to a discharged convict, provided he was not going to return to the place at which he received his sentence. The second clause was the principal one. It provided that :

“The Governor in Council may appoint a fit and proper person to be the Accountant of Penitentiaries, who shall be an officer of the Department of Justice, and who shall receive such salary as may be voted by Parliament. He shall be charged generally with the direction, inspection, and audit of the books, accounts, money transactions, and financial affairs of the Penitentiaries, and with such other powers and duties with which the Inspector is now charged as may be assigned to him by order of the Governor in Council; and from and after the appointment of such Accountant, the powers and duties of the Inspector in respect of the matters with which the Accountant may be charged shall cease.”

Under the law, the Governor in Council appointed an accountant or clerk to each Penitentiary, and the only supervision now exercised over these several accountants was that which the inspector might be able to make during his annual visits, or whenever he happened to visit the Penitentiary. It was thought desirable, however, to have an officer whose especial duty would be the supervision and inspection of the books and accounts of Penitentiaries, without any material increased cost in regard to the administration of Penitentiaries. It was manifest that this provision should be made in order that this work might be efficiently performed.

MR. MACKENZIE said that this Bill, though practically a matter of no importance in the first part, provided in the second section for the appointment of another Penitentiary Inspector. It was the duty of the present inspector to inspect the accounts of the Penitentiaries precisely the same as the Inspector of the Ontario Government. That gentleman had to inspect the accounts as well as

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the discipline of the gaols of Ontario, of all the reformatories under the charge of the Government, of the Penitentiary at Toronto—for the Central Prison was, practically, a Penitentiary;—then he had all the lunatic asylums to attend to; whereas the Dominion Penitentiary Inspector had only the Penitentiaries of Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): And of the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia.

MR. MACKENZIE said the present Government had thought it desirable to send Mr. Moylan to these remote places, but the local inspectors had previously done that work. The hon. gentleman had given no reason why this additional appointment should be made. Mr. Moylan ought to be competent to do the work, and if he was not competent some one could be easily obtained who was. The public ought not to be asked to appoint another inspector after he (Mr. Mackenzie) had shown clearly that the work of the Dominion inspector was not a tithe of the work done by the Inspecting Officer of Ontario.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought the hon. gentleman was rather mistaken in regard to Mr. Langmuir's duties. The accounts of the county prisons were audited by the county officers of the county and municipality. The Inspector of Prisons in Ontario had nothing to do with the accounts, except to see that any grants made by the Government of Ontario had been properly expended.

MR. MACKENZIE: That only relates to the jails. That is not half the work.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there were only one or two Asylums and the Central Prison in addition, besides one or two charitable institutions that were assisted by the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is a Blind Asylum and a Deaf and Dumb Asylum.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes, those are two of the charitable institutions, but I take it there is no auditing done there by Mr. Langmuir.

MR. MACKENZIE : Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was sure no man could do all that work. The Bill under consideration provided for the auditing and careful examination by an accountant of all the accounts of the Penitentiaries. It was a work that could be done, perhaps, by the Finance Department or the Auditor-General's Department, but some officer should be detailed other than the inspector, whose business was to attend to the discipline and see that the whole machinery was in order.

MR. MACKENZIE said that if the hon. gentleman would look at the report of Mr. Langmuir for one year, he would find out what he had done ; and by looking at the report of the Minister of Justice he would observe the work done by Mr. Moylan. Mr. Langmuir had to visit five lunatic asylums, containing about 2,000 patients. The accounts of these institutions were wholly under the control of Mr. Langmuir. Then there was the Provincial Penitentiary at Toronto, managed by Mr. Langmuir. Then there were the charitable institutions, to which the Government paid a certain proportion, according to the number of inmates—such as orphan asylums and institutions of a cognate character. Then there were the general hospitals which received a proportion of the Provincial revenue. The accounts of all these institutions had to be inspected by this officer. There was in every county, or union of counties, a jail, and in some counties more than one, and these had to be inspected by the Provincial inspector, and no one could say that the amount of work this officer discharged was not largely in excess of that done by the present Inspector of Penitentiaries. He must enter his solemn protest against the creation of this office when there was not work enough for the officer who had charge of this business.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said it was highly desirable that there should be an accountant to examine the books of the various Penitentiaries where they had large factories and workshops, and where stock was to be purchased, wages paid, and where there were all the intricacies of a large and extensive business.

He was under the impression that a large amount of money had been lost to the country, owing to the want of this supervision, while the additional expense to the administration of Penitentiaries would be but small.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : What salary would you propose to pay this accountant?

MR. McDONALD : From \$1,200 to \$1,400 a year.

MR. OUIMET said he thought the reasons given by the hon. the Minister of Justice with regard to having a proper officer to examine the accounts of these institutions, was quite correct. As he understood the present Act, this was the duty of the Inspector of the Penitentiaries. In the Bill before the House, it was provided for the appointment of a new officer, who was not controlled by the Inspector of Penitentiaries, and he did not belong to that office. He thought it was dividing a responsibility which heretofore rested on the Inspector of Penitentiaries, and he did not think it was advisable to divide that responsibility, and create a new machinery in that office which was complete enough at present. For those reasons, he would suggest to the Minister of Justice that he should provide that this office, which belongs to the office of the Inspector, the holder to be responsible to him, and through him, to the Minister of Justice, so as to have the whole machinery working together. He thought that that would be enough, unless it were deemed better to acquire an officer outside the Department to look after the matter, more financial than administrative. But any accountant appointed ought to belong to the Inspector's office.

MR. MACKENZIE said what was to prevent the travelling financial inspector, who inspected the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway, from inspecting the accountant's books in the Penitentiary. There was a good deal of force in the remarks of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), as to dividing the responsibility. He was now charged with duties which the hon. gentleman was taking a vote to appoint another person to do. They were told he was unable to discharge them. But if it was essential to appoint another

individual, he ought to be responsible to the inspector, and through him report to the Government. But he (Mr. Mackenzie) could not believe—and no evidence had been offered by the Government to show—that the inspector was so hardly worked as to be unable to look over the books of the accountants of the various Penitentiaries. Unless that was shown the hon. gentleman should not ask the House to appoint another official.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had not stated the inspector was not competent for his functions, but, that in his opinion, the appointment of another officer and the subdivision of the labour proposed, was for the public interest. It was his belief, and the opinion of the Department, that a very much larger sum would be saved by the appointment of an officer charged with the sole duty of making a proper inspection, regularly investigating the vouchers, and seeing that the books were regularly kept, and that all the financial affairs of the institutions were correctly looked after by the clerks, whose salaries were limited to \$600 or \$700 a year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the hon. gentleman was in error; the accountants in Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul had \$1,000.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that that sum would not command the services of a first-class accountant. He had considered the suggestion of the hon. member for Laval before, and did not think it well to accede to it, for the reasons he (Mr. McDonald) had given, it would be better that this accountant should be directly under the control of the Minister having charge of the Department. He wished again to say that his desiring the passing of those resolutions did not indicate any doubt of the competence of the present Inspector to discharge the duties of the office; but he thought, owing to the amount of his work, that this work would be better done by the appointment he asked. The suggestion of the member for Lambton, with regard to the travelling Inspector, would be considered.

MR. OUMET asked for explanations as to the extraordinary powers that might be assigned by order of the Governor in Council.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the Governor in Council was to have power to redistribute the duties and responsibilities of the inspector and those accountants. He took it for granted that this duty would be exercised only in case of necessity—the Statute pointed out the duties of the inspector, and he took it for granted that he could not be interfered with, unless there should be some pressing reason for it. The duty of the inspector would be to keep such supervision over the statements, and the financial concerns of every Penitentiary within the jurisdiction of a Department, as would secure the due and proper keeping of the Penitentiary accounts.

MR. OUMET said that, when the Bill was passed by the late Government, there were three Inspectors of Penitentiaries. He thought it would be better to come back to the old system, and create two offices instead of one of Inspectors of Penitentiaries.

Motion for second reading *agreed to*, on a division.

Bill read the second time.

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

After Recess.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Tilley, for the second reading of resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (April 9th).

MR. TILLEY: I purpose calling the attention of the House, for a short time, to the remarks that were made, especially by the hon. members in Opposition from New Brunswick, because in answering their arguments I think I will be able to answer the arguments that have been presented by hon. members on the other side of the House, from all parts of the Dominion. In the first place, I think it was observed during last Session by hon. members, that, when any attack was made on the Administration, it was responded to by a declaration that when the Opposition

were in power they did precisely the same thing.

AN HON. MEMBER : Or worse.

MR. TILLEY : Judging from the course taken during this debate, I have arrived at the conclusion that that line of argument has been taken on the present occasion and during this Session. It is not entirely an answer to the arguments presented on this side of the House ; but the hon. member from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) said the other night in justification of a remark he made, that I asked an hon. member whether there was anything inconsistent in the political conduct of gentlemen on this side of the House. This question was put with a view to meeting arguments of members on this side. I think my hon. friends opposite have endeavoured to meet the arguments in favour of this tariff by striving to find some inconsistency in my conduct as a representative of New Brunswick, in order to strengthen their arguments or make good their opposition to the tariff. We had speeches from the member for Queen's (Mr. King), and I must say that, from his standpoint—though I entirely differ with him—he put his points very clearly, and made a very creditable maiden speech ; but I entirely dissent from the grounds on which he based his arguments, as well as from the arguments themselves. We have had statements made by the member for Northumberland (Mr. Snowball), as to the unfair bearing of these propositions upon New Brunswick and the lumber trade. We have had a speech from the late Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee) and his colleague from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) in the same direction, and speeches from several members whose seats are contested, like my own ; and, of course, I can quite understand that those gentlemen were anxious to make speeches that would help them, if possible, in the approaching elections. There are several others in this condition, however—and I am not at all alarmed, in that case, as to the result of the enquiry ; or, if we had to go to the people, I would be prepared, as in days passed, to present my case to my constituents, and I am certain I could present one that

would merit and receive their approval and endorsement. Now, Sir, in the first place, it has been said that I was inconsistent. Though this array of talent from the Province of New Brunswick presented their case so strongly here, even the late Minister of Customs, the hon. member for Westmoreland, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the member for Gloucester, with all his ability, with all the arguments they could bring to bear, were not considered sufficient, but they must have my hon. friend, who sits there reading now, who had to point out that I had occupied a somewhat distinguished position in the Province of New Brunswick, and that my name was dishonoured, execrated, because I had introduced a measure to Parliament that was going to crush the people of New Brunswick. That champion had to stand up here, when I know his constituents have declared in favour of the proposition submitted to Parliament, and argue to show that my name was desecrated in that Province. It is said that I am entirely inconsistent. And my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, too, said that my course was inconsistent, inasmuch as I declared one thing on the hustings at St. John, and that I presented a different proposition here ; that my position was not honest, and was not tenable. I recollect very well that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), the other night, quoted a speech of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), to show that that gentleman was inconsistent. I have never been in Scotland and made a Free-trade speech in one city, and a Protection speech in another. I have never held two different opinions with reference to this question, Sir. Now, let me see the position I take. My hon. friend said that, in the city of St. John, I said that, if I had been in power in 1875, I would increase the duties. I said that then, and I say it now, because at that time we wanted a little more money than was required in 1873 from Customs. What was the fact in reference to that matter ? In my place in Parliament, in 1873, I stated that the Government did not contemplate proposing any additional taxation to Parliament, but, in view of the increased liabilities, it would be necessary to come down next Session for a

change of tariff. In 1874, if there had been need for some additional revenue from Customs, we would have raised it upon articles that were not manufactured in the country, and at the same time afforded indirect Protection to the industries of the country. That is what we would have done. Then hon. members say that I stated in the speeches I made that I was opposed to an increase of taxation, that we did not want any increase of taxation, that what we wanted was a readjustment of the tariff. If I erred at all in the line I took in the discussion; if I erred in any of the conclusions at which I arrived, it was because I had placed too much confidence in the calculations of my predecessor, with reference to the amount of revenue we would receive from Customs. He assumed \$13,750,000 as the receipts from Customs, and I do not hesitate to say to-day that, if it had been shown by the receipts up to the present time, or for the first six months in the current year, that we were to receive \$13,750,000 from Customs, instead of asking an increase from 17½ to 20 per cent., we would have been able to leave it at 17½, if not reduce it, because we would not have required over that sum. And, therefore, I stated that it would not be necessary to increase the taxation. But we wanted a readjustment of the tariff. It was argued that the proposition of the Opposition was to impose a United States tariff on the Dominion of Canada, and, when we did that, to show clearly and distinctly that such a proposition would give us double the Customs revenue we receive at the present moment. That never could be contemplated by a Government, or by an Opposition, but what we said was simply that what we required was from \$13,500,000 to \$14,000,000 from Customs, and from \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 from Excise, and the tariff would be imposed to raise that sum of money. That being done, all that was necessary was to give at the same time Protection to the industries of the country. There was nothing inconsistent in that at all. That was our line of argument, and I say here that I went on to point out the necessity of giving Protection to our manufactures and industries. Did I not, over and over again, point out—as a member said in his place the other day,

MR. TILLEY.

that I stated to a deputation in the lumber interests that this was a waning interest—did I not point out to a meeting in New Brunswick that our lumber trade must be steadily decreasing from year to year, and it was absolutely necessary for us to find some other industry to which our people should turn their attention, and not have their whole energies directed to that trade, although, at the present time, producing more than England and the United States would take from us? Did I not point out it was necessary to construct manufactories, and give employment to our people upon those water powers that are now used in the manufacture of lumber? Did I not point out in other addresses that it was absolutely necessary, if this Dominion was to become what under Providence I believed it was destined to be, that we should find some other employment for our people, so as to retain them in the country, instead of having them go off by hundreds and thousands to the United States? There was nothing inconsistent then in the line of conduct I took with the proposition that has been submitted to the House. The hon. gentlemen have looked up my speeches since 1864. Why did not they, if they could, put their hand on a single argument that I used inconsistent with this? Why did they not show the inconsistency? But it has not been done, and cannot be done. Hon. members laugh, but can they put their hand upon it? In addition to that, let me say there is an attempt made to renew the old feeling, the old anti-Confederate feeling. My hon. friend from the city and county of St. John, who has always been an anti-Confederate, spoke in that strain, and I was not at all surprised to hear him, with lamentation and mourning, speak of the present condition of the country. He had prophesied that before, and other hon. gentlemen did the same thing. It was asserted that, because I, at the close of my first Budget speech, indicated that there was a great future before this Dominion, the House was told that no dependence could be placed on any prophecy of mine, that my prophecies with reference to Confederation had not been realised, and therefore my prophecies with reference to this tariff, and the future of the country would not be

realised either. My hon. friend from Queen's stated, and he was followed by several other hon. members, as a proof of the fallacy of my calculations, that in 1864 I asserted, and asserted boldly, they said, that \$2.75 per head, and subsequently \$3 per head, as taxation of the population of the Dominion, would be all that was necessary for a quarter of a century to come. I did say that, Mr. Speaker; I did say that. But let us look at the circumstances and the position of matters then and now. What was the fact? The hon. member for Westmoreland the other day said that, under the first proposition that was agreed to at Quebec — and that statement was made before the alterations were made afterwards in London — the whole policy of the deputation, at that time, was to draw as lightly as possible from the Dominion when organised, and to leave the separate Provinces to manage as economically as possible, and make the charge on general revenue as light as possible. Now, what was the fact? The fact was that, notwithstanding that arrangement was altered before Confederation took place, in the first three years of Confederation, though we had given an additional sum to all the Provinces, and made additional charges on the revenue of the Dominion, it may be seen by the Customs and Excise returns that the taxation was but a fraction over \$3 per head during the first three years of Confederation. If I erred at all, it was with reference to the wonderful prosperity that has attended Confederation. Let me point out the fact that, subsequently, we came down to Parliament and assumed the debts of all the Provinces, amounting to something like \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000 from Ontario and Quebec. We then gave additional subsidies to some of the Provinces, increasing these charges on the general revenue. What is the state of the case to-day? The late Minister of Customs stated — or, at all events, some of the hon. members did — that now the taxes of New Brunswick averaged \$7 per head paid into the Dominion Treasury, and that, under the operation of this tariff, it would amount to \$9.50 or \$10 per head. Now this was a very unfair way of stating the case. The only way we can

arrive at a fair test of the taxation of the Province, is not on the general receipts; it is not upon the sums paid for the maintenance of railways, post-offices and public works generally. We must look at what we are assessed in the shape of Customs and Excise, because we have obtained receipts in return for the expense of maintaining railways, so they should not be taken into account. To make up this sum of \$7 per head, we have to add \$464,000, which was very exceptional in its character that year, on account of the great fire in St. John, which destroyed all the stocks of goods in the city. That fire required, during the last year, an additional taxation of between \$400,000 and \$500,000. That was held up to-day by hon. gentlemen to make the people of New Brunswick, and this House, believe that this is the average sum New Brunswick pays per head. But take out of that the sums paid from which we obtained a return, and you will find that the average for the years 1875, 1876 and 1877, was \$1,391,464, as receipts from Customs and Excise in New Brunswick. This sum includes receipts from the Sick and Disabled Seamen's Fund, and Weights and Measures, amounting to \$14,000. That is the average for the two years preceding the last year, which is an exceptional one. Now, what is the fact with reference to this matter? I had a letter from a friend in St. John the other day, and he tells us what the matter is. He says there are as many copies of the *Globe* circulated through the county of St. John to-day as if we were on the eve of a general election. Our hon. friends opposite, especially the one from St. John, must be anticipating an election, for these papers are sent to the electors without money and without price.

MR. MACKENZIE: Still it will do good.

MR. TILLEY: That remains to be seen. I doubt it myself. But, in view of the statement that had been made, I claim a little time in order to show what the position of New Brunswick is. The average was \$1,391,464, and under the arrangement for New Brunswick, she has a loan of \$63,000, which was given her for ten years, she receives

direct in the payment of the interest upon her debt, and a subsidy of \$128,475, which is equal, within a few cents per head, of the whole sum she contributes, making no reference whatever to the expenditure for Civil Service, or for Intercolonial Railway, or harbours, or rivers, or breakwaters, or on the Pacific Railway. Now it is said that New Brunswick pays a duty upon articles that are brought from Ontario and Quebec. But we must remember that St. John has the trade of a part of Nova Scotia, and a large portion of the revenue credited to New Brunswick is really paid by the people of Nova Scotia, and amply makes up for whatever she may contribute in the shape of duties directly to Montreal or Quebec. We know perfectly well that, as far as New Brunswick is concerned, if she buys any goods at all from Ontario and Quebec, they are goods in Excise or in bond, and they pay Excise duty in the Province of New Brunswick. So much for reference to our financial condition. I know the time was, and I have been threatened with it again, that I would be execrated, and be so unpopular in New Brunswick that I could not carry a constituency. In 1864, after we had agreed upon this Quebec scheme, I went back to New Brunswick with the propositions contained in these resolutions passed at Quebec. We dissolved the Legislature of New Brunswick and had a general election, and, as the hon. member for Gloucester stated the other day, we were defeated in the contest. So great was the feeling at the time against me, that I could not obtain a hearing on a husting before that election. The hon. member for Gloucester recollects that perfectly well. I had always a *posse* of friends to see me home from public meetings ; my life was not considered safe.

MR. ANGLIN : I contradict that positively and at once. The hon. member was never interfered with in a public meeting.

MR. TILLEY : No, never interfered with ; but it was a humiliating position when the hon. member for Gloucester had to stand upon the platform of the city of St. John and ask the people who were preventing me from speaking, to give me a hearing.

MR. TILLEY.

MR. ANGLIN : I never did anything of the kind ; I will have a thousand witnesses to that fact in the city of St. John.

MR. TILLEY : I have advocated a cause that was unpopular at the time, but it became popular, and if I am unpopular with reference to this position, it will become popular also. I know well that I was never personally interfered with, but excitement ran high, and my friends did go home with me from the meetings. We were defeated. We discussed this question though we had a short time to do it in—two or three months to reach the length and breadth of the Province of New Brunswick. And then it was a cry of taxation—the same cry that we hear to-day—that the people of New Brunswick were to be subjected by this Confederation to enormous and increased taxation. Well, we were defeated. We had but eleven out of a House of forty-one ; all the representatives of the city and county of St. John were defeated. But in six months after that, being perfectly at leisure, I visited eleven out of sixteen counties in the Province. We held meetings, and the result was that the year after, when people had time to reflect upon this question, when they had thought the matter over, they reversed the verdict. It was not because the Fenians came on to our frontier. The hon. member for Gloucester made a very singular admission the other night. He said the Fenians were brought in at Eastport to frighten the people into Confederation. I saw some three hundred of them. They visited one of the islands, and destroyed some buildings there, tore down the British flag, and made various demonstrations. And then the hon. member said he was in the Government.

MR. ANGLIN : I was not in the Government at that time.

MR. TILLEY : But you spoke of your connection with the Government, as having had a tendency towards that direction. The hon. gentleman being a member of the Government, I certainly thought he meant he was in some way connected with it—that his connection with the Government, and the cry with refer-

ence to the Fenians had produced this feeling of alarm into the Province. It was stated on the hustings of St. John that Tilley had really brought these Fenians there; and I recollect that Colonel Gray said at the time that Tilley must be a wonderful man if he could induce all the poor servant girls in the United States to contribute money out of their earnings towards this Fenian movement. But it was not the Fenian movement that wrought this change; it was the sober second thought of the people, and, when they came to the polls again, out of forty-one members there were only eight returned in opposition to Confederation. Then we went on year after year. I recollect, six or nine months after Confederation, there was a good deal of feeling in New Brunswick, with reference to the assimilation of regulations in the Customs Department. I recollect a friend saying to me: "Mr. Tilley, do you not feel uncomfortable with the feeling that is manifested here against the Confederation by some of your old friends?" No, I said, I did not; I did feel it to a certain extent, but I have such an abiding faith that at the expiration of five years the people will be perfectly satisfied that I am content to wait five years for the vindication of my course. Well, I waited five years. At the close of five years, in 1872, when we returned to New Brunswick, though we had been in the Government here five years, carrying on the business of Confederation in a most successful manner, I was able to go back to the constituency of St. John, and there receive a support such as I had seldom received, after this union had been in existence for five years. I found that there was scarcely a man who came to the hustings, but was prepared to support the Administration and to declare that Confederation had worked more favourably than they expected. They had been told, in 1866, that Canadian labour would go down in the Province of New Brunswick, and that they would have French labour for 1s. per day. I pointed out to them that all their misgivings were baseless, and I said to them: Are you not receiving better wages than before? and they said yes, and I received a hearty hearing, without any interruption

whatever, and the very large support of my own constituency, and throughout the length and breadth of New Brunswick. That was the result of the five years' experience of Confederation. With reference to this matter, the hon. member for Westmoreland, among the rest, declared on the hustings, in 1872, that he came here with his sympathies in favour of the Opposition, because he had been an anti-Confederate. After sitting here for five years, he made up his mind that the present Administration in 1872 were the best men, because they were more liberal to the Maritime Provinces than the Opposition. That was the general impression that prevailed with reference to this policy, but it only required a change of Government in 1873 to make it universally acceptable. Men who had been opposed to Confederation accepted the position after the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. Of course, they had their fair share in the Administration of the Government, because the party then in power was very largely composed of anti-Confederates, and in 1874 I had the satisfaction of hearing universal peace proclaimed, and Confederation accepted. Now things are changed. These gentlemen have passed to the opposite side of the House, and, when a proposition is submitted which, under the changed circumstances of the country, in the judgment of the Government, is absolutely necessary, which will give Protection to our manufacturing, agricultural and mining interests, we find those gentlemen who were formerly opposed to, and some who were in favour of, Confederation, rising up and declaring these propositions are going to ruin the country, and are one of the results which some of them had predicted of Confederation. Now, I desire to consider the effect which this proposal is likely to have, in my judgment, upon New Brunswick, and, when I say New Brunswick, it will have the same effect upon every other part of the Dominion, but I say so because the arguments of my hon. friends have been presented especially in regard to New Brunswick. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Snowball) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) both spoke of the effect this tariff would have

on the lumber interest, but, before I touch that, let me state the effect I believe it is calculated to have on the manufacturing industries of New Brunswick. According to a statement made by Mr. Everett, the president of the Manufacturers' Association of the city and county of St. John, of the manufacturing industries of the city and county of St. John in 1874, as compared with 1878, giving the amount of capital invested, the number of males and females employed, and the annual wages paid, it appears that in 1874 there were 8,428 males, 1,769 females employed in these manufacturing industries, and that in 1878, the number employed was reduced to 5,031 males, and 1,821 females; that the capital invested in 1874, was \$7,966,000, against \$5,730,300 in 1878; and that the labour paid in 1874 was \$3,605,720, against \$1,825,645 in 1878. This return gave the results of the different industries. Take for instance, the boot and shoe manufacturers. In 1874, 1,071 persons were employed in this industry against 695 in 1878. I mention this industry alone to show the falling off since 1874, down to 1878, and Mr. Everett, in his letter to me last January or February, accompanying the statement, states that then the number of persons employed in the different industries was still further reduced.

MR. ANGLIN: What is the cause?

MR. TILLEY: There are two causes, one owing to the depression of trade, the other to the unfair competition from manufacturers in the United States.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. TILLEY: Suppose we deal with New Brunswick alone. I believe that within twelve months this former prosperity will be largely restored. I do not expect that our business will come up to what it was in 1874, but that a decided improvement will result. In 1875 when I pointed to the exhibition that took place in St. John, an exhibition that would have been creditable to any of the Provinces, I called attention to the fact that in the census returns of 1861, the value of manufactures, not including ships and lumber, was \$3,150,000, and in 1871 their value was over \$8,000,000; and that Mr. Everett,

MR. TILLEY.

a gentleman connected with this association, declared the increase from 1871 to 1875 was greater in proportion than the increase from 1861 to 1871. In 1873 we had as much Protection nearly as we will have under the propositions now before the House, against the United States. Under our 15 per cent. tariff then, which with the high rates of labour in the United States formed practical Protection, our industries could compete successfully with those of the United States, and did not require the legislative shield to be thrown around them that is now required and is given by these resolutions. The depressed condition of trade, and the sharp competition from the manufacturers of the United States, who made our country a slaughter market for their surplus goods, however, caused our industries to decline, and necessitated the introduction of a Protective tariff. Since the 14th of last month, many of those manufactories which had closed down have been re-opened. An Act was passed in the Legislature, a few days ago, to incorporate a company for a sugar refinery; application has been made to extend a cotton manufactory, and increase the capital of the company; the glass works are again in operation. We have been told here that these propositions will not benefit the agricultural interests at all. If we can give new life and impetus to the manufacturing industries of the Dominion, increase the number of men and women employed, give them remunerative wages and plenty of employment, though we did not give one cent directly to the agricultural interests, the revival of these industries and consequent employment of these people would create a home market for the agriculturist, where he could, as in 1873, get profitable returns for what he had to sell. If we do nothing else but give vitality and life to these industries, we shall have accomplished a great deal. But we do more. The hon. member for Northumberland, and the hon. member for Queen's calculated that it would cost the manufacturer of lumber, under this tariff, 60c. a thousand feet to get out their lumber. Why, if that were the case, the lumbermen would have to pay the whole of the additional sum required from New Brunswick. But that is not

correct. They will have to pay something more for their oats than before, and the agriculturist will benefit by that additional price. I said I had two or three letters of complaint with reference to this tariff. What are the natures of these complaints? One letter contains the complaint that we have an *ad valorem* and specific duty on cotton and woollen goods, which makes it difficult to pass the entries. The other two complained that a duty was placed on corn and cornmeal, but I have two in my hand in which the writers complain that the duty on corn and cornmeal was not higher in the agricultural interest. That is the extent of the complaints that have reached me. As far as the agricultural interests in the Lower Provinces are concerned, they will be benefitted by getting an increased home market for their productions, and increased prices for some of their articles. The hon. member for Northumberland said: "See how much Miramichi will suffer." Well, I admit that, perhaps, Miramichi will suffer a little in the future, not by the change in the tariff, but, perhaps, by the change of Government. Some of the manufacturing industries may not be able to sell deal ends at a dollar and a half a cord more than firewood could be laid down for at the railway. Some of those industries, one in particular, may suffer in that direction, but, with reference to the tariff, the sufferings will be very light. Let us look at it. I am not a lumberman, but know something about the supplies sent into the woods. We will take, for instance, the article of pork. How much additional will the lumberman have to pay on that? 10c. a barrel. On tea he will pay less, and on molasses a slight increase. Then, as to the tobacco, under our propositions, by using the commoner kinds of tobacco instead of Canadian twist at 10c. a pound, he will pay but 4c. per pound. Most of those persons take their own supplies and horses. They used the blankets they manufactured themselves, and if they bought their blankets, they could now get them as cheap as under the old tariff. He made statements before me that those persons engaged in the woollen manufactures had not increased the prices of their goods. The competition will be so

great that there will be no practical increase under the operation of this tariff, and a better article will be produced, not an article heavily weighted with ingredients, as many of those imported were, to give it a substantial appearance, but Canadian blankets made out of Canadian wool. As regards flour, if the statements of the leader of the Opposition and other hon. gentlemen be true, the duty on wheat and flour will not increase the price to the consumer.

MR. ANGLIN: Is it true?

MR. TILLEY: In the northern part of New Brunswick, it will not increase the price of flour one cent; but, on the southern side, it is possible, from the fact that sometimes vessels bring in flour at a freight of 8c. to 10c. a barrel, the price may increase, but I do not think the average increase on the price of flour will be over 10c. per barrel, taking the whole Province. The molasses is less, the tea less, the pork and flour 10c. a barrel more, and the oats a little higher. As far as the practical effect is concerned, in increasing the prices of articles used by the lumbermen, it will scarcely be felt at all, and with reference to the various other industries, they must be materially benefitted. Something was said the other night with reference to our manufactures in the different parts of the Dominion. I am not, I think, over sanguine when I say the day is not far distant when the population in the western country will be greater than it is in Canada, and when the Maritime Provinces, with their coal, iron and water power, will be the manufacturing centres for this vast Dominion. Now, of course, our manufacturing industries are centered in Hamilton, Montreal and Toronto, but, for the population of the city and county of St. John, compared with the population of other districts, the manufactures there are in excess of those of any other district. There are water privileges on the St. Croix that, in value and importance, are not exceeded in any part of the Dominion. It is only necessary to obtain authority for the construction of cotton and woollen mills with one end in the Dominion, and the other in the United States, and you can have your manufactures supplying this whole continent. It

holds out advantages such as can be found in no other part of the Dominion, and I predict, under a tariff such as this, the results in that part of the country alone will be of inestimable value. The lumber in that section of the country is fast passing away, and the power which exists there must be brought into use for some other manufacturing interest than the lumber industry, which is a failing industry. It is a failing industry in that part of the country especially, and something else must be established for it, so that the power will not cease to be as valuable as it is at the present moment. You may go into various parts of New Brunswick, and you will find that persons with a small amount of capital will be starting new industries, and be giving employment to the people now idle. Unless some such industries are introduced, the country will remain in a condition none of us would like to see it in. It is my conviction, in reference to the Province of New Brunswick, that the manufacturing equally with the agricultural and lumber interest, will be fostered and encouraged by the present tariff. Now we come to the ship-building interest, which is a very important interest indeed. You would suppose from the statements that have been made generally, that we are imposing increased taxation on that industry, instead of relieving it. The question has been asked: "How could you arrange this drawback?" We know that before Confederation took, we had an arrangement by which a drawback was given on certain articles entering into these vessels. It is impossible to make a like arrangement now—an arrangement by which the duty will be returned on articles used in ship-building, on which duty has been paid. It cannot but be a benefit to these industries. The hon. member for South Wellington said the other day, with reference to the drawback, if the consumer paid the duty, why give the drawback?

MR. GUTHRIE: I said if the consumer did not pay the duty.

MR. TILLEY: Well, it makes no difference. It does not affect the case in the least. Drawbacks are given to enable manufacturers in this country to compete with manufacturers in

MR. TILLEY.

other countries. I recollect, in regard to the manufacture of sewing machines, a deputation waited upon me, at the head of which was a constituent of the hon. member. I said one of the propositions of the Government is to give a drawback on articles on which you pay duty, used in the manufacture of sewing machines, and which are exported from the country. This gentleman rose and said: "That is just what I want; I tried to get the late Government to do that, but they would not. When I export my sewing machines, I want to export a certain number of needles with them; without these needles the sewing machines are not saleable. These needles are not manufactured in Canada. I made an application for a drawback, but they would not give it. This drawback will put me in a better position to compete with other countries." That gentleman's name is Raymond. He was emphatic in his approval of this proposal with regard to the drawback on the duty paid upon the material that enters into their manufacture.

MR. GUTHRIE: They would rather have the whole tariff without a drawback.

MR. TILLEY: I doubt that very much.

MR. GUTHRIE: Oh, yes; I know it.

MR. TILLEY: The drawback is for the purpose of encouraging those industries, and enable them to compete successfully with manufacturers in other countries. I am satisfied that this system can be carried out successfully, but some regulations may be necessary in regard to it. It will, doubtless, entail a great deal of trouble in the Departments, but still there can be no difficulty in practically working out a system. The hon. member stated, the other day, that, under this tariff, we could not grind corn in this country. Since that speech was delivered, I have heard from Eastport, the place the hon. member said I would be so popular in—why I cannot say—as popular as the hon. member himself was, when the paper in Calais advocated his appointment as Governor of New Brunswick, perhaps, from the fact that he was supporting the patronage of the United States. There was a corn mill

there, and, since this tariff had been announced, arrangements have been made to establish a corn mill on this side of the river, for the purpose of grinding corn instead of driving the trade away. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, with regard to sugar, although it is not used extensively by lumbermen, there will be a decrease in the price of it. This has been questioned, but I have not the least doubt that, under the operation of this tariff, there will be a decrease in the price of that article also. The practical effect of these resolutions, if made applicable solely to the Province of New Brunswick, I am satisfied will be found to be most beneficial indeed; I have no doubt of it.

MR. MACKENZIE: It must be awfully unjust to the other Provinces, then.

MR. TILLEY: No, it is not unjust to the other Provinces. I say this, and I referred to it the other day, that, while, from the statements that have been made here, and from the opinions that efforts have been made to inculcate, throughout the length and breadth of New Brunswick, that this is to be a most oppressive tariff, as far as New Brunswick is concerned, I am satisfied that within a year, or two years at the outside—and I may say, at this moment, I am receiving letters every day, stating that this tariff is growing more acceptable there every day—it will have proved to be of decided benefit to New Brunswick. Now, Sir, that is the information I have received from New Brunswick. And I can only say, with regard to other portions of the Dominion, no matter from whence I receive communications, whether it be in Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal, or any of the large centres, where there has been universal depression for the last two or three years, I find there is now a feeling of confidence restored, the result of which has been the starting of new industries, the restoration of old ones, and the placing on full time, and more than full time, men who have been out of work or only partially employed. It is not to be expected that propositions of this kind should work revolutions in a month; but I doubt if any propositions ever submitted to this or any other Parliament have done as much by way of

giving as much increased employment, and restoring shaken confidence, as these propositions have done everywhere. I am satisfied, with reference to this matter, that we are not over sanguine, but the results we have already seen justify us with reference to the conclusions at which we have arrived. Some hon. gentlemen have risen here and said, when it proved a success we will be satisfied with it. All I can say is, I am confident it will prove a success. I hope in twelve months we will have our friends opposite not only sustaining us in these propositions, but, when they find the resolutions do not afford sufficient Protection, they will be here to encourage us in increasing that Protection. If the result proves that the Protection we have given has not raised the price materially to the consumer, but has given additional employment to our people, increased their wages, increased the compensation for their labour, if this is shown, I believe these resolutions will be most acceptable throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. I desired to say a few words with regard to New Brunswick and the effect these propositions will have upon her. Having done so, I will now leave the subject, because I presume our friends will move amendments with reference to certain propositions, and it will be necessary to justify and defend them at that time. Before I sit down, I desire to call the attention of the House to a personal matter for a few moments. In the somewhat warm and animated discussion that took place here the other day, reference was made by me to a communication which the hon. member for Westmoreland had alluded to at a picnic. I referred to the matter, saying that, as he had alluded to part of it, if I were free to refer to the whole correspondence it would put me in a better position. When the hon. member asked me for the correspondence, I did not have it; nor did I know where it was then, but I immediately set about to ascertain where it was. I telegraphed on Thursday night to a friend at St. Andrews to send me on a trunk with some of my correspondence in. That telegram did not reach him till two hours after the train had left on Friday morning, but he sent it on Monday by express. I thought it would have been here yes-

terday, but it did not arrive until this afternoon, and I hold now the correspondence which took place between the hon. gentleman and myself, which at his request I purpose reading. This letter, marked "confidential," is dated the 1st of December, 1877. The first part of it refers to the death of a member of my family, then the hon. gentleman proceeds to say:—

"Before leaving for Ottawa, which I shall do on Monday next, I propose to carry out a purpose which I have had in contemplation for some time, but which I would prefer to have done (if opportunity had offered) by personal communication instead of by letter. I hope you will regard it as strictly confidential and not consider it out of place. It is this. What are your personal wishes as regards the future? Do you desire to return to active political life, or would you prefer to continue in the position you now occupy? I need not say how successful you have been as Governor. All parties unite in bestowing the highest encomiums on your administration as such, and your re-appointment would, I am quite sure, meet with universal approbation. If you and I could sail in the same political boat, I do not hesitate to say that I shall be heartily glad to have you resume political life, but I suppose this is too much to hope for. You feel yourself, I presume, allied to the other side, although I cannot but feel that your normal position is with us. You will pardon me for speaking thus freely and receive, I hope, what I have said in the friendly spirit in which I intended. Old friendship, too, must plead in my behalf. If you do not wish to answer these questions, say so without hesitation. I shall receive it well from you, and we will consider the correspondence as absolutely obliterated, leaving no trace behind. I may add that Mackenzie has no knowledge of my writing this letter, and if you answer, address me at Ottawa. I shall be there till Christmas.

"Sincerely yours,
"A. J. SMITH."

This was my reply:

"(Private.)

"FREDERICTON, Dec. 21, 1877.

"Hon. A. J. Smith:

"MY DEAR SMITH,—In your note of the 1st inst., you ask if I desire to return to active political life, or would I prefer to continue in the position I now occupy. I have to say in reply, that I have no particular desire to return to active political life, but I have to add that I see objections to my acceptance of a second term. I thank you for the frankness of your note, and I will be equally frank in return. My re-appointment would secure to me, should my life be spared, five years more of rest and quiet and freedom from political strife—matters of some consideration I admit to a man in his sixtieth year. But consider—

MR. TILLEY.

ing the readiness shown in certain quarters, to charge me wrongfully with being influenced by selfish motives for standing by my old colleagues to the last, I am the more careful not to lay myself open to the charge that I have placed myself beyond the reach of my old political friends in St. John, from personal considerations. I am sensitive on this point—possibly too sensitive—but let the consequences be what they may to me personally, I cannot take a step that my judgment has failed to approve. Personally it would afford me pleasure to "sail in the same political boat with you," but as your Minister of Finance, in his addresses to the electors of Ontario, makes, as some of his chief charges against the Administration of which I was Finance Minister, the terms on which Prince Edward Island was admitted into the Union, the redistribution of the debts of the Provinces, and the payment of the \$150,000 a year to New Brunswick in lieu of export duty, and other Acts for which I claim personally some credit for having aided their passage through Parliament, you will see that, were there no other points of difference, I could not be expected to approve the policy of your Government. I feel that I ought to be free to defend my personal acts from erroneous statements and inferences, and to justify my financial policy. This I cannot well do, as long as I hold my present non-political position. I thank you very much for your kind reference to the manner in which I have discharged my duties as Lieutenant-Governor. It is most satisfactory to be assured that my re-appointment would meet with universal approbation. I assure you I could desire no higher compliment. Thanking you for the friendly character of your note,

"I remain, my dear Smith,

"Yours sincerely

"S. L. TILLEY.

"P. S.—I see by the papers that you are to spend Christmas at Dorchester. I will send this note there, instead of Ottawa, as I previously intended.

"S. L. T."

In answer to that I received the following:—

"(Private.)

"DORCHESTER, Dec. 27, 1877.

"MY DEAR TILLEY,—Your note of the 21st inst., is received. I am sorry you could not have seen things in a different light, either to have accepted the Governorship or taken sides with us in the approaching contest. And allow me to say that I think you are too sensitive with regard to the references to the past. These are only in answer to charges made. If we should win, I take it for granted you would take a seat in the Cabinet if you could have seen your way to have run with us; and that we will succeed at the next election is my firm conviction, whatever may be the result in New Brunswick. Sir John calculates without his host, when he talks of gaining fifty-five

seats in Quebec. The current in that Province is setting strongly in our favour, and the opinion of many well-informed persons is that we shall have a majority. There are several causes for it, one of which is, that the Local Government is in a state of decadence, and becoming more and more unpopular every day. However, all this is matter of opinion, and I may be quite astray. To me personally, as you are aware, it is not of much consequence. I care very little for being in a Government. That is my honest view of the situation. To conclude, we will consider the correspondence as obliterated.

"Believe me to be,

"Yours very sincerely,
"A. J. SMITH."

I have omitted some references to the fishery matter. I leave the balance of my remarks on the tariff question until we come to the items, when I will be prepared to give explanations.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I do not intend to discuss the question of the tariff. I spoke at considerable length on that subject the other day; but I think the speech the hon. gentleman has made to-night was made up of sophistry. I do not think he has answered the arguments even of the members from New Brunswick. I rise now, however, to refer to the personal matter which has arisen between the Finance Minister and myself. I think I have reason to complain of the way in which I was treated on Thursday night by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman referred to that letter, and insinuated that something extremely damaging to me existed. I had a general recollection of the contents of that letter. I knew there was nothing in that letter of which I need be ashamed, and that it was written under the injunction of the extreme confidence, and, I may say, friendship. When the hon. gentleman spoke of it across the floor, I said I would remove the seal of secrecy if he would produce the letter; but he gave his own version of it, and when I rose to check that, I was met by shouts led on by the First Minister. In the hon. gentleman's version, he suppressed, as the letter proves, many very material facts. I rose because it is customary in this House for hon. gentlemen to do so when they have anything to say in regard to matters stated by hon. members on the other side; and how was I treated? A statement, appeared in the daily *Sun*, of St. John, which, I think,

is the special organ of the Finance Minister, and is said to be under his control and inspiration. Whether that is so or not, I do not know, but it is a vile and infamous sheet. It is issued day by day laden with slander, calumny and falsehood; but it is said that paper is edited by an officer of this Government, that he is the Immigrant Agent in St. John, and that he is receiving the pay incident to that position. If I am in error, I ask the Finance Minister to correct me.

MR. TILLEY: He only holds it temporarily; it is only a temporary employment.

SIR A. J. SMITH: He has been in the Reporters' Gallery and in the corridors of this House. He is an officer of this Government, and he is paid to abuse and villify me in the most abominable manner. It turns out that this man who edits that paper is actually in the pay of this Government, and he is villifying me and other members, and lauding to the skies the hon. the Finance Minister.

MR. DOMVILLE: He is only telling the truth.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I ask if there is anything against me in that letter which has been read? I had a lingering feeling of friendship for the Finance Minister. We were associated for many years, and were politically and personally in the most intimate relations. The discussions as to Confederation created a divergence between us, but when I came here after that as an independent member for Westmoreland, I did not desire to show any antagonism to him, and I gave the Government a reasonable support. When I said in that letter that I believed the hon. gentleman's normal position was with us—the Liberal party, and not with the Tory party—he knows that his antecedents were all Liberals, that he and I were in the first Liberal Government formed in New Brunswick, and that we fought the battle side by side against the Tories of that Province, and I am not ashamed of that. Although I may have found fault with the way in which the hon. gentleman got his appointment as Governor, I did not think it was a serious offence, but that it was a matter to be regretted that he obtained it in the manner in which he did. I said he

ought to be with us, and if so, no doubt he would have a situation in the Cabinet.

MR. DOMVILLE: What would you do with Burpee?

SIR A. J. SMITH: I did not want a situation in the Government myself, and I felt that in the future there would be a seat in the Cabinet for the hon. gentleman. Further, I expressed myself to the effect that he made a most efficient Governor in New Brunswick, that his appointment was popular there, and that he conducted himself in a way to please the people of New Brunswick. I think I was treated badly by the gentlemen on the other side, and not fairly by the hon. gentleman himself, when I gave a qualified assent to his producing the letter, and he gave his own version, and concealed many facts in it. The hon. gentleman and I are, to a certain extent, at issue on this point. He referred to a Mr. Dunn, and a conversation he had with me upon a subject of a second term of the Governorship. I recollected distinctly that Mr. Dunn was in my office, and that Mr. Burpee was present. Mr. Dunn, Mr. Burpee and myself had a friendly conversation in regard to Mr. Tilley. Mr. Dunn had evidently feeling as to Mr. Tilley, and was anxious that a second term should be given him, and discussed the matter as to whether Mr. Tilley could get the second term. I was cautious, and said, of course, in regard to these matters of patronage, members of the Government could not talk very freely, but that Mr. Tilley had made a good Governor, and I have no doubt I said I have no objection to his getting a second term. But the conversation was entirely and strictly confidential, and I think it is degrading that such letters as have been read to-night should be read here.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Hear, hear.

SIR A. J. SMITH: When the hon. gentleman made the statement the other day, that Mr. Dunn had authority from me and Mr. Burpee, I communicated with Mr. Dunn by telegraph. This was my telegram to him:

"JAS. L. DUNN, St. John.

"Did you say to Tilley you were authorised by me to offer him a second term of governor-

SIR A. J. SMITH.

ship, or anything to that effect? Please answer."

Here is the reply:

"Your despatch just received. In reply beg to say neither you nor Mr. Burpee authorised me to offer to Hon. S. L. Tilley second term of Governorship. My action in this matter was non-political, and was so regarded and admitted by you, Mr. Burpee, and Mr. Tilley, on the ground of friendship, and of the need of having a competent Governor. I did intimate to Mr. Tilley he could get a second term if he chose to accept it, and if he would allow his friends to induce him to do so, and I believe what I represented to Mr. Tilley could have been accomplished. As it was strictly private, and admitted to be so, think I ought to protest to a reference to it in Parliament.

"JAS. L. DUNN."

MR. DOMVILLE: What is the date of that telegram?

SIR A. J. SMITH: The 14th of April. I say that I wrote without any authority from Mr. Mackenzie, but I was going to Ottawa, and would desire to know what his wishes were as to a second term. If he expressed a wish, I do not hesitate to say that my own feelings would have been to appoint him for a second term. Mr. Dunn, no doubt, regarded this as strictly confidential. He approached the Finance Minister, I have no doubt, in the same spirit, and he enters his protest here against having it referred to in Parliament. There is another point in controversy, in regard to the meeting held in St. John, at which the requisition was presented to the hon. gentleman, asking him to accept the nomination as the candidate in opposition to the Government. I recollect reading an account of that meeting in the newspapers. I thought it was a public meeting, but I was checked by the hon. gentleman, who said that it was of a private character, and I understood him to say that he told the people upon that occasion, that being Governor, he could not accept the nomination, but that he would communicate with the Governor-General, and would afterwards come to St. John and expound his views. The charge I made against the hon. gentleman the other day, and I think that it was well grounded, was that while he was Governor of New Brunswick he had no right to enter into any political contest, to accept any nomination or become the candidate for St. John. He says he did not

become the candidate while he was Governor.

MR. TILLEY : You said I had made a violent speech against the Government. I said I had made no speech.

SIR A. J. SMITH : No ; I did not say that. I said I could not affirm that, but that you were the Opposition candidate, and I want to show that the nomination was accepted by the hon. gentleman. The following is from the *Daily Telegraph* of St. John, of the 27th June last :—

“About eighty gentlemen representing various classes and interests, met last evening in a hall in Nickerson's building, Prince William street, for the purpose of presenting a requisition to Hon. S. L. Tilley, asking him to become a candidate for the representation of the city of St. John, at the forthcoming elections for the Dominion Parliament. At 8.15 Governor Tilley, attended by several friends, entered the room, and was heartily cheered. After a few moments had been spent by him in shaking hands with his acquaintances, a motion that C. H. Fairweather, Esquire, take the chair, was put and carried, and that gentleman took the chair accordingly. The requisition having been placed in his hands, Mr. Fairweather rising and addressing Governor Tilley said that he had the agreeable duty to perform of presenting him with a requisition from his former constituents in the city of St. John, asking him again to be their representative. This requisition contained upwards of 1,000 names, the procuring of which had been a most light and agreeable duty, and there were many who did not feel themselves free to sign it, who had expressed the warmest sympathy with its object and the greatest desire to aid in the election of the Hon. Mr. Tilley.

“Governor Tilley, in reply, said that he had been waited on by a deputation of gentlemen last evening on his arrival in the city, who asked him if he would be willing to receive the requisition. He had expressed his acquiescence and had taken the opportunity of reading over the names it contained during the day. He found there the names of some who had supported him when he first entered public life twenty-eight years ago, the names of some who until now had not been his supporters, and the names of the sons of many of his old friends now dead. Six months ago, he had said that he intended to hold himself free as a public man to serve this constituency or some other constituency in Parliament. He felt that it would not be right for him to withdraw himself entirely from public life, if his fellow-citizens demanded his services. The citizens of St. John had first elected him to represent them in 1850, and, with the exception of two years, they had continued to favour him with their confidence and support up to the year 1873, when he be-

came Governor. Through them he had, before Confederation, held the highest position in the Government of his native Province for a series of years ; he had held the highest office, but one, in the Dominion Government, and he had held the highest office to which a New Brunswicker could aspire here in the Governorship of this Province. After that, his ambition might well be satisfied, and it was satisfied. He would have been content to retire to some humble abode, and to spend the remainder of his days quietly. But he felt that he had duties to fulfil to the citizens of St. John, who had so favoured him, and, when they demanded his services, he could not refuse them. He, therefore, accepted the requisition so handsomely tendered to him, and would comply with the request which it contained. He would place his resignation in the hands of the Dominion Government at an early day, and, when it was accepted, and his hands were free, he would call a meeting of the citizens of St. John, and explain fully to them his political views. He believed that these views would be endorsed by the majority of the people of St. John. Governor Tilley was frequently and heartily applauded in the course of his speech, especially when he announced his determination to comply with the requisition.

“After a few remarks from the Chairman, Governor Tilley retired, and the meeting separated.”

Now I think that the hon. gentleman has forgotten that ; he certainly stated it was so.

MR. TILLEY : Oh, no.

SIR A. J. SMITH : Will the hon. gentleman see the position in which he puts himself, as regards his acceptance of the nomination for St. John, as a candidate in opposition to the Government ?

MR. TILLEY : I never said a word in opposition to it.

SIR A. J. SMITH : Why, it was notorious. Does the hon. gentleman mean to evade the thing in that way ?

MR. TILLEY : No.

SIR A. J. SMITH : Did he not know his nomination was in opposition to the Government ?

MR. TILLEY : Yes.

SIR A. J. SMITH : Of course. He accepted the nomination. He accepted the nomination for St. John while continuing the office of Lieutenant-Governor, which he filled for some time afterwards. He could select either horn of the dilemma. Will the Finance Minister

approve of that—a Lieutenant-Governor accepting a nomination and continuing to hold office? And yet the hon. gentleman now professes to have come here as the saviour of his country.

MR. TILLEY: Hear, hear.

SIR A. J. SMITH: He thinks it was indispensably necessary for him to take office in this Government to arrest the flood of depression overspreading the country. See what he says in his letter to me? Does he rise to a height of patriotism when he says that his reason is to vindicate his own position, which was assailed by Mr. Cartwright when he was Finance Minister? That was the only reason given in those letters. My object in these explanations was to resent the way I have been treated by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and to get fair play. I made this personal explanation without any feeling, either one way or the other. I am glad that these letters are produced, and hope they will be published. I felt it necessary to make this statement in order to vindicate my position.

MR. TILLEY: I cannot complain of the spirit which my hon. friend opposite has manifested in this discussion, but I must take exception in the first place to his remarks about the statement in the public meeting. I think it will be remembered that the hon. gentleman charged me with having, while Lieutenant-Governor, attended a public meeting in St. John, and made a violent speech against the Administration. I said that that was not the case; that I was waited upon by two gentlemen, on my arrival in the city, who stated that they had a requisition to present; that they accompanied me to the hotel, where they left the requisition for my consideration, and called two hours afterwards to say that the room at the hotel would not be large enough, and asked if I had any objection to meet them on Prince William Street.

SIR A. J. SMITH: It was not a public meeting.

MR. TILLEY: The reporters were there, and an account of the proceedings were published afterwards. A member of the press made that statement. A member of this House, present on that occasion, knows perfectly well that I

SIR A. J. SMITH.

accepted that report as correct, and stated that while I was there to receive that requisition and accepted it. I offered no expression, *pro* or *con*, with regard to the conduct of the Government, neither condemning or approving it. But I said, under the circumstances, that I could not but accept the proposition, but that I could not be expected to speak on politics till I had tendered my resignation and it had been accepted, when, my hands being free, I would state my views on public matters. With reference to Mr. Dunn, I would call the attention of the House carefully to that telegram, which, if not an affirmation of my statement, I do not know what it is. I might say more, but will refer to this, as he had communication with me, and had no doubt as to his representation to me, which was that, if I had only expressed my willingness, I should have been appointed. How could that gentleman understand that, if he had not learned it in his communication with the member for Westmoreland and the late Minister of Customs (Sir A. J. Smith and Mr. Burpee)? How could he, to this day, otherwise express that opinion. While here in Ottawa in connection with the meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, he said that he had asked those gentlemen this question: Am I in a position to say to Tilley, if he will accept this position, he can have it? And the answer was—yes. The answer that Mr. Dunn gives fully bears me out, in a general correspondence as well as the nature of that interview. But the hon. member for Westmoreland referred to the mention of this correspondence as a breach of confidence. Why was it necessary for me to refer to it here? Because it has been stated, over and over again, and repeated in the House by that hon. gentleman himself, the other day, that I had no authority for saying I could have remained Lieutenant-Governor for five years longer. The member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) referred to it because I made a statement to that effect in the Mechanic's Institute. He said at that picnic speech I had betrayed confidence by speaking of the communication he had sent. That was the position I was placed in. I do not suppose that hon. member will rise to repeat that statement again, but under the circumstances was

I not justified in vindicating my position and stating what had taken place. I did not state all that took place with the gentleman who had two or three communications with me. My statements were made with respect to the interview with Mr. Dunn, not with reference to the private communications of the hon. gentleman. I have no doubt that the gentleman had authority to say what he did—namely, if you only say you will accept another term, it will be offered to you. When the hon. gentleman said I had no justification for my course, I had to refer to the communication. When he referred to it the other day, I said if he would take away the seal of secrecy in regard to this matter, he would put me in a better position. The hon. gentleman then said he would remove the seal; he imposed no conditions.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Yes, I did.

MR. TILLEY: I said I had not the letter, as he says himself he was ready for its production. I know, when he says he rose to insist upon it, it could not then be produced. I heard no such condition as he mentions.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Well, the House heard it.

MR. TILLEY: If the hon. gentleman had said, I do not take off that seal, I should not have produced this letter; but he did not say so.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I said at once, produce the letter.

MR. TILLEY: I never would have referred to the matter; never dreamt of the hon. member bringing it up here. He said the other night that communications of that kind should come from the leader of the Government. What did I do with regard to that hon. gentleman himself? When, after conferring with Mr. Mitchell, we agreed that the hon. member for Westmoreland would be most acceptable for the Lieutenant-Governorship, I submitted the proposition to him and he took time to consider it.

SIR A. J. SMITH: The Premier himself wrote me an official letter, offering me the Lieutenant-Governorship.

MR. TILLEY: Of course, he did afterwards. I stated to him that there was no question about the character of the affair after Mr. Mitchell and myself had considered the matter, and made the proposition in question. The hon. gentleman said he would have grave duties to discharge, and gave other reasons why he did not think he could accept it. After some time had elapsed the offer was made formally by the Premier. Under these circumstances, I think that the House and country will feel that I had a right to say—by the statements of the gentlemen referred to, and by the communication read, the interviews with Mr. Dunn, and his statements so clearly, decidedly, emphatically made—that I might have remained in the Government House for another five years had I chosen. It was notorious at the time. It was stated by the friends of the Government that the offer had been made, and that they thought I would accept. Hundreds of persons in St. John were anxious I should accept.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Your friends were anxious.

MR. TILLEY: Some were and some were not, but I made this reference for nothing else than to vindicate my position.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I would like to ask whether, there having been no formal official offer made, the hon. the Finance Minister was justified—whether it was dignified for him, on the hustings at St. John, to say that the Grit Government had attempted to bribe him with \$45,000?

MR. TILLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. SNOWBALL said that, when the hon. the Finance Minister had risen to answer, as he said, the members from New Brunswick, and with them those from the whole Dominion, he had hoped he would have heard some answer to the arguments of members of the Opposition. But crimination and recrimination had been indulged in, and he had not replied to those arguments.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MACKENZIE: Should this noise continue—if the hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side are to disturb

every speaker on the Opposition side, they must understand how the House was to be managed.

MR. SNOWBALL said he was particularly sorry to hear a personal discussion between the two hon. members from New Brunswick whom he had regarded as his friends. He would have been very glad to see the Finance Minister appointed Lieutenant-Governor a second time. But he regarded reference to a private letter, in this case, as a violation of honour. There was a time when gentlemen possessed such a sense of honour as would have induced them to spurn any reference to documents of this kind—when, if a request or an offer conveyed in a letter had not been complied with, it would have been considered as obliterated, as requested by the writer. What could the member for Westmoreland do but say—produce the letter; he had carried out his portion of the bargain. He (Mr. Snowball) had a very different opinion about the conduct of the Finance Minister. He had made particular reference to him and his transactions with the late Government, the reference to him being about as bad as the matter affecting the member for Westmoreland. In answer to an hon. gentleman, papers had been laid on the table respecting certain transactions in lumber, between him and the late Government. The hon. member arose here and passed judgment on a matter now before the Public Accounts Committee. Was that justifiable? Were these transactions to be condemned without any investigation? His transactions with the late Government were not individual. He was manager of a branch railway between which and the Government they took place; he was conversant with them of course. But the hon. the Finance Minister prejudging the whole case, cast a slur upon him. He (the Finance Minister) had admitted that he did state in 1864, that the amount of taxes to be paid by New Brunswick would not exceed \$2.75 to \$3 per head, but went on to observe that he (Mr. Snowball) had stated that the amount was up to \$6.14. He (Mr. Snowball) had given the figures for his conclusion. Did the hon. gentleman give any for his? He (Mr. Snowball) had distinctly stated

that he had taken the actual revenue returns for Customs, Excise, and Bill Stamps only in making the calculation of \$6.14 per head, as the tax of the people of New Brunswick, which had not been disproved. Was not that increase made under the rule of hon. gentlemen opposite? The hon. gentlemen had staked his honour on the smaller amount mentioned, which he had violated, as he had admitted, within three years of the time after making that pledge. He (Mr. Snowball) did not know how the money went, but he had made a statement, and proved it out of the hon. gentleman's own mouth—that the taxes were only to be \$2.75 per head, instead of which they had been raised to \$6.14. He had dwelt on the subject of the lumber trade and the mining industries in New Brunswick, saying much of their depression. He admitted that they were in a depressed state, but that was the case with all other interests. How much worse was the lumber trade to-day than other industries? The prices of everything had gone down. If lumber had fallen so had other things. A few years since flour was \$9 a barrel, now it could be bought for \$4.50; pork was formerly \$20, but had come down to \$9. The exports of timber from New Brunswick had increased annually for a number of years past up to the year 1877, and those of 1878 were nearly as great. The lumber trade was just suffering like other branches of trade, and yet the hon. gentleman proposed to bring prosperity back by a tariff tending to make the prices of all kinds of supplies required to carry on that business still higher. The hon. gentleman stated that it had been affirmed by an hon. member in Opposition that the additional cost of producing 1,000 ft. of lumber under the new tariff would be 60c. That statement was made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King); he (Mr. Snowball) had looked it over and found it to be correct. Let the Finance Minister disprove it if he could. The Finance Minister had ridiculed the statement of the member for Queen's and said if it were correct it would realise a sum greater than the whole revenue of New Brunswick. This was about on a par with many of his other statements. Taking the amount of lumber produced in New Brunswick at 400,000,000, at 60c. per

thousand, would amount to \$240,000. How would the Finance Minister make this compare with their present revenue of over \$1,700,000? The hon. gentleman also stated the advance on cotton goods was only going to be 2½ per cent. He (Mr. Snowball) brought forward facts to show that the advance in duty on cotton goods would be 95 per cent.; and the hon. gentleman had not contradicted it. This statement had been ridiculed, but they had not attempted to disprove it. The hon. gentleman insinuated that he (Mr. Snowball) had had a transaction with the Dominion Government which he had found very profitable. He could say that he never had anything to do with the transaction, excepting as a member of a joint stock company, and that he never received a dollar of money from it. It was a debt of the Chatham Branch Railway before he had anything to do with it as manager, and the whole thing went to pay the debts of the company. He thought his hon. friend had descended to small things in order to cast a slur upon a member sitting on the other side of the House.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought that all who had heard the statements made by the hon. the Finance Minister, with regard to the contents of the letter written by the hon. member for Westmoreland, must be satisfied that it was most desirable, in the cause of justice and fair play, that that letter should have been produced. The statement made by the hon. the Finance Minister, he (Mr. Anglin) must confess, had made a strong impression on his own mind at the time, because he believed that the letter must have been, at all events, of a character to justify, to some extent, the very strong charges against the hon. member for Westmoreland, and to justify the threats the Finance Minister uttered, of what he could do, and would do, if the seal of secrecy were only removed from that letter. Now that it was produced, they found it was only such a letter as the hon. member for Westmoreland—were he a private member—might fairly have written, to one for whom he still retained a feeling of friendship and personal regard. He distinctly stated in that letter, he had no authority to make any offer to the Min-

ister of Finance. He (Mr. Anglin) heard the Finance Minister say in St. John, that he had refused a bribe of \$45,000, which he could get if he would keep out of the election contest. He stated distinctly that the renewal of the Lieutenant-Governorship was offered to him. He (Mr. Anglin) admitted frankly that the hon. gentleman would have a right to say that overtures had been made to him with regard to the Lieutenant-Governorship, but he was not justified in saying that he was offered that office as a bribe, and that he rejected it. With regard to another extraordinary statement made this evening by the Minister of Finance, he had felt it his duty, at the moment, even at the risk of a violation of order, to give that statement a most emphatic and direct contradiction. The hon. gentleman stated that, during the excitement of the Confederation agitation in St. John, he was unable to obtain a hearing at the hustings. The hon. gentleman must strangely have mixed things, or have forgotten what took place at that election. He (Mr. Anglin) never knew of an instance when the hon. the Minister of Finance was speaking at the hustings at St. John, and was interrupted in the slightest degree, and when he was not treated with the greatest respect by those who were strongly opposed to him. He had, on several occasions, had the honour of opposing that hon. gentleman on the hustings at St. John, but in no instance was it necessary for him to interfere, in order to obtain a hearing for the hon. gentleman. The statement that he felt it necessary, from time to time during that conflict to go home, accompanied by bands of friends to protect him from personal violence, was a statement which he never heard before, and which, he was sure, would astonish all parties in the city of St. John. This statement cast a slur of the worst description on the fair fame of the city, whose people, whatever might be their faults, always showed a willingness to give the utmost fair play, and an impartial hearing to all parties engaged in political strife. Occasionally some few in a crowd of 5,000 or 6,000 people might be troublesome, and ask questions at a time when it was an impertinence to do so. It was the policy of himself and of his

hon. friends during the whole election to avoid the introduction of personalities, and to ask the people to look at the question on its own merits, and to judge of it as presented to them. Now, he understood that the hon. the Minister of Finance, was, on this evening, entirely to demolish the statements made by the hon. member for the county of St. John, the late Minister of Customs. He listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. gentleman, expecting that he would at least make the attempt; but the whole speech proved to be of such a character that, if the hon. member for the county of St. John had had a chance of replying, he could have found very little indeed to reply to. It was one of the emptiest and most pointless attempts at argument he had ever heard. The hon. member told them of the wonderful increase of prosperity in the city of St. John for a certain number of years. There was an increase. This was a growing country. Every part of America was advancing more or less rapidly, notwithstanding temporary and occasional depressions in particular localities. St. John did advance rapidly during those years. He was not aware that any new industry was established in those years, except a cotton factory; but the others did grow during that period, and they had since declined. The depression which prevailed all over the world had reached St. John. The hon. gentleman was very unfortunate in giving, as an illustration of the evils of American competition in St. John, the case of the boot and shoe factories. This business was, for some years, in a most prosperous and thriving condition, and, if it had since declined, it was not owing, in the slightest degree, to the importation of boots and shoes from the United States. If the hon. gentleman would compare the importations of 1876, 1877 and 1878, the years during which this depression had been increasing, with the importation of American boots and shoes during the prosperous period to which he referred, he would probably find that the importations during the prosperous period exceeded those of the last three years, and that, therefore, the decline in the amount of employment afforded was not, to any extent, due to the importation of goods from the United

States or from other parts of the world. He would find that, during the year 1876, the importations of boots and shoes, of all kinds, and from all countries, including English fancy goods and French fancy goods, and including childrens' boots and shoes, which were not manufactured in this country, the whole importations into New Brunswick were something over \$60,000, or about 20c. a-piece for the whole population. There was no slaughter of American boots and shoes in that market. There was no interference, to any serious extent, with the trade on the part of the boot and shoe manufacturers in the United States. The real competition came not from the United States, but from Montreal. It was the competition of Montreal manufacturers that led to the decline of the manufactures in New Brunswick. The Montreal manufacturers were determined to force their wares on that market. They sent their runners all through the country, into every village and town; and in the city of St. John itself, close beside their factories, shops were opened in which goods manufactured in Montreal were largely sold; and it was in that way that the prosperity of their boot and shoe manufacturers was materially diminished. There was also another cause, and that was the decline of the purchasing power which had been felt all through this country. The same might be said of other articles where there had been a decline. The main causes had been the diminution in the purchasing power of the people caused by the diminution in the value of our exports, the general depression in trade, and then the extraordinary competition with the manufacturers of the Upper Provinces, where there was more capital, where labour was cheaper, and where there was a larger home market. The manufacturers of the Upper Provinces also used their markets below occasionally as slaughter-markets. Then the hon. Minister asserted that the amount of goods that was imported from the Upper Provinces into New Brunswick, was comparatively trifling, that it was more than compensated for by the amount St. John shipped to the western part of Nova Scotia. The hon. member must be strangely astray as to the facts. The returns in the time of the old Provinces

of New Brunswick would show pretty accurately what the amount of exports to Nova Scotia were in those years, and they had not changed much since, because in those days they had a system of drawbacks, and the amount of their annual exportations were made to appear smaller than they really were. The hon. member from the county of St. John had made a very careful calculation as to the amount of merchandise imported into New Brunswick from the Upper Provinces, and he (Mr. Anglin) was astonished to learn that they amounted one year to the enormous sum of \$5,000,000. Although a very large part of this sum was the price of flour—some 250,000 barrels or thereabouts—even deducting the price of flour, there would still remain an amount or over three millions of dollars on which the people of New Brunswick paid duties at Montreal and other ports of the Upper Provinces. Any one who knew how the whole Province was overrun by salesmen from the Upper Provinces must have at least some vague idea of the magnitude of that trade. He could not close without once more referring to the extraordinary statements affecting the city of St. John. He denied the truth of those statements. He remembered, indeed, one occasion when the hon. Minister of Finance was refused a hearing. It was at a meeting called by the anti-Confederates of St. John, which was not, in the proper sense, an election meeting at all, or a public meeting. The meeting was held in the Mechanics' Institute, and was addressed by the hon. member for Westmoreland and other gentlemen who had been invited to attend. After they had spoken, the hon. the Finance Minister, who was among the audience, sprang upon the platform and attempted to make a speech. The hour was late and the crowd, who knew that the hon. gentleman could speak for two or three hours, when he chose, and that a reply would be impossible, refused to give him a hearing, but no insults were offered to him or violence attempted. The same people who were then present, numbering 1,000 or 1,200, frequently listened to him after with all possible attention and respect. The hon. gentleman had no right to make this unfounded charge against the people of St. John, to whom he owed so much, and

who never, in any instance, had shown him even the slightest discourtesy.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was surprised that the hon. member for Gloucester should try to make this House believe that the hon. the Finance Minister was not speaking the truth when he made his statements. The hon. gentleman should remember that, only a few days ago, he stated in this House, that if the hon. members who had been returned from New Brunswick had dared tell the people they were in favour of Protection, not one of them would have been returned. In the article in his own paper in which that statement was made, the theory of Protection was scouted as absurd, and the intelligence was said to be greatly shocked at the extreme Protectionist views of Mr. Domville. The question was asked, if Protection could secure a home market, why the people of the United States sent so many hundred millions of dollars' worth of produce to Europe for sale, and it was claimed that the effect of Protection on the flour and produce of Ontario would be absolutely imperceptible. Could they desire a more complete admission than that contained in his own paper from the hon. gentleman, that the Conservative party went in for Protection? Then the hon. gentleman said they were going to tax the poor man, while in this article he contended that Protection would not raise the prices. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) said this tariff would increase the cost of producing lumber. How could that be, if farm produce was not going to cost any more? The people of St. John had confidence in the Finance Minister, who had so long and ably represented them. Money influence and every influence possible were brought to bear against him in his election. The hon. the late Minister of Customs canvassed Mr. Levi H. Young, and stated to him, if he would support him, the Mackenzie Government, if returned, intended to go in for manufactures.

MR. BURPEE: I never said that to any living man.

MR. DOMVILLE said he expected a denial. He would go further, and say that the superintendent of the railroad went to Levi H. Young's shop, and gave

him an order for trucks for the Intercolonial, and never made a bargain for the price. And yet these gentlemen said they ran a pure election, and tried to prove that the Minister of Finance made assertions that were derogatory to him and the country. He (Mr. Domville) was at the meeting when the requisition was given to the Finance Minister. He said he could not do what he should like to do in his position as Governor, and would have to resign his position before he could give an answer at all. Mr. Tilley never made the statement that he was offered a bribe of \$45,000.

MR. ANGLIN : I heard him making the statement.

MR. DOMVILLE said he heard him making this statement—he said that, if he accepted such a position at the hands of his political opponents, it would look as if he had taken a bribe of \$45,000. The hon. member for Gloucester was able to distort statements as well as anybody else. The hon. member for Northumberland, who spoke of the hon. the Finance Minister as being his friend, went all over Northumberland villifying him from poll to poll.

MR. SNOWBALL : I deny that.

MR. DOMVILLE said they had so many denials from hon. gentlemen opposite lately that it was hardly worth while taking any notice of them. But the hon. member, perhaps, would also deny that he went down in the train to St. John and tried to get the Conservative party to adopt him.

MR. SNOWBALL : I do deny that emphatically.

MR. DOMVILLE said he would not challenge his denial, because it would be unparliamentary. But he was telegraphed to look out for the hon. gentleman, and that he had gone down to tell Mr. Tilley he would give him no factious opposition, provided he (Mr. Snowball) was given the patronage of the country. There was then the hon. member for Queen's, who sent a gentleman to him (Mr. Domville) to buy off the protest against him (Mr. King) in the county of Queen's.

MR. KING : I deny that.

MR. DOMVILLE.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was bound as a member of Parliament, if challenged to give his authority, to give it. His authority was the Hon. Thomas R. Jones, of St. John, N.B. That hon. gentleman came to him and said: Mr. King is a very nice gentleman, and it is a pity to have him opposed, and I am authorised to be responsible as far as \$2,000, if you will get the suit withdrawn.

MR. KING : Authorised by me ?

MR. DOMVILLE said the hon. gentleman should know whether he authorised him or not.

MR. KING : I contradict what the hon. member for King's has said.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was sorry he had trod on the hon. member's corns. The hon. member should not get so excited, if what was said against him was not true. It was not customary with those against whom false charges were made to become so excited. One hon. member, the other evening, talked of his representing New Brunswick, and having New Brunswick in charge. Such a statement was preposterous. Were a poll taken in St. John to-morrow to test the popularity of the Minister of Finance against that of any other hon. gentleman from New Brunswick, the poll would give the Finance Minister 1,000 majority. If politics were dropped, and the decision given on the merits of the Finance Minister, as a man of integrity and honour, there was no man in New Brunswick could stand against him. As regarded this offer of the Governorship, where there was smoke there must have been fire. He supposed they would be asked to admit that these letters were never written, that Mr. Dunn never went to Mr. Tilley, and that no Governorship was ever offered, but he might go further back and recount the particulars of a ride he took on a special locomotive one evening with the Hon. Mr. Mitchell to a certain hon. gentleman's house, and, after a discussion about the Governorships and all sorts of things had got through, that hon. gentleman stated enough to convince him (Mr. Domville) that his professions as to his being opposed to their party were not sincere. In order to make it parliamentary, and

not betray confidence, he would say the hon. gentleman was not in his seat, but if he was, he (Mr. Domville) would say that he heard the hon. gentleman state that on the Pacific Scandal he had committed himself by his expressions, but after that vote was disposed of, he would stand by them, and that he believed in them. But he would not proceed further.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Go on, I am quite prepared for it.

MR. DOMVILLE said there were other hon. gentlemen who had dealt for crowns, as well as his hon. friend, and the least said on the subject the better. The hon. gentleman had referred to the *Sun* as a vile sheet, and had said that the editor was employed by the Government. The editor knew well enough how to defend himself, and could sling ink as well as other people could sling words. There was no doubt that he was an officer of the Government; he had been appointed temporarily because there was no other man who, from his ability and knowledge of the country, could fill the vacancy so well. In a previous debate Mr Anglin had said that the present postmaster of St. John had denied that he was interested in the *Globe* newspaper there.

MR. ANGLIN: The denial is that he ever wrote the editorials.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He only paid for them.

MR. DOMVILLE said it was only colourable information to say he was not a member of the firm. He (Mr. Domville) knew him to be, and why did they blame his side of the House for a system they had inaugurated themselves. As regarded Mr. Dunn, he had openly spoken on the streets that Mr. Tilley would accept the Governorship for a second term. With regard to the city of St. John, he was prepared to show that it would not suffer in consequence of the imposition of the present tariff, as the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had tried to prove. Upon the completion of the Megantic Railroad, the post of St. John would be some 300 miles nearer Montreal than Halifax. The tariff would give them a home market

for sweets, and was calculated to foster the West Indian trade, and St. John would naturally become the chief port for the West Indian trade of the Dominion. This would undoubtedly prove a great commercial advantage to St. John, and, in addition, it would become the refining point of the Maritime Provinces. The West Indian trade would employ a class of small vessels of from 150 tons to 300 tons, which would take their lumber to the West Indies and return with sugars and molasses. He was assured that the present tariff would, in every way, work advantageously to New Brunswick.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not intend or desire to renew the very long and protracted discussion that has taken place on the principle involved by this tariff. In fact, I agree with the hon. the Minister of Finance so far that I think our time would be best employed in examining the very complicated and intricate details he has submitted in the resolutions now in your hands; and I trust he will be able to explain more fully than he has yet done, the causes which have induced him to impose some of these very heavy taxes, and the results he expects to derive from them, not only as regards the number of people whom he expects to employ thereby, but as to the losses sustained by the revenue in each particular direction. I do not, at present, as I said, intend to dwell on the principles of Protection or Free-trade, but I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that several objections have been levelled at these propositions wholly irrespective of the principle which underlies them. These objections he has not answered, as I hoped he would have done to-night. These objections are of very grave moment. In the discussion of this tariff we have objected mainly to these five things: First of all, we say the imposition of the taxes they propose would inflict a very great and grievous injustice on the poorest class of the community, a thing which, under all circumstances, must be regarded by all statesmen as calling for the most serious condemnation of the people's representatives. We say also, Sir, and to this point the hon. gentleman did in part allude, we say also that it is inevitable, partly in consequence of the geographical position of

the country, that the tariff the hon. gentleman now proposes must work a very great injustice to particular Provinces—not to his own Province only, but to the Province of Prince Edward Island and a great part of Nova Scotia, as well as New Brunswick, and most particularly to the Provinces in the North-West. We contend, in the third place, that this tariff is so framed as to bring us into direct conflict with Imperial policy, and to grievously hamper, to a very great extent, the trade of Great Britain with her North American possessions, of which the hon. gentleman by this time must have received ample proof from the Imperial Government itself, if I am not misinformed. The universal condemnation with which men of all kinds of politics in England have visited this tariff is well known. Then, over and above all this, a point to which the hon. gentleman ought certainly to have directed some attention to-night, we contend that the leading sin of this tariff, in an economical point of view, is that he is taking an enormous sum of money out of the pockets of the people of Canada, over and above the sum which he is putting into the Treasury. Now, my hon. friend behind me, in a speech evidencing the most profound research—and from a five years' knowledge of that hon. gentleman I can say I do not believe there is in this House, or in Canada, a gentleman who is better able to arrive at a correct conclusion on that somewhat intricate difficult subject than the hon. member for the county of St. John—that hon. gentleman had stated, in great detail, that the application of the existing tariff to the importations of last year would involve an additional taxation on the people of over \$7,000,000. Now, I am not prepared to say whether or not, in spite of all the minute details which my hon. friend went into, it is possible for him or for any man to arrive at a perfectly accurate computation. But I believe this may be stated with perfect safety, that, if you take into account the enormous addition to the taxation which will be caused by the number of middlemen who would have to exact a profit on their advances, the sums actually paid by the people of Canada will be largely in excess of \$7,000,000. Then we again take objec-

tion to this tariff, on the hon. gentleman's own confession—at least, he hardly took the trouble to deny it—that it will, of necessity, work a very grievous injustice on several most important interests all over the country, particularly the lumber interest, the fisheries of the Dominion, and the transportation interest. These three interests are of enormous importance, as every man who has the least acquaintance with the trade and commerce of this country knows. Now, Sir, I repeat that, be Protection right or wrong, if it be true that these or any of these objections can be established, it would, in itself, be a very serious condemnation of the tariff resolutions the hon. gentleman has brought down. This discussion to-night has taken so exclusively a New Brunswick turn, that I do not feel disposed to dwell at any length on the statements made by the hon. gentleman, as they affect his own Province, more particularly as that question has been discussed at great length. But I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this: I believe he is going to make a leap in the dark, of the nature of which neither he nor any of his advisers have any conception whatever. I do not think he has at all considered, or that the three or four gentlemen whom we have been informed have been constructing this tariff at the rate of \$30 a day, how, in the attempt—possibly an honest and well-meaning attempt—to aid this or that particular industry, they were going to hamper other industries of far greater importance to the people of this country than the particular industry they specially desired to assist. And I am assured that gentlemen on both sides of the House cannot pass their time more advantageously to the country than in calling attention, as far as their information enable them to do it, to the mode in which almost every one of these increases, which I see made in these resolutions, would affect other industries apart from the special ones they are supposed to foster. Now, Sir, I do not condemn the hon. gentleman too severely because, at the time of Confederation, he, in common with others, supposed it might be possible to keep our expenditure within very much narrower limits than it actually proved possible. But, at the same time, the knowledge that

the hon. gentleman did pledge his reputation that the total annual expenditure for 25 years should not exceed \$12,000,000, ought to make him exceedingly cautious in making any prophecies regarding the future trade of the country, or the future expenditure that may become necessary in the existing condition of things here. In 1873, the hon. gentleman based his whole financial policy on the assumption that there would be a steady increase of our importations over and above the \$128,000,000 we obtained that year. That was the language of the hon. gentleman. It was impossible for anybody to have put it in stronger terms; and I ask the hon. the Finance Minister to look at the course of trade since, and see if we were not justified in doubting somewhat the accuracy of the very elaborate calculation he now submits as to the course of what he rightly called a complete and total revolution in the whole trade and business of the country. Now the hon. gentleman said it would have been an easy thing to have got twice the revenue by doubling the tariff, and appealed to the case of the United States to show that there they derived a double revenue from a doubled tariff. If we look to the Customs imports of the United States, we shall find that their enormous tariff, which is certainly more than double our old tariff, so far from giving them a double revenue, hardly gives them as much per head as we received from our comparatively moderate tariff. It is impossible to say how far the hon. gentleman may or may not have been correct in stating that the number of persons employed in certain industries in St. John had decreased from 8,000 to 5,000 hands, or thereabouts. The source from which he quoted is not above suspicion. But, be that as it may, is it at all likely that we shall regain those 2,000 or 3,000 men under his policy? He ought to remember that the same number of persons are now able, by improved machinery and improved scientific appliances, to produce a vastly greater quantity per head than before. That of itself would allow for a considerable reduction in the number employed. Besides, 1874 was the culminating year of a number of years of extraordinary inflation, and therefore no proper comparison could be drawn between the state of

things then and at present. When he called attention to the great decline in the boot and shoe trade of St. John, was he aware that the total imports of boots and shoes into the whole Province of New Brunswick, from the United States, would, at the ordinary rate of production per head, have employed just 45 hands? The census statement shows that New Brunswick produced \$967,000 worth of boots and shoes in 1871, wholly apart from her imports from the Upper Provinces, and it is scarcely possible that 5 or 6 per cent. of imports from the United States was likely to seriously injure the trade of St. John, as the hon. gentleman appeared to think. He said that Canada, in future, would very likely grow to the West, the great West we have acquired; and he now proposes to build up that country by making it almost impossible for the future settlers to obtain their goods, animals, implements, and furniture, at such prices as prevailed under the old tariff. Those taxes on animals and implements will press with most exceptional severity on the inhabitants of Manitoba, and the North-West, to which a large part of the animals imported into the Dominion are imported; and the way he is going to encourage those settlers is to compel them to pay enormously enhanced prices for their coarse woollens, cottons, and every article of primary necessity to the pioneer settling on the prairies.

MR. TILLEY: Last year the most of the animals imported were pigs.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No; sheep were most numerous brought into Manitoba, and oxen into British Columbia. The hon. gentleman told us that, in the case of New Brunswick, he expects the greatest possible revival from the wonderful encouragement of manufactures under the benign influence of Protection, and he specially quoted the case of the St. Croix, where a man could erect a factory, having one end on Canadian and another on American territory. I would like to know why, if the value of this water power is so great, our enterprising and acute friends on the other side of the border have so long neglected it? In concluding, he made a most touching appeal to us to encourage him, as he desired to protect the unfortunate people of

this country. He says more Protection is needed, and I have not the slightest doubt that before he has held office twelve months he will discover that more is wanted; that those daughters of the horse-leech are creatures that no Protection can satisfy. If he supposes that we, in Opposition, knowing what we do, feeling that the country has entered on a downward path, contrary to all sound doctrine, and the experience of all civilised nations, are going to encourage him in his course, great is his faith. Were it the last moment that any of us should sit here, we should not hesitate to protest in every possible shape and way against the ill-omened path in which he is now attempting to lead the people of this country. I will request, when these matters are under discussion, that each item of the tariff shall be read separately. We do not desire to delay, or factiously oppose these resolution, but simply to know on what data the hon. gentleman founded his propositions. What special industries does he propose to encourage, and what it would cost the revenue up to the present, although I admit it has been a difficult point for the hon. gentleman to answer. He has given not even a vague idea of the extent to which he supposes these various changes will affect trade and business; and I think it is very desirable that both sides should be put as fully as possible in possession of the information on which those various important changes are proposed to be made.

MR. HOLTON said that the resolutions before the House should be put *seriatim*; he thought it was understood that the items should be read and passed if not challenged.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That will do very well.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 2,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked for explanations as to the object and extent of the resolution.

MR. TILLEY: The object of this very important resolution is to meet the

MR. CARTWRIGHT,

difficulties which we now experience in regard to some of our industries, including that of sugar. During some twelve months or more nearly one dollar per 100lb. of drawback was paid by the Government of the United States over and above the amount paid by the refiner into the Treasury. That has been reduced from 75c. to 25c., some say to 65c. It varies very much on the character of the sugar that the refiners use; but we may safely take for granted that, under the law of the United States, which enables the refiner to introduce sugar below number seven, on which \$2 to \$2.15 per 100lb. is paid, a very superior class of sugar imported from the West Indies, with a saccharine percentage of 96 to 98 almost, pays but \$2.15, which is converted into white sugar, making the drawback very large, and leaving a considerable surplus of profit to the refiner. It is under the operation of this system that we have entirely lost our sugar refining, which it would be impossible to restore, unless such a proposition as this is affirmed by Parliament. Because it will be understood how difficult it would be if power was given to the Government simply to say we will charge, in addition to the duty levied, the amount of bounty or bonus given, which would form a question of dispute between the authorities of the States and the Canadian Government. They would assert it would only be 25c. per 100lb., while it might, on the other hand, be asserted it was 65c. The present arrangement is designed to meet this case as well as others where there is a specific and fixed duty.

MR. HOLTON said a point on which he desired information was whether the effect of this resolution would be to prevent the purchase of raw sugar in bond in the United States for consumption in this country. He knew the trade had a very deep interest in understanding clearly whether it was the intention of this resolution to prohibit absolutely, as the imposition of the double duty would prohibit absolutely, the purchase in the United States and the importation into this country of raw sugar in bond for consumption in this country.

MR. TILLEY : What kind of sugar ?

MR. HOLTON said those grades of sugar which were imported largely for consumption without undergoing any process of refining here, or having undergone any in the United States. He was told a circumstance of this kind when in Montreal the other day, and a good deal of discontent existed in consequence of the construction put upon this resolution by the Customs authorities. Parties there had ordered considerable quantities of raw sugar from the United States, in the belief that it could be entered here less the duty in the United States, or, in other words, that it could be bonded there and brought to this country.

MR. TILLEY : That was an entire mistake about the raw sugar.

MR. HOLTON said he thought the hon. gentleman had no power to do that under the resolution as now worded. The former part, of course, applied to sugar brought in for refining purposes, and then it went on to say : " and the fair market value of all goods, wares and merchandise imported into Canada shall be understood to be the ordinary wholesale price at which the same are sold for home consumption in the country where they are purchased or manufactured." Clearly, therefore, the price of sugar bought in New York at a fair market price for home consumption would be the price, duty paid, and could only be introduced into this country as it was now, or had hitherto been largely introduced, on payment of the American duty in the first place, and the Canadian duty in the second place, and the Canadian duty to be levied on the whole price, including the American duty. He desired to know whether the hon. gentleman meant that, and whether his officers had construed the resolution in Montreal under instruction from Ottawa.

MR. TILLEY : I may state that I do not think it was under instruction from Ottawa. I had a communication on the subject, and I stated that if such was understood, it was a mistake. For instance, as for the purchasing of raw sugar in bond, as there is no drawback given, it is to meet the case of the refiner.

MR. HOLTON said that it did not relate to drawback at all. The phraseology was very plain, and justified the construction that had been put upon it.

MR. TILLEY : I am not aware of any question having arisen. A man purchases a hundred or a thousand hogsheads of sugar in the United States ; if it is raw sugar, there is no drawback on it.

MR. HOLTON : It is true, without deduction of any kind out of the price for which it is sold for consumption in the country. The purchase is made in New York ; it may only be sold for consumption after the duty is paid.

MR. TILLEY : It is sold in bond.

MR. HOLTON : But that will not be the price if sold in bond.

MR. TILLEY : That is not contemplated at all. There is only one port where the question has arisen at all.

MR. GUTHRIE said it might be well to add some words so as to remove any misapprehension.

MR. MILLS said it was perfectly clear that the construction put upon the words by the hon. member for Chateauguay was correct, and they would bear no other construction. When goods were purchased in bond in the United States, that was the market value for consumption. The market value in New York for consumption was the price that those goods would bring after the American duty was added. Now, if these sugars were refined in bond, how would the hon. gentleman do in that case? Would he do exactly as he did in the case of raw sugar ?

MR. TILLEY : There is no sugar refined in bond.

MR. BUNTING said the hon. member was in error in saying that sugars were refined in bond in the United States. The duty was paid on all raw sugar before the refinery got possession of it. The resolution before the House would be very readily understood by those engaged in the sugar trade, who would comprehend distinctly what was meant by a drawback. It was the

abatement of the duty which had been paid by the refiner on the raw material when he had the refined material ready for export to a foreign country. The hon. member for Bothwell should know that, as a matter of fact, the drawback allowed to the foreign buyer of American refined sugar, for some years past, had been out of all proportion to the duty paid on the raw material. Not many years ago the drawback allowed on white refined sugar was \$3.75 per hundred. Notwithstanding the fact that no increase was made in the duty on raw sugar, this drawback was reduced to \$3.60, and subsequently to \$3.15, so that it would seem the American Government concluded from time to time that the drawback was in excess of the duty paid. It was the opinion of men engaged in the sugar trade, as well as the United States Government, that for some years past, the bounty on refined sugar exported from the United States had varied from 25c. to 75c. per cwt. The amount of the drawback had consequently been reduced. He thought his hon. friend the Minister of Finance was justified in putting this resolution on the Statute-book, because it was the only way by which he could defend Canadian refiners against the unfair competition of the American refiners, and also the expedients which had been heretofore resorted to by the American Government, in granting to their refiners privileges which no other refiners enjoyed. There was a good deal more in this matter of drawbacks than many members were aware of. There was a very large amount of foreign matter exported from the United States as sugar which never paid any duty to the American Government at all. He knew that in the city of Buffalo there was an establishment which consumed from 4,000 to 5,000 bushels of Indian corn every day. From this corn, common starch, glucose and syrup were produced. This glucose was sent in large quantities to New York, and other sugar refining centres, and there sold to the refiners. It was added to the sugar, and the drawback on American refined sugar was not calculated on the quantity of raw sugar which had been used in producing the refined, but on the weight of the material exported; so that the glucose pro-

MR. BUNTING.

duced in the Buffalo factory and sent to New York was there mixed with sugar, and that sugar carried with it a drawback. Now, it was quite impossible to ascertain the quantity of glucose that was added to the sugar, therefore it was quite impossible to guard against it. The only way, in his judgment, by which justice could be done to Canadian refiners was to ignore the drawback altogether, and to calculate the duty on the actual duty-paid value of refined sugar in New York, as it was sold to the American consumer. To-day, in New York, white sugar was worth about 8c. a pound, and as the drawback was \$3.15 per cwt., the price for export would be \$4.85 per cwt. Heretofore, the *ad valorem* duty of 25 per cent. had been calculable on \$4.85, and it was proposed by this resolution to make the new duty of 35 per cent. calculable on 8c. It was but just that it should be so, until such time as the American Government adopted some measures whereby their refiners should not be permitted to impose upon our refiners. This resolution would be understood by the trade. It was well understood by the Custom-house officers throughout the country that it applied only to refined sugar.

MR. HOLTON: How can my hon. friend say that in face of these words: "all goods, wares and merchandises"?

MR. BUNTING said because it was made to apply not only to sugar, but to cut nails and other articles that were entitled to a drawback. Articles made in the United States from foreign material, on which a duty had been imposed, were entitled to a drawback on being exported, and it was contemplated by this resolution not to recognise the drawback, but to have the duty calculated on the actual out-of-bond price of those goods in the United States.

MR. MACKENZIE said the point upon which the hon. member for Chateauguay had called the attention of the House had no reference to a drawback at all, nor to refined sugar. The hon. the Minister of Finance had admitted that the construction put upon the clause by the officers in Montreal was wrong.

MR. BUNTING said that was only in regard to raw sugar, but it was well

understood by the Customs officials what was meant by a drawback. The term drawback did not apply to raw sugar at all. Raw sugar coming to New York remained in bond; the portion sold to Canada was exported and the duty applicable to the quantity exported was remitted. But the refined sugar must have paid a duty before the refiner got possession of it for refining purposes, and after it had been refined the drawback was allowed. But in the matter of raw sugar there was no drawback at all: it was exported without paying any duty to the Customs of the United States, and therefore, there could be no fraud and no collusion.

MR. MACKENZIE said no one was speaking about a drawback, what they wanted to know was if the resolution covered sugars purchased in bond, not refined sugars, but the ordinary raw sugars; they wanted to know if these sugars should only pay a duty upon prices paid in bond.

MR. CARTWRIGHT suggested that the hon. the Minister of Finance should insert such words as would prevent misunderstanding of the clause.

MR. TILLEY said there had been but one officer in the whole Dominion who had taken that view of the case—the Collector of Montreal—who had written to him on the subject.

MR. HOLTON said undoubtedly the Collector read the resolution correctly. It stated that all goods, wares, merchandises of any description whatever, purchased in a foreign country—which meant the United States—should be subjected to duty at the fair market value, which was to be established by the wholesale prices for consumption in the markets of that country. Clearly, therefore, the wholesale market price for consumption was the price of duty-paid-sugar. And then, when it came to our frontier, it was subject to duty at that fair market price, including American duty, and subject to our duty at that price. And, therefore, the importer in this country from the United States had to pay double duty. This was a practical prohibition and would be felt very severely along our whole frontier, and more perhaps in Ontario where there was

more of that sort of sugar imported, and more bought in New York than in Montreal. It was an absolute prohibition as regarded Ontario, without any reference to drawbacks or the protection of our sugar refineries.

MR. TILLEY said the duty would be reckoned by the market price at the place at which the sugar was purchased.

MR. JONES said that in the United States every possible means was taken to protect their labour. It had been said that sugar was refined and exported in bond. He knew well that iron was imported in bond, manufactured in bond, and then exported. In this way the labour was secured to that country. The United States drawback system worked against us also in foreign countries, and as we had had no drawback system since Confederation, we were placed in a very wrong position as regarded the United States.

MR. GUNN said the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Bunting) had alluded to glucose. Now, it was a well-known fact that no respectable refiner exported sugar with glucose.

MR. BUNTING: I did not say they were respectable.

MR. GUNN said that, under the proposed resolutions, raw sugars would pay 40 per cent., and refined 57 per cent. He was in hopes the hon. the Minister of Finance would have looked into this matter, and he hoped the hon. gentleman, before the resolutions were adopted, would see his way clear to look into the matter.

MR. CASEY said the sugar duty clearly discriminated unfavourably against England, as compared to the United States. Provision had been made for reciprocity in regard to the United States in reference to certain articles; but there was no similar provision with regard to Great Britain in relation to the same articles. With regard to coal, we might make a reciprocal arrangement with the United States; but there was no similar provision with regard to Great Britain, while England at present admitted our coal free.

MR. TILLEY said that in 1854 the Imperial Government gave their assent

to reciprocity on these very articles between the United States and Canada, and they gave their assent to a similar proposition made by Mr. Brown, that extended not only to these, but other articles of manufacture. Therefore, he did not think there could be any objection to this proposition. No concession would be made to the United States that did not put England in the same position.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman proposed in these resolutions to admit American coal free, as soon as they admitted Canadian coal free. If the same principle were applied to England, we should now admit British coal free, because England admitted our coal free.

MR. GALBRAITH said that the result of these resolutions would be that, as soon as the United States admitted certain of our agricultural products free, this Government would be in a position to issue a proclamation, allowing similar articles to come into Canada free of duty. During his canvass last summer, he found great complaint among people with regard to the action of the Mackenzie Government in not putting a heavy duty on American pork, and it was one of the reasons given why it should be defeated that it had not put a proper duty on that article of farm produce. He found that pork was carrying a reciprocal duty, a cent a pound, and no change had been made. He wanted to know if the Government, upon the Government of the United States reducing the duty on any article enumerated in this resolution, would find it obligatory on them to make a similar reduction in case of anything coming into Canada. Last year, Ontario alone imported, of pork, \$308,044 worth, while they sent into the States \$1,065 worth. Their importation of Indian corn from the United States was \$2,972,301, and their export thereto was, from Ontario, \$49. They imported \$5,117,282 worth of wheat, and sent to the United States \$1,125,808 worth. Oats imported, \$620,628 worth, and exported to the Republic \$128 worth. If the Americans were the astute and selfish people that hon. gentlemen supporting the Government gave them credit for being, they would at once reduce the duties on all those articles, and allow the small exports

from Canada to reach their markets free, in order to secure hers. So far as his own impression was concerned, he believed the duties on agricultural products were not going to benefit the farmers. The true policy with regard to the farming community was to let them severely alone, and allow them to purchase those articles that they did not produce themselves at the most reasonable rate at which they could be obtained. When they considered the very large volume of agricultural products of the United States, it was computed that last year wheat reached 300,000,000 bushels, and Indian corn 1,300,000,000, they would see that if they sent into that country every dollar's worth of the Canadian surplus of agricultural products, it would not have the least appreciable effect on its markets. It would not reduce prices though increasing somewhat the carrying trade of that country. Now, in regard to a great number of articles of agricultural produce sent into the United States last year, and for which we received a cash return, very little of the same commodities, except wool, was sent from them to Canada. The Ontario exports amounted to nearly \$8,000,000, and it was not likely the American Government would make any reduction on the duties chargeable on those articles, because it was in their interest to maintain them, seeing that it would not be very beneficial to their people to send similar articles to Canada. If it would be obligatory on the Canadian Government to make certain reductions on articles named in this resolution, in case of similar reductions being made by the United States, the farming community of Canada might expect very little protection under this Bill.

MR. HESSON said he was glad to see that the Government had reserved the right of making certain reductions in import duties on corresponding reductions being made by the United States. He felt that they should abide by the judgment of the hon. gentlemen in charge of the matter, and particularly that the country credited them with an honest intention of carrying out the propositions so ably brought before the House by the Finance Minister. He (Mr. Hesson) was not at all anxious about the matter.

MR. TILLEY.

He told that the Finance Minister and the Governor in Council would regulate wisely in future, and that, if they did not get much revenue from those items, they would, at all events, be none worse than before.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said he took it for granted the object of that was to induce the Americans to lower their duties on the articles mentioned, going into their country, and that the only object in imposing duties on those articles was reciprocity. If so, why was it that the same duties were not levied on the American articles which were carried by the same Canadian articles entering the States—why not charge 20c. a bushel on wheat as they did? Was not the position of the Finance Minister weakened by this difference. While Canadians charged only 50c. a barrel on flour, their charge was \$1. They said they would not lower their duty on coal, and Canada was to impose only 50c. a ton as against their 75c. If they wished to coerce the Americans into reciprocity, why enact lower duties against them than theirs against Canadians?

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolution 3 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 4,

MR. MACKENZIE said that he had supposed the hon. the Finance Minister would be willing to consider suggestions of a change in the wording of the resolutions, when it was only desired thereby to give effect to his own views. But so far he had declined to make a single alteration of any kind, and there was no use in wasting time in discussion if he was bound to carry them through unchanged.

MR. TILLEY said he would like to know any suggestions hon. gentlemen on the opposite side had to make. These resolutions had been prepared, to a great extent, by the Commissioner of Customs, who had had 12 years' experience in these matters. It was after consultation with him and the Minister of Customs that he (Mr. Tilley) had adopted the propositions made here, and he felt great delicacy in altering the work of such

an experienced officer, without some clear and undoubted reason therefor. With regard to the point made by the member for Chateauguay, he did not see that anything could be done. The object of that provision was to ascertain correctly the duty on the value of the article, and the place where it was purchased. This resolution was, word for word, the one accepted in 1871. But it was entirely in the hands of the Government to say that, if any propositions were made, they would accept or reject. They certainly would not on corn and the other articles referred to, and it was not likely they would on barley. It was intended, as a whole, as a policy that would bear upon the whole of these articles, and, if the United States were to say they would reduce their duties below what they were at present, the Government would then have the authority to reduce the duty on articles coming in here. The imposition of these duties now was because these goods had come in free from the United States for twelve years, while the United States imposed their duties on our goods. The Government now imposed duties on articles of the United States sent in here, in the hope that it might lead them, as indicated in the *New York Herald*, to open their markets to us if we agreed to abrogate those duties.

MR. JONES said that, while in the city of Toronto, a large importer there brought under his notice the fact that, under the sixth resolution, goods brought by rail from Pittsburg to Toronto would not be charged duty on the freight to the border, whereas, if they were brought by rail to Cleveland and shipped from Cleveland to Toronto, a duty would be collected on the freight from Pittsburg to Cleveland.

MR. TILLEY said this proposition was first introduced, he thought, by Sir Francis Hincks, and to a certain extent had been in operation to the present time. It was originally passed with a view to levying duty equally on the value of goods at the shipping. For instance, when wine was purchased in the interior of the country at a very low figure, the *ad valorem* duty on the cost would be much lower than on the same article at its cost when bought at the

port from which it was shipped, the freight in the latter case being added to the price. It was thought desirable to retain this provision, with the exception of adding the words, "except when imported from Great Britain."

MR. CASEY said he thought the difficulty suggested by the hon. member for South Leeds had not been met, and the clause required amendment.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the words, "the cost of inland transportation," he thought met the case. He thought the meaning was clear, and there never yet had arisen any difficulty through misconstruction.

MR. TILLEY: I entirely agree with the construction put on it by the Minister of Justice.

MR. MACKENZIE asked how it would be if a train of iron were shipped from Pittsburg and crossed the line at Buffalo? Would the duty be charged on the cost at Pittsburg, with the freight to the bridge added, or would it be charged on the price at Pittsburg, or on the price when it arrived at Toronto?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the sentence might be rather involved, but, as a matter of construction, he had little doubt on the subject.

MR CASEY asked what the intentions of the Finance Minister were in relation to this matter? Did he intend to collect duty on freight that came by land as well as by water?

MR. TILLEY said the hon. member had offered some remarks a few minutes ago, which he thought were not called for, to the effect that this was the work of some subordinate, such as the Commissioner of Customs. It was a fortunate thing, in connection with our Government, that we had officials who remained in office, and were not removed in consequence of a change of parties; who, in fact, had the confidence of both parties. The deputy heads, he considered, would do credit to any country, and he did not hesitate to say that he looked upon the deputy head of that Department as one of the most efficient men of the public service; and he had not hesitated to leave this matter largely

in his hands. He (Mr. Tilley) had been happy to take the advice and counsel of that gentleman in regard to it, taking into consideration his great experience. From him he had understood that the resolutions, as they existed, did not touch the American trade at all.

MR. MILLS said no doubt the Commissioner of Customs was a very intelligent officer in that particular service, but he did not think his opinion ought to govern this House. It was for the House to say whether the wording of the resolution was such as to give effect to the views of the Minister of Finance. He (Mr. Mills) thought that upon the construction of the resolution the view of the Commissioner of Customs was of no value, though his opinion as to the practice might be very important.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said this was a new resolution entirely. When first it was introduced, it was to include British and other goods, but that had been changed, and Great Britain had been struck out.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said this resolution had created a great deal of interest in the city of Montreal. He believed the contention of the ex-Minister of Customs was sustained by the Collector at Montreal, who stated that he had followed the practice indicated by this resolution all the time. He (Mr. White) knew that inland charges had been made. So far as continental shippers were concerned, it was quite clear that the practice had been to charge the cost of inland transportation, in order to arrive at the dutiable value of the goods. The point raised by the late Minister of Customs had created a good deal of feeling among persons engaged in transportation in the city of Montreal, namely, as to whether, in the case of goods purchased in Paris, taken to the frontier, placed on a vessel, taken to Liverpool, and then shipped to Canada, the inland charges to be added would be charges from Paris to Liverpool, or simply from Paris to Rouen, or to whatever port they might be shipped from. It seemed clear, from the reading of this resolution, that it would only be charges to Rouen. The point raised by the hon. member for South Leeds, as to the effect which this would have upon

MR. TILLEY:

goods coming from the United States, part by rail and part by water, or all by rail, was a very pertinent one. There seemed to him (Mr. White) to be a strong point in that, because, if goods came from any point in the United States to a lake port, and were then shipped to Canada, the transportation of the vessel in this case would have to be added to the cost of the goods; whereas, if they came altogether by rail, there would be no such charges. It was quite clear that, in the construction of this clause, American ports in the United States had never been thought of at all. The point was one of sufficient importance to merit a careful study before it passed.

MR. JONES said this clause had been a deadletter, both in regard to Great Britain and the United States. But it should not certainly have been a deadletter as regarded the United States, considering the action they had taken against us, and we should, in every instance, cause the duty to be levied upon the freight.

MR. BOWELL said there had been a misconception as to whether this clause had to be really the law of the land or not. It was a fact, as stated by the hon. member for Cardwell, that the interpretation given to the repealing clause of the tariff of 1876 did not apply to this clause, and the best evidence of that was that the city of Montreal had been in the habit of having these charges added to their invoices, and it had been the universal custom in the Maritime Provinces. If it had been understood otherwise, it must have been from the neglect of duty on the part of the Customs Department in the past. There should be uniformity in all entries and all invoices. On making enquiry as to the enforcement of this provision, he found it never had been made to apply to any goods purchased in the United States and sent to this country. The practice of the Department, in certain cases, had been to enforce the provisions of this Act, but that was provided for by a Departmental Order, and consequently, it had never been enforced in regard to the transit of goods purchased in Great Britain.

MR. BURPEE said the law of 1868 was repealed in 1874, and the whole Act was consolidated in 1877, but this clause

was left out of both those Acts, and whatever carried with it certain packages and certain charges, was provided for in the Act of 1875. The general merchandises of all countries does not carry transportation charges, except on certain articles provided for in the Act.

MR. MACDOUGALL said it seemed doubtful whether this law had been enforced recently, at all events. If this resolution meant to re-enact that law, he was in favour of it. In view of the policy proposed, it was desirable to add to the cost of goods at any point in the United States the cost of transportation to our frontier. That was one of the elements of Protection to our own manufactures. If the word "Canada" was placed in the resolution before the word "vessel," it would cover the difficulty, so as to make it clear that, on goods coming by vessel from any part on the lakes or by the bridge, the cost of transportation to either of those points should be added in estimating the amount of duty to be charged.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 5 and 6 read the second time and agreed to.

* On Resolution 7,

MR. ANGLIN asked how many appraisers it would be necessary to appoint, and what the expense would probably be.

MR. TILLEY said the system had not been thoroughly matured yet. The object was not so much to appoint appraisers in different ports as it was to have a more efficient arrangement here at Ottawa. All the invoices were to be submitted to officers here to see that they were uniform in the value of goods. It would be their duty to ascertain the value of an article manufactured in the United States for the home market. The Estimates would probably cover the expenses of three or four experts. He could not name the amount, but it would not be large.

MR. ANGLIN asked if the experts were to visit places of export, and ascertain the prices of articles; how could they ascertain the prices obtained?

MR. TILLEY said he could not enter into an explanation here, but it would be the duty of these men to ascertain the value of these goods, and then, by addressing circulars to all the collectors, to have uniformity of action.

MR. HOLTON said he regarded with favour the idea of having appraisers here to establish uniformity of valuation in all the ports of the country. This was a point we had long aimed at, and now, as we were getting a more complicated tariff than we ever had before, some process of that kind would be more than ever necessary.

MR. SNOWBALL said it was a dangerous proceeding to appoint appraisers to value goods. He did not think there could be uniformity of value placed upon goods in Ottawa or anywhere else. All we needed was persons to examine the goods and see that they were the classes specified in the invoices. The tariff was bad enough, if they were going to get the full benefit of it, but, if they were going to put on an enormous staff of officials, the poor were going to get very little benefit out of it.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 8, 9 and 10 read the second time and agreed to..

House adjourned at

Twenty minutes before

Two o'clock

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 18th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree to Resolution 11, relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Way and Means (April 9th).

MR. ANGLIN.

MR. HOLTON said that, before the House entered upon a consideration of the items of the tariff, he would like to go back for a moment to the resolutions passed last night. They had been passed somewhat hurriedly, and he had intended to call attention to circumstances connected with one of them, namely, the resolution relating to the tea trade, which was as follows:—

“That it is expedient to provide that, if, at any time, any greater duty of Customs should be payable in the United States of America, on tea or coffee imported from Canada, than on tea or coffee imported from any other country, then the Governor in Council may impose on tea or coffee imported into Canada from the said United States, an additional duty of Customs equal to the duty payable in the United States on tea or coffee imported from Canada: Provided that tea or coffee imported into Canada from any country other than the said United States, but passing in bond through the United States, shall be taken and rated as a direct importation from the country wherever the tea or coffee was purchased.”

He did not propose to raise any discussion on the principle involved in this resolution; he did not think it would be fair to the House to do so, but he desired to enquire as to the practice under this resolution, as to whether the Government had caused an Order in Council, such as was here contemplated, to be issued, and as to the date when the differential duty was to become operative. Considerable confusion of ideas prevailed outside in respect to this question. It might be doubted, he thought, whether it was in the contemplation of anybody that this Order in Council should be issued before the Bill became law. He believed an Order in Council had been issued, presumably under the authority of a resolution in Committee, and he doubted whether that would be a correct procedure. He believed it had been issued, though he had not verified the statement by a reference to the *Official Gazette*. Then, as to the date at which it was to become operative, he believed it became operative under instructions from the Customs Department to its officers in the various ports on a day anterior to the day at which the Order in Council was issued. He desired to ascertain the precise position of this matter. First, had the Government the right to issue an Order in Council before the final passage of the Act? He

thought this power was to flow from the authority of an Act of Parliament, not from the authority of a resolution passed in Committee. And, secondly, if the Government were right in issuing this Order in Council, had they the right to make a differential duty operative at a date anterior to the issuance of the Order in Council ?

MR. TILLEY said that the Order in Council in question was not based upon the resolutions passed by the House recently, but upon an Act of Parliament which had not been repealed. The Order in Council was repealed, but they held that that Act remained unrepealed, and that the Government had authority, under that Act, to pass that Order in Council. Of course, the question would arise, and he had no doubt there was something in what his hon. friend had said in regard to the duties collected before the passage of that Order—whether they would have to be refunded or not.

MR. HOLTON said he thought that was a very questionable position, but he was not disposed to contest it. It had been a question, during the last four or five years, whether that Act was repealed by the Tariff Act of his hon. friend from Centre Huron or not. He thought that the better opinion was that it was repealed. This proceeding, however, produced a great deal of confusion. The general opinion was that the differential duties would only come into force upon the proclamation founded on this Act; that, until such proclamation was made, parties were at liberty to import tea and coffee in accordance with that view.

MR. TILLEY said that that matter would receive the attention of the Government, as he thought there was a good deal in that point.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he wanted to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the last clause: "Provided that tea or coffee imported into Canada from any country other than the said United States, but passing in bond through the United States shall be taken and rated as a direct importation from the country wherever the tea or coffee was purchased." Now, he would like to know, and it was a question of great interest to the trade, what construction the hon.

gentleman put on the Order in regard to goods passing in bond through the United States. If there were any delay of the goods *in transitu*, and they were obliged to be warehoused, would that prevent this from applying. He supposed the effect of it would be that, if a man purchased a cargo of tea in China or Japan, and wanted to dispose of a portion of it in New York, he would be forbidden to do so. It would be a matter of serious inconvenience if a reasonable time were not allowed, in New York or the port at which the cargo was discharged, for the remainder to be brought on to Canada.

MR. BOWELL said that the instructions which would be sent out immediately required that there must be a direct transportation and no delay.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was important to know if any specified time would be allowed for warehousing at the port where the goods were discharged.

MR. BOWELL said that the instructions did not name any specified time, but it might be advisable for the Government to give that matter their consideration.

MR. HOLTON said he thought it was necessary that they should arrive at a perfectly clear understanding upon this point. Supposing a Canadian merchant imported tea from China and Japan, coming to New York and being entered in bond there. If a portion thereof should be sold in New York, what effect would it have on the remainder coming to Canada? Would it have to pay a differential duty ?

MR. TILLEY said there could be no question about that. If a cargo of tea was imported, and one-half of it was sold in New York and the other sent on here, it was not contemplated or intended, and it would be unwise to deprive our importers of the rights they would enjoy under the circumstances. It must, however, be a direct importation, but the sale of one-half would not vitiate the balance.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he wanted to repeat what he said the other day, that this discriminated against the people of his own Province, and against Nova Sco-

tia. If a man sent a cargo of potatoes or fish to the United States, and wanted to buy twenty or forty chests of tea at Boston and New York, he was not allowed to do so without paying a 10 per cent. differential duty. The Government were placing this trade in the hands of a few monopolists. It discriminated against the people of the Maritime Provinces, whose business was largely with the United States. It would prohibit many in those Provinces from taking goods from that country in bond, and make them pay 10 per cent. more duty than if they had purchased in Montreal. Therefore, he protested against it.

MR. TILLEY said that discussion on the general policy was really out of order at this time. He thought that they should proceed with the regular business.

On Resolution 11, item—Muriatic and nitric acid, 20 per cent., *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Is that for revenue purposes?

MR. TILLEY: Yes.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What is it expected to produce?

MR. TILLEY: I cannot tell at this moment. It is hardly desirable to estimate the product of each item, even were it possible with accuracy. This item was free before. Perhaps the duty will encourage the manufacture of this article in Canada, though the importation is not large.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it was not the desire of the Opposition to protract the discussion, but they wished for information on those items which the Finance Minister should be able to give—such as whether the duty would bring \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$20,000. It was not very difficult to get an approximate estimate of the quantity of this article imported. A good many of those acids were the bases of certain manufactures, and it was desirable they should know what other manufactures might be affected by the duty on them.

MR. MILLS said that the Finance Minister must have calculated the

SIR A. J. SMITH.

amounts to be produced by the several items which he expected to make up the aggregate of \$2,100,000 he wanted. It was very important that they should know, as nearly as possible, the amounts expected from the various additional duties. The hon. gentleman had not yet given the House the information on this subject which he promised.

MR. TILLEY said it was impossible to know, exactly, what revenue could be obtained from this description of acid. The value of the acids imported last year was \$31,832, but no line was drawn between the different acids. All except sulphuric acid, and a few others, were free under the old tariff.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he did not expect minute accuracy in forming estimates of the probable revenue, but he did expect that the hon. gentleman would have made some enquiry as to the quantities imported, so as to enable the House to arrive at some safe conclusion with regard to the likely result of those duties.

MR. TILLEY said he had no means of ascertaining the size and proportion of those different acids, and the trade could not have told him.

Item agreed to.

On item—Agricultural implements, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Is this additional tax imposed for revenue or Protection purposes?

MR. TILLEY: I may say for both, though I do not expect much revenue, as the enhanced duty will increase the manufacture.

MR. MACKENZIE: It cannot increase the manufacture very much, seeing that only \$20,000 worth were imported last year.

MR. TILLEY: Then it does not affect it very much.

MR. MACKENZIE: The tariff is practically prohibitory.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that importations of those articles would be practically prohibited. The manufacture of agricultural implements covered several

million dollars' worth every year, the 17½ per cent. having excluded all but \$17,120 worth of certain implements, \$20,000 worth of mowing and reaping machines. The tax would of necessity fall with very great weight on the settler of the North-West. Of the total importations, barely 58,000, Manitoba paid a tax on \$8,800 of agricultural implements of the ordinary class, and \$14,123 on mowers and reapers. In that country, above all others, it was a matter of extreme desirability,—of necessity, even—that the people should be allowed to obtain those labour-saving agricultural implements at a reasonable rate. Yet here a tax of 25 per cent. was imposed, from which the hon. gentleman said he did not expect to receive a cent of revenue. This seemed a very impolitic tax. He would be very glad to hear of any grounds for it. Had the manufacturers petitioned for more Protection? He believed that it had been shown that this interest was particularly prosperous.

MR. TILLEY said there was a deficit of \$2,500,000 this year, and it was necessary to propose some duties to produce that amount. Iron was one of the articles on which they would get a large sum, and when it was to be additionally taxed, it was right that this industry should receive increased Protection to put it in the same position it occupied before its raw material was taxed. They knew that agricultural implement-makers were, perhaps, as well satisfied as any other manufacturers, but many other articles were manufactured under patents with which no one could interfere.

MR. MILLS said the position of the Finance Minister was rather extraordinary. His hon. friend had told the people that Protection would not increase prices, but now he stated that, in consequence of the tax on iron, the prices on agricultural implements might be increased, and, in order to secure the manufacturers against loss, they must have more Protection. Apart from Manitoba, agricultural implements were not purchased in the United States by Canadian farmers, but by the manufacturers of such articles in the various parts of the Dominion, with the object of adopting any improvements made in the States. This tax, therefore,

which was to aid the manufacturers, and compensate them for the tax on iron, would be a burden on them and a discouragement.

MR. GUTHRIE said that this duty illustrated, very forcibly, the character of the tariff. It was acknowledged by the Finance Minister that it would increase the cost of coal and iron—of production. The trade and navigation returns showed that there was no market in Canada unoccupied by their agricultural implements. Therefore, the makers could not increase their sales. If this increased the cost of production, the manufacturer must charge a higher price to a farmer, or take it off the workingman's wages. That was the clear intention of this duty. To put on 25 per cent. was one instance where the tariff was purely ornamental. The full tariff would press severely upon manufacturers, or, if it did not, it would on the workingman on the one hand, and the purchasers, the farmers, on the other.

MR. SCRIVER said he agreed fully with his hon. friend. The tariff would have the effect of so increasing the cost of the articles which the makers of agricultural implements employed, as to place them at a decided disadvantage, unless they could increase the price of their implements proportionately. This they could not do, because they produced more than were required for the consumption of the Province. There was a very successful manufactory of agricultural implements in the constituency he had the honour to represent, and it was represented to him by the proprietor of the manufactory, a gentleman of great experience in the business, that this tariff, instead of affording him, and those engaged in that industry, any Protection, would prove an injury. He had often stated previously that he had asked for no increased protection, nor did he desire any.

MR. SKINNER said the people had been told by the gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches that, if they were again entrusted with the reins of Government, they would introduce a policy which would protect every industry in the Dominion. There was a very important industry in his constituency—

an industry intimately connected with the great agricultural interest—he referred to the manufacture of agricultural implements, and what effect had this wonderful National Policy had on this industry? The manufacturer was handicapped with a duty on his raw material, his iron, his coal, his screws, his nuts; in fact almost everything which entered into the finishing articles, had to pay an additional tax, and, as he could not get the additional price for his manufactures, not on account of foreign competition, but because the home trade already supplied the demands, he was forced to reduce the wages of the mechanics and labourers engaged in the trade. Many of the mechanics and labouring men, he was sorry to say, had had faith in the National Policy, and many of them, in consequence, voted for his opponent in the late contest. He regretted, on this account, that they had been the victims of misplaced confidence. They asked for bread and they had got a stone. In corroboration of what he stated, he read an extract from a letter received from one of his constituents as follows:—

“Our business suffers from domestic, not from foreign competition, so that the new tariff gives us no Protection, but, on the contrary, taxes our business to the extent of about \$707,000 a year, for which we receive no earthly equivalent to protect ourselves against the insane policy of the Government. We have been compelled to reduce the wages of our workmen ten to twelve per cent., and the prospects are a fresh reduction will have to be made when the trade has begun to feel the full force of the tariff.”

This letter was from Mr. James Noxon, the Managing Director of the Noxon Manufacturing Company. The firm was a joint stock one, composed of Tories and Reformers; at any rate, he knew that partners in the concern voted for his opponent and worked hard against him.

Mr. ELLIOTT said he desired to express his approval of the new tariff which he said was calculated to promote the prosperity of the country in the highest degree. It was a measure which, he felt sure, would also meet the approval of the people of the Dominion generally, for it would be conducive to the welfare and the best interests of the country at large in all branches of its industries. In the year 1870,

MR. SKINNER.

when a member of the Council of the county which he had now the honour to represent in Parliament, he had favoured a resolution asking his colleagues to memorialise the Government in order to obtain a duty upon all farm produce then imported from the United States, and until the recent tariff passed the House, free of duty, for the unfairness of the then prevailing rule was evident to himself. He had exposed, to the best of his ability, the falsity of the one-sided Customs tariff that then prevailed, and had shown to his associates in the County Council that the tariff was weighted by its unfairness—Canada admitting farm produce free while ours was taxed on entry to the United States—and must be in time radically changed. Although his propositions were not at the moment received with favour, he was happy in being able to state to-day, that the correctness of his views had been generally accepted, and the soundness of his principles universally attested at the recent general elections, and he was also deeply gratified by the knowledge that the Government of which he was a supporter had, to the letter, complied with the wishes and commercial needs of the people at large. The populace, especially those engaged in commerce, knew well enough their own needs, they were a reading and an intelligent people, and he was astonished that the hon. gentlemen now in Opposition, should, to suit the exigencies of their party strife, insult and cast contumely upon the yeomen of the country by stigmatising them as “ignorant,” simply because they had raised their voices against the policy which had been productive of so much evil to the country. The result of the election was in no degree, he thought, matter for wonder, for it was very clear to all that the moment in our national career had arrived when either our industries had to be protected or else to perish altogether. And it should also be remembered that the protection of our manufactures would consequently benefit our farmers, even if the latter did not receive direct protection; for it must be obvious to the most superficial observer that the more villages that sprung up, and the more manufactures that were carried on in their midst, produced in exactly an equal ratio

the sale of farm produce. Much had been said as to the need of agricultural protection, but he would not enter into the subject at any length, as it was very certain that the farming community, under the present system of duplex protection, would not fail to benefit to a most satisfactory extent. It had, indeed, been alleged, and he had been told as much by an hon. member, that the farmers did not benefit by the juxtaposition of prosperous towns and villages; and it was also asserted that Toronto did not in any way benefit the farmers in the neighbourhood and adjoining counties. This was a most fallacious statement, as it was based upon the assumption that grain was the sole product of the farm. This was not the case. The farmer had to look to a great many more items of his produce for profit; and it was perfectly clear to anyone thoughtfully considering the case, that all those items were of a class which found a ready market in any prosperous town or village. He believed that Toronto and Hamilton would increase in population very rapidly in consequence of the new tariff, and that, in consequence, the sale of the domestic produce of the farmers would increase in like proportion. The arguments brought forward for the purpose of supporting the theory that the tariff was not popular in the country, were, he thought, equally fallacious. He could fearlessly assert that, in his own county, the scheme was approved by both parties. He held in his possession letters from various manufacturers, some of the largest in Western Canada, and all expressed their high and eulogistic approval of the action of the Government in connection with the tariff, which they regarded as most ably framed, and calculated to produce satisfactory results. One of these gentlemen, who was not a supporter of the Government, said:

"In my opinion, the new tariff redeems the promises the Government made, that the change of policy should bear a distinct national character. * * * As far as the effect of the new tariff in the country is concerned, I feel satisfied that the change, in time, will be a benefit. Mr. Haggart is satisfied, with the exception of a small matter on raw material. * * * The Messrs. Barber are satisfied, and I understand they have arranged to run their mills full time. This is a change from half time and a decrease of wages. Among the farmers, there is a good

deal of speculation as to the benefits, but I think the majority are satisfied, and will cheerfully wait the result of the great change. * * * As a miller, I am satisfied with a duty of 50c. on flour and 10c. on wheat. * * * This is, as far as I know, satisfactory to our trade. * * * You could briefly call the attention of the House to the impetus the new tariff has given to the manufacturing, milling and agricultural interests in this county."

He had also another letter from a supporter of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who was a farmer. He said:

"That it would not be six months before we shall see the return of our former prosperity; and I can see it already in the stir there was in our town last week, and the pleasant faces of any of the farmers that have any of the coarser grains to dispose of. Oats and pease have gone up 10c. per bushel since last Saturday, and it will help a great number of my fellow farmers this hard year. Nearly every person looks happy. The only thing I have heard the farmers complain of, is that the duties on corn are rather low. They think it should have been 10c., but they do not complain."

He had also a letter from a large manufacturer of mowers and reapers, and farm implements of all kinds, who was also a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. This writer said:

"With the exception of those whose minds were made up to oppose any and everything your Government would enact, very general satisfaction prevails among manufacturers in our line, both Whig and Tory. I would say, go on and do what you consider right and just from a Canadian standpoint, and you will find all of the threats now being made by certain Opposition papers will recoil on themselves. We, along with all other implement makers, have not, nor do we intend to advance one cent on our prices, believing that the increased market will fully compensate large makers. It may be found that an additional 5 per cent. may be necessary for Manitoba and Eastern Provinces, to secure their trade from the United States making a slaughter market of the surplus or inferior wares, but I have no doubt you will receive reliable information on this point from others who have done more in those markets."

He had only cited these letters, gratifying as they were so far as proof of the success of the tariff was concerned, in order to show by direct evidence that hon. gentlemen, when they opposed the tariff, did not represent the views held by the country generally; and this was amply proved by the free testimony he had produced from members of the party of gentlemen opposite, in proof of the suc-

cess of the yet young tariff. The tariff, he thought, would necessitate to some extent, a change in the system of farming, as it would be made more profitable. Greater attention would have to be given to stock raising and to the rotation of crops, for, in the older countries, there could be little doubt, farmers could hardly compete with the producers of cereals in younger and virgin soils as were found in the West. The growth of manufactures would bring in its train a greater demand for beef, mutton and pork, as grown by the farmers. The leader of the Opposition had not long since stated that the new tariff would be ruinous to manufactures, as it would create over-competition, but this statement was on the face of it fallacious. Under the present tariff the reverse would, of necessity, be the case, as it was only external competition that was a source of danger to any manufacturing community.

Mr. McINNES said that, in British Columbia, agricultural implements could not be manufactured, because they had no wood there suitable for the purpose. Their agricultural implements had to be imported from the United States or from Canada, and this very heavy duty would inflict great hardships on them. When British Columbia entered the Dominion, one of the principle clauses in the terms of the Union was that it was optional with the Legislature of British Columbia to retain her own tariff, or adopt the Canadian one, until such time as the Pacific Railway would be built; but having due confidence in the Canadian Government to build the railway, she abandoned her own tariff, and adopted that of Canada. In view of these facts, he hoped the Government would see clear to make exception in favour of British Columbia until the railway was built.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he feared the Finance Minister scarcely apprehended the immense burden which this increased duty on agricultural implements was likely to impose on the farming community. According to the Census, there were about twenty millions of acres of improved lands in the Dominion, representing 200,000 farms of 100 acres each. It was scarcely the

average to assert that each farm required \$200 worth of agricultural implements. As this tariff was imposed entirely for protective purposes, it necessarily followed that, by its imposition, the cost of agricultural implements would be increased. Assuming a small average of increased cost, 5 per cent., the farming community all over the country would pay \$2,000,000 on these articles more than under the old tariff. If we brought this down to our own individual counties, its effect would be localised and more marked. In his own county there was, at the very lowest calculation, about half a million dollars, worth of agricultural implements used there, an increase of five per cent. on which represented \$25,000, without any corresponding advantage being given, as far as he could see, to those engaged in the trade, in return for the duty imposed. If it were true that the trade fully supplied the Canadian market, there was no possibility of their improving their business.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings) said it was a good thing for this country that the farmers had got so many to take their part in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite were very anxious to make the people believe that they were not getting proper protection under this tariff. In West Hastings a gentleman who was doing a large business in the manufacture of agricultural implements, was manufacturing to-day reaping machines which he could sell at \$90, which last year were sold at \$110. He (Mr. White) knew a little about this matter, having served his time in the business. When iron cost \$30 per ton, the articles were sold as cheap as they were now, with iron at \$18 per ton. The manufacturers could afford to sell their implements as cheap, even if they had to pay a little extra duty. The difficulty our manufacturers had to contend against was the competition from the United States, and the loss through agents selling to irresponsible parties. The cry was raised that the poor man was going to suffer. Give the poor man an honest day's pay and he would give an honest day's work in return. It had been said that he (Mr. Ross) lived by farming. Not a bit of it,—the Ontario Government had made provision for him,

Mr. ELLIOTT.

and he knew nothing about farming. He never ploughed a furrow in his lifetime. He would not know how to put a reaping machine together, and he (Mr. White) doubted if he knew how to harness a horse. When he cried out about the farmers, he was talking of something he knew very little about.

Item agreed to.

On item—Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles, 18c. per Imperial gallon,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he observed there were some alterations in these articles. Suppose we imported the same quantities we did before, there would be rather a loss than a gain in revenue of \$2,000 or \$3,000. He would like to know why the hon. gentleman had made these alterations.

MR. TILLEY said he did not think we should lose any revenue. With respect to bottled ale, it remained the same, that is, 18c. per gallon. Ale in bulk was 12c. before, and it was now reduced to 10c. That change was made on account of the reduction in the malt duty, and in order to give encouragement to importers of ale in bulk. It would give employment to a large number of persons in making the bottles and bottling the ale.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there would then be a loss of about \$3,000. We got last year \$18,000 revenue on 152,000 gallons of ale imported in casks. Under this tariff we would only get \$15,000.

Item agreed to.

On item—Animals, living, of all kinds, not otherwise specified, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. MACKENZIE said the wording of this item meant the same as all other specified animals.

MR. TILLEY said certain animals were declared free. A discussion had occurred in the Customs Department as to whether leeches were animals or not. Other instances might arise of uncertainty, if certain animals were not otherwise specified. Animals imported for the improvement of stock were specified and made free.

MR. GUTHRIE asked what revenue the Minister of Finance expected to obtain from this additional tax.

MR. TILLEY answered about \$25,000. The hon. member for Centre Huron said last night that this tax would all fall upon Manitoba, but that Province imported but a very small fraction of the whole number of animals brought into this country.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had stated that it would fall largely upon Manitoba, but not exclusively, as it would also be heavy upon British Columbia. During the last two or three years those Provinces had imported a very much larger percentage of horses, cattle and sheep than the other Provinces. This tax would consequently fall very heavily upon the North-West settlers, and was a very impolitic one.

Item agreed to.

On item—Artificial flowers, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT remarked that the hon. the Finance Minister made a difference between artificial flowers and feathers. He would like to know the reason for doing that.

MR. TILLEY said that as 30 per cent. was imposed upon silks and satins, and as we required a revenue, artificial flowers could pay it as well as anything else. Those who will wear artificial flowers must pay for them as well as those who wear silks and satins.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the tax was fair enough, but, if the object was revenue, this tax would be likely to defeat that object by being too high. The chances were that we would have an inferior article of artificial flowers manufactured in this country.

Item agreed to.

On item—Babbit metal, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked if this article was taken from the free list.

MR. TILLEY replied that babbit metal was formerly 17½ per cent., and

tube metal free. It was found to be exceedingly difficult to draw a distinction, the two were so much alike. Both were placed on the 10 per cent. list so that there could be no difficulty in future on that score.

Item agreed to.

On item—Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, bound or in sheets, not being foreign reprints of British copyright works, nor blank account books, nor copy books, nor books to be written or drawn upon, nor bibles, prayer books, psalm and hymn books, 6c. per pound,

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Will the hon. gentleman tell us what additional revenue, if any, he expects to derive from this, and then the basis on which he makes the alterations?

MR. TILLEY said when he made his second statement, he stated that it had been decided to adopt this specific duty, and a duty that would yield an equivalent, and something in excess of the duty that was levied on paper. Under the old law, books, as a manufactured article, paid 5 per cent., but paper paid 17½. Therefore, it was considered very unfair to Canadian publishers that the raw material should be subjected to a duty of 17½ per cent., and the manufactured article to 5. In addition to that the question arose as to how it should be levied, whether *ad valorem*, or, as proposed here, by weight, and, after careful consideration, it was found that whichever course was adopted there were difficulties in the way, and of two evils the Government selected that which they considered the least. If we made it an *ad valorem* duty, a valuable English work, valuable on account of the talent displayed in it, as well as in the material on which it was printed, would pay a high rate of duty, while an inferior book would pay a lower rate of duty. Now, the same difficulty arose, but not to the same extent, in the application of the specific duty. Heretofore that duty varied from 7 per cent. to 22 per cent., and they estimated that the duty would produce an average revenue of about 12 per cent. The duty collected last year was \$44,000, and a large number of bibles and prayer books, etc.,

MR. TILLEY.

still remained at 5 per cent., and it was estimated that the proposed duty would yield probably an increased revenue of \$30,000. If, for instance, the whole were imported and not manufactured, it would, perhaps, give a revenue of \$40,000. But there was no doubt, whatever, that it would lead to the printing of a large number of books that were formerly imported. It would aid the paper manufacturer in the country, and give employment to a large number of people, besides yielding an estimated revenue of \$30,000.

MR. MILLS said he objected strongly to putting a tax upon books. If the hon. gentleman would consider the case, he would see that second-hand books would almost be prohibited under this tariff. It was almost impossible to make up a good library because of the difficulty of getting books that might be just going out of print. All books printed before 1852 were now imported into the United States free of duty; if the hon. gentleman had made a proposition of that sort it would have been very much more reasonable. This tax would, in fact, be more than the original price of such books purchased in New York or London. Then again the mode of imposing the duty was a very objectionable one. The importer would be obliged to have his books opened at the Customhouse. The boxes would have to be broken open, and the books, if not well bound, would be injured. But, if the importer was only required to produce his invoice for the tax to be imposed on the value of the books, there would be no difficulty. Under the provisions of this tariff, every box must be opened and the books must be all examined. Then he found that stationers were subjected to different rates of taxation. He was told that a small parcel worth \$30 or \$40 had been received by an Ottawa bookseller, which was opened and assorted. The paper cutters, made out of ivory, were subjected to one tax, and those made of gutta percha to another. Inkstands, made of glass, were subjected to one tax, and those of metal to another. And so the articles had to be assorted and classified, and a great amount of time wasted, in order to determine the amount of tax to be imposed upon them. Com-

ing to pencils, it was impossible to say how they should be taxed, whether as manufactured goods, as plumbago, or as India rubber. This was one of the practical difficulties of the tariff. If we were to impose an *ad valorem* tax upon books, there would be no difficulty, and books that were going out of print would only pay a tax according to their value.

MR. ANGLIN said the objections made by the hon. member for Bothwell were very serious in their character, inasmuch as importers must be subjected to a great many annoyances arising from the conflicting character of the tariff. The chief objection to this impost was that it would tend to prohibit, or, at all events, greatly to diminish, the circulation among our people of those cheap English reprints of the most valuable works of the English language. It was a very bad policy to tax the production of the intellect, but we had in our language a large number of the very best works which were produced by English publishers, at a low price, for circulation amongst the masses of the people. This was one of the most civilising influences that could be employed in any country, and we were now about to prohibit or diminish the effect of that influence in this country. He thought he saw it stated in a letter from St. John, N.B., that this class of books recently imported had to pay something like twenty-five per cent. duty. He objected to this tax, because it would seriously interfere with the circulation of books through the country.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said, that in the course of previous remarks, he had referred to the effect of this tariff on Sunday School literature. His hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) knew that all Sunday School library books had to be imported largely from the United States, and he thought it was somewhat inconvenient to be obliged to pay increased prices for those books. He thought his hon. friend would agree with him, that Sunday School library books were almost as important, in one sense, as bibles, hymn-books, etc., and by increasing the duty on them it would be a serious injury. There was another objection. Certain denominational works, particularly those used by the Lutheran denomination, and

which were published only in Germany, had to be imported. It would not pay a publisher to reproduce those books in Canada. The discrimination in that case was due more to the language spoken by these people than to the tariff. But a discrimination of that kind which bore so heavily upon their German fellow-citizens was one that was exceedingly objectionable, and it appeared to him it might be obviated. He hoped the matter would receive the further attention of the Government.

MR. TILLEY said this matter of religious publications had received the careful consideration of the Government, and at one time it was thought they might be put in the same class with bibles, prayer books, etc., at 5 per cent. duty. But when they came to work the matter out they found that a special class for religious books could not be made, because religious books could not be clearly specified or defined; and the Government was compelled, under the circumstances, to abandon the proposition. He thought that with a population of 4,000,000 the time had arrived when they should print and publish their own Sabbath School books; and he believed it would not be long before that would be done. It was because of the difficulty they found, after consultation with the Customs Department and the members of the Government, of giving any clear definition of this description of books, that they had not been put in the 5 per cent. class. •

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. the Minister of Finance was mistaken if he thought that a population of 4,000,000 could sustain the publication of the kind of cheap Sunday School periodicals which were published in the United States and Great Britain, because it was only an enormous circulation that would enable a publisher to publish them, except at a loss to himself. These books were published to a large extent by benevolent societies, which had an income over and above what they got from the sale of their periodicals. He believed a very large majority of such publications were delivered at the present time to the Sunday Schools for less than half the price for which they could be produced in

Canada, no matter if they had a complete system of protection. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had had some of these periodicals sent him, that were published in the United States, and used by the Episcopal Methodists in Canada. This denomination was the largest religious body in the United States; whilst they were comparatively small in numbers in Canada as compared with the Wesleyan Methodists, and they, very naturally obtained their supply of cheap church periodical literature from the great depôts in the United States. He would send over a few of these periodicals to the hon. gentleman to look at. They would at least bring him back to the days of his childhood. But seriously, he thought it was a great injury to Canadian Sabbath Schools. The hon. gentleman would, no doubt, to some extent, promote the publication of certain classes of papers. He hoped the Government would yet consider this matter, and allow this class of Sunday literature to be brought into the country. He had letters from parties engaged in the business, but he would not take up the time of the House by reading them. He appealed to the Government earnestly to reconsider the decision come to in the matter. He admitted there would be a difficulty about the definition of religious literature in the shape of books, and while he thought the system of imposing the duty was not a correct one, still, the class of books that were taken into the ordinary Sunday School libraries could not be properly classed as religious books, although they were more or less of a religious character, or had that tendency. But the periodicals to which he referred were clearly and wholly of that stamp, and could not be published anywhere for the sake of profit. They were almost always published by benevolent enterprise, or by publishers who were enabled, on account of the vast circulation in Great Britain and the United States, to sell them profitably.

MR. TROW said he agreed in the remark of the hon member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), in reference to the hardships imposed on the German population of this Dominion. At present the German Conference of the Lutheran

Church was in session in Berlin, and were discussing this same subject. All their tracts, Sabbath-school books and periodicals were printed in the United States, either in Cleveland or Cincinnati. He had spoken with three ministers of that Church recently on that subject, and they seemed to think that something should be done; and he was aware that a very largely signed petition would be forwarded to the Minister of Finance immediately, on the subject, and he trusted that some measure of relief would be afforded the German body, which formed a very large and important element of the population of Western Canada.

MR. KEELER said it was very desirable that this class of literature should come into the country at a cheaper rate than under this tariff. He had received from a number of his constituents who took a great interest in the subject, letters condemning the tariff on this point, though the writers were warm political partisans of the Government. He hoped that some means would be provided, by which this class of literature might be brought in under a special arrangement at a lower duty than that proposed. He did not believe that these books could be printed and sold in Canada at as cheap a rate as they were supplied heretofore.

MR. TILLEY said his hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) thought he (Mr. Tilley) supposed to influence him by appealing to the days of his youth. He might say, for the information of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that those periodicals came in free through the post-office as newspapers.

MR. MACKENZIE said they were sent in packages, and in that case the postage would be greater than the duty.

MR. MILLS said it was absurd to suppose that periodicals could be printed in Canada and sold as cheaply as they could be obtained in the United States. The people would purchase them where ever they could be obtained cheapest, and that was from the large depôts in the United States. Supposing a sufficient inducement was offered to publishers to undertake the publishing of these books here, they could not be sold for less than

double the price now charged. It would be utterly impossible for small denominations, if they had to pay this taxation, to obtain Sunday School books at all. This proposition was a premium on ignorance. The effect of the tariff would be such as to exclude the importation of magazines into the country at all. The people would have very limited means of obtaining information in order to enable the publisher of some periodical to obtain greater profit. This provision in the tariff was one unworthy of the House, and one, which he trusted, the House would not support.

MR. CASEY said he did not agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that this proposition was unworthy of the Government, inasmuch as it was perfectly consistent with all the other provisions of the tariff, which bore so heavily on the people. There were in his (Mr. Casey's) county a large number of German Lutherans, the headquarters of which body were on the other side of the line. It in fact discriminated against these two denominations. It also placed a special tax on the Highland Baptists, who had their headquarters in New York. He hoped the arguments which had been submitted to the hon. gentleman would have weight with him.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said he thought the hon. gentleman who had just sat down was not likely to increase his influence in the House if he adopted the tone he did when he cast his sneers at gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches. They at least might be presumed to have as much interest in the welfare of the country as the hon. gentleman, and he thought his position in the House entitled him to adopt a different tone to that which he affected. The point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell was, of course, the broad question as to whether there would be any duty on books at all; and there was a great deal to be said on both sides of it. In the United States, where they must admit that a deep interest was taken in education, a higher tariff was imposed on books than was proposed in these resolutions. The tariff of the United States was twenty-five per cent., whilst that under consideration would not be more than ten and one-half per cent., or twelve per cent.,

therefore the charge of a determination to prevent, except at a high price, the introduction of literature from abroad, applied with greater force to the United States. The hon. member for Bothwell, in his first speech, advanced an argument which he (Mr. White) thought instead of making for him rather made against him. He referred to second-hand books, whose value on account of their scarcity, was far beyond their intrinsic value. These books, if charged, even at a low *ad valorem* rate, would have to pay a much higher duty than at so much per pound. That argument, therefore, was very much in favour of this arrangement of the tariff. The contention that considerable difficulty would be experienced by the Custom-house authorities, he did not consider was well taken. There might be a little difficulty with regard to the first importations, but it would disappear at the second importations as soon as the Customs authorities became accustomed to the work, and the system of invoicing was improved. The only argument which undoubtedly excited some interest, and which, in a good many quarters outside, was felt to be a serious one, was that in reference to the religious publications such as the hon. member for Lambton had referred to. The question involved in this matter was rather a wide one, and he must confess he was astonished to find gentlemen, whose opinions were strong against any union of State and Church, or legislation in the interest of religious bodies, or special exemptions in favour of religious bodies, urge this argument. His impression was that that class of literature could be supplied in Canada just about as well as it could be in the United States. The production of them in Canada involved the sending of the plates from the place of publication to this country, instead of the printed papers, and the labour required in the production of them would be performed in Canada. In regard to magazines, he thought, by the arrangement of the tariff, substantial justice would be done. It was a remarkable fact that since this scale of duties had been commenced, the Messrs. Rose, of Toronto, had already issued a paper similar to the Franklin Square edition of novels, at an actually cheaper cost than the Franklin Square edition. This was

one of the early results of a tariff, which he was satisfied the people would discover was a fair and equitable one.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he rose to deprecate the tone in which the hon. gentleman had criticised the conduct of an hon. member of the House. If there was any member in the House who did not deserve such a thrust, it was the hon. gentleman referred to. He was intelligent, amiable, highly cultivated, and assiduous in attention to his duties, and he would tell the hon. member for Cardwell, without any discourtesy, that the reputation with which he had come to this House would not last long, if he exhibited the partisan spirit his opening remarks had just displayed.

MR. BOULTBEE said that no charge had been made that the young gentleman in question did not possess the qualities attributed to him. It was only charged that he had forgot what was due to a man of culture and attainment, in speaking as he had done.

MR. SCRIVER said he hardly thought the hon. member for Cardwell was justified in his personal allusion to the hon. member for West Elgin. He rose, however, to express his regret that the hon. the Minister of Finance did not listen to the representations that were made to him from an influential source, in reference to the particular class of literature, in regard to which so much had been said. He desired, however, to call attention to the *British Workman* paper, which had exerted so wide an influence in training the minds of the young in regard to the question of temperance. For this reason, both the Finance Minister and himself were specially impressed with doing every everything in their power to promote the general circulation of this paper throughout the community. He regretted that the ingenuity of himself and colleagues was not equal to the prevention of the imposition of an almost prohibitory duty upon this and similar publications, including some of an artistic character, of which he could not speak in too high terms; 25 per cent. was too much to impose.

MR. OUMET said that Latin and Greek books, translations and dictionaries, though much used in their educa-

tional institutions, had to be imported from Europe and elsewhere. They could not be printed in Canada with a profit, and might very properly be put on the same footing as bibles, prayer books, and other works paying 5 per cent. The duty of 6c. per pound on the larger books would be nearly 50 per cent. on cost.

MR. KRANTZ said that the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) had referred to the German Lutherans as being very much oppressed by this tariff. To quiet his mind and conscience, he might state that they had Lutheran literature printed in this country, of fully as high a standard as that printed in the United States, German school books being printed in Canada as many as twenty-five years ago.

MR. TILLEY said that the question of that class of books was connected with an *ad valorem* duty, and would, if he recollected right, pay more than an ordinary specific duty. Classical dictionaries would pay according to weight.

Item agreed to.

On item—British copyright works, reprints of, 6c. per pound, and the addition of 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said if that duty was intended to apply to the British quarterlies, reprinted in New York, which belonged to a valuable class of works which he thought would not be reprinted here, the duty would be very heavy on them.

MR. TILLEY said they paid 12½ per cent., which went to the author; the 6c. would be collected on the weight.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that he did not think that the reprints of the quarterlies ever paid 12½ per cent.

MR. TILLEY: They came through the post-office, but other works did pay that amount.

MR. BOWELL said that publishers in New York might secure the copyright and send works in without that charge. The duty was to apply exclusively to copyright books. Under the

old tariff, the duty was evaded by Canadian printers establishing printing offices on the line and sending works in in sheets. The duty did not apply to the quarterlies.

Item agreed to.

On item—Books, periodicals and pamphlets, imported through the post-office, for every two ounces in weight, or fraction thereof, 1c.,

MR. TILLEY said the duty would make 8c. a pound, as against 6c., and this was considered the most convenient way of collecting the duty. Previously, many books imported through the post-office, paid no duty. In other cases the postmasters were particular and forwarded books to the post-office for collection of the duties. But for the purpose of simplifying this matter, it was proposed that the postmaster should weigh the books and collect the duty for the Customs Department. On a pound 8c. would be paid, and on two ounces 1c.

MR. SCRIVER asked if it was proposed to compensate the postmasters for the discharge of this additional duty.

MR. TILLEY : Yes, a certain percentage.

MR. CASEY said that the duty would discriminate against the importation of any book by post, and in favour of importation through distributing houses in Canada which could evade it.

MR. TILLEY said one object was to facilitate the collection of the duty. The tariff made a difference of only 2c. per pound, and he thought that their own people should have the benefit of some slight discrimination.

MR. MILLS said this would be a very serious tax upon people in the rural districts. The bookseller purchased at 33 per cent. below the publisher's price, and the man in the rural districts paid that whether he purchased from one or the other ; and now an additional tax was proposed should he take his periodical through the post-office, when that might be his only way.

MR. SNOWBALL wished to know what check would be put on the post-

masters in reference to the collection of that duty.

Item agreed to.

On item — Blank books, bound or in sheet, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. TILLEY said those books had been admitted at a lower rate, with bills, advertising pamphlets, etc., most of which had been sent through the country without contributing anything to the revenue.

MR. MACKENZIE : They paid 17½ per cent.

MR. TILLEY said that a great many small pamphlets, with regard to patent medicines and insurance companies bill-heads, showbills, and everything of that kind, had been brought into the country, depriving Canadians of a certain amount of employment. He thought it proper, therefore, to propose a 30 per cent. duty.

Item agreed to.

On item—Bookbinders' tools and materials, including cloth, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he thought that this would bear heavily on the trade ; 15 per cent. on cloth would increase the cost on school books, the binding of which constituted a large percentage of all the bookbinding in Ontario, where one or two million books per year were used up by the half million of school children.

MR. TILLEY said that the articles in the list referred to had been admitted free, but this industry had more protection now than before, and it was necessary to obtain a certain revenue. Under this duty there would be more employment for the bookbinder, many of whose tools could be made in the country. It was imposed merely for the sake of revenue, and it left a sufficient margin of profit to this industry.

MR. ANGLIN said that the bookbinders had been treated with peculiar hardship. The duty would have been a mere trifle on the better description of articles to be used. They taxed not only

the binders' materials, but even their working tools.

Item agreed to.

On item—Billiard tables, without pockets, 4 ft. 6 in. by 9 ft., a specific duty of \$22.50,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked what was the average cost of those articles; and what did the duty represent *ad valorem*?

MR. TILLEY: According to the different kinds, and prices, and billiard tables; the duty varied from 21¼ to 23½ per cent. The prices ranged from \$200, \$225, \$250 and \$300.

Item agreed to.

MR. KILLAM said he understood the hon. gentleman to say there was to be a drawback on some manufactures used in the construction of ships. Brass bushings were imported to be used in the manufacture of blocks. Were the manufacturers of the blocks or the shipbuilders to receive the drawback of the value of these bushings?

MR. TILLEY said either the shipbuilder or the blockmaker would get the drawback, as agreed between them. The blockmaker could sell the article at a reduced price and get the drawback, or the shipbuilder could pay the full price and receive the drawback.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 50) Respecting La Banque Jacques Cartier.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the consideration of Resolution 11.

On item—Brass, old and scrap; in bars, bolts and sheets; in wire, round or flat; on seamless drawn tubing, and on

MR. ANGLIN.

plain and fancy tubing, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it was very unlikely, indeed, that these articles would yield any revenue under this tariff. He supposed the hon. gentleman believed that the imposition of 30 per cent. *ad valorem* would cause these articles to be manufactured in Canada but he (Mr. Cartwright) thought the hon. the Finance Minister would lose both the revenue and the manufacture.

Item agreed to.

On item—Barley, 15c. per bushel,

MR. CHARLTON enquired, Whether the hon. gentleman anticipated that the imposition of 15c. would materially advance the price of grain to the farmers of Canada in our own market, and afford an increase to the revenue.

MR. TILLEY said he found the imports of barley last year were 302,147 bushels, valued at \$137,243. The exports were 1,040,000 bushels, valued at \$697,454. He did not expect to obtain any revenue from this, except, perhaps, a few thousand dollars; because 15c. a bushel would practically exclude American barley. A few thousand bushels, however, would probably be imported into British Columbia. As to the expected benefit to the farmers he would answer that question twelve months hence. He did not think it necessary for him to state here how much it would increase the cost of the article to the people. The great object was to give them the home market.

MR. BUNSTER said he would inform the hon. the Finance Minister that if he expected to get any revenue on barley imported into British Columbia, he would be mistaken, as they would raise it themselves.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman spoke about giving the farmer the home market for his barley. There never was a period when we had not a larger market than the hon. gentleman could give us. The hon. gentleman would see by the returns that it was only during the last two or three years that American barley was finding its way through Can-

adian channels to the European market. During the whole period since Confederation, less than 2,000,000 bushels of American barley had found their way into Canada, and the whole of this had been re-shipped to Europe. If the hon. gentleman excluded that barley, he would simply exclude it from being carried to Europe. The hon. gentleman dared not say that the proposition would give the farmers better prices. He knew right well that he would neither put money in the pockets of the farmers, nor into the Treasury. Then what was the tax imposed for? It was for the purpose of keeping up this sham. The farmers were to pay a higher tax on the article they purchased for clothing or for food, but they were not to get any more for the articles they sold. The hon. gentleman ought to be frank with the House, and state what he imposed this tax for. He knew that American barley did not come into competition with Canadian barley in our market. The importation of American barley, on its way to Europe, was a thing of the last few years; and yet the hon. gentleman proposed to put on a tax that, if it meant anything, would prevent those few hundred thousand bushels being sent through Canadian channels to the European market.

MR. TILLEY: There is nothing in the world to prevent the transmission of American barley through Canada under this resolution.

MR. MILLS: What is this tax for?

MR. TILLEY said that was another thing. But there was nothing to prevent barley going through the country by the Great Western or the Southern road, and being shipped to Montreal. Nothing would prevent its being passed through in bond; on the contrary, every facility would be given for it.

MR. GUTHRIE said the hon. the Finance Minister had not answered the question as to whether he expected this duty would raise the price of barley to the Canadian farmer, but he did say it would give the home market to the Canadian farmer. He (Mr. Guthrie) asked him whether he meant by home market a better price?

MR. TILLEY: It may be so.

MR. GUTHRIE said there was another question: why had the duty on barley been put at fifteen cents? It had not been put for purposes either of revenue or Protection. Was it put there because that was the amount Americans put on barley under their tariff?

MR. TILLEY: Because the Government considered it the right thing to do.

Item agreed to.

On item—Indian corn, 7½c. per bushel.

MR. TILLEY said last year we imported 7,789,507 bushels of Indian corn, valued at \$3,535,619; we exported 3,987,600 bushels, valued at \$2,678,000. There was a surplus of imports over exports of 3,400,000 bushels. Now they estimated that, under the new tariff, instead of there being 3,400,000 bushels imported in excess of exports, the amount would be reduced to 2,000,000 bushels. We must take into account that there would be consumed, in Canada, 150,000 bushels of meal, a portion of which would be manufactured from corn, which would increase the quantity of corn imported, and diminish the quantity of meal. But the practical effect would be that the revenue from corn, or cornmeal, would be about \$210,000.

MR. FLEMING asked if the Government intended to give the Canadian farmer a drawback upon American corn. The manufacture of beef was just as much a manufacture as the manufacture of sewing machines, and Canadian farmers were as much entitled to a drawback when they purchased American cattle, and fed them with American corn, and sold the product to European markets. They were just as much entitled to the drawback as the Canadian manufacturer. He defied the hon. gentleman to show why the Canadian manufacturer was entitled to a drawback and the Canadian farmer was not entitled to one.

MR. TILLEY said that was a proposition he was not quite prepared for. It had not entered into his calculations. He could imagine a great deal of difficulty in dealing with an interest of that kind, for the reason that a large portion

of the corn that would be consumed would be used in the distilleries, and we knew that the distilleries would have the benefit of it, inasmuch as there was a small addition to the Custom's duty, owing to the fact of their having to pay so much on the corn.

MR. CHARLTON said he would like to know if the hon. the Finance Minister anticipated that, in consequence of the imposition of duty on corn, that the production of corn in this country would be fostered to such an extent that hereafter the production would amount to 1,500,000 bushels more than at present.

MR. TILLEY said that he would leave his hon. friend to arrive at his own conclusion on that subject. His (Mr. Tilley's) conclusion was that it would increase the quantity of corn grown in Canada; that it would substitute for corn, to the extent of 1,500,000 bushels, oats, pease and other products of the Dominion of Canada, instead of importing corn.

MR. CHARLTON said that the advantage to the farmers of Ontario, during the last three or four years, in buying corn and selling in place of that corn, pease, cats, barley, etc., had been a gain of 18c. upon every bushel, and, in many instances, more. The imposition of a duty of 7½c. per bushel did not compensate the farmer of Ontario for the deprivation of the advantage derived from selling coarse grains. He did not think it was possible, under any circumstances, to increase the growth 1,000,000 bushels in that Province. This duty upon corn was the only advantage that was offered the agricultural corn-growing belt for all the onerous burdens imposed upon them, and that duty was a delusion and a snare. But his (Mr. Charlton's) constituents could not be deluded. Their choice of representative showed they would not be deluded. He submitted to the hon. the Minister of Finance the propriety of dealing honestly with this question.

MR. CHRISTIE said he was fully convinced that the imposition of a duty upon corn would be very injurious and oppressive to many of his constituents, who did not grow corn very largely. So

MR. TILLEY

far as he knew, we did not export a single bushel; but, on the contrary, imported a large quantity annually for feeding purposes. Many of our farmers found it profitable to sell their barley, pease and potatoes and buy corn. It was well known that corn was better for feeding purposes than barley, and money was made by the exchange. If we were to participate in the English cattle trade, which was assuming such large dimensions (last year we exported from the Dominion to the English market 50,000 or 60,000 sheep and 18,000 cattle), cheap cattle feed was necessary. When hay was a short crop, cheap corn became invaluable; besides, it was used to some extent as a substitute for flour, and was a cheap, healthy and nutritious article of diet. Now, the imposition of a duty of 7½c. per bushel, or 40c. per bag, on cornmeal, was simply filching that amount out of the pockets of those farmers who required to buy, and whose soil was not adapted for its profitable cultivation. It would be a loss of two or three thousand dollars annually to his constituents.

MR. MILLS said if the hon. the Minister of Finance had not considered the effect of the imposition of this duty on corn, if he would ascertain the large quantities of pease, etc., sent out of the country and the quantity of corn that was imported instead, at a much lower price than that received for the products exported, and that this trade was increasing every year, he would have some idea of the injurious effects of this duty. About two and a-half million bushels of corn was imported last year, by farmers, for feeding purposes. The quantity of corn imported was increasing every year, because it was found that the production of other grains was more profitable to the farmers. The whole tendency for the past six years had been to import large quantities of American corn for feeding purposes. He thought that the proposition of the hon. gentleman, instead of helping the farmers, would hurt them very seriously.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the people of his county were opposed to the tax on corn, as were also the people of the Eastern Townships, as the whole corn was bought in his county for feeding purposes. The farmers there generally,

including the supporters of the hon. gentleman opposite, considered that the Government had made a vast mistake with regard to the duty on corn.

MR. SPROULE, as a representative of an agricultural constituency, said that large quantities of corn was imported into his section, to take the place of beans, oats and pease and other coarse grains. It had not paid farmers to raise oats at 25c. and peas at 50c. a bushel, which was the prices received until recently. Since the tariff, coarse grains had increased in price. Last year oats realised 31c. per bushel, but now from 45c. to 48c. Peas, which sold last year for 60c. now fetched from 65c. to 70c. No argument was required to convince the farmers that they received substantial advantage from the new tariff, and this fact had been admitted by rabid Grits in his county.

MR. GUTHRIE said he noticed that a duty of 15c. was put on barley, and 10c. on pease, the same as the American tariff. But on corn the duty was put at 7½c. less than the American tariff. Now, if it was a good argument, as was alleged, for putting this duty on corn—that it would increase the price received by the farmer who grows the corn, why had the Government shrunk from imposing the full American duty on that article. If a 7½c. duty would be beneficial in that direction, a 10c. duty would be more so. Another reason given for the imposition of this duty, was that it would induce Americans to grant Canada reciprocity, if the Government put on retaliatory duties. Why did the Finance Minister shrink in the case of grain? Was he afraid that this policy of retaliation would fail—that it would amount to the Canadian people being taxed, whilst it would not succeed in inducing the Americans to grant reciprocity? Those were points he thought needed some explanation.

MR. HOOPER said Canadian distillers would not buy Canadian rye whilst they could purchase corn from the United States without paying any duty, and he thought that the result of this tariff would be a valuable protection to the farmer.

MR. GILLMOR said this was one of the most objectionable features of the tariff to the county which he had the honour of representing, and he would desire a change if it were possible to have one. He thought the advance which would take place in the price of oats, would be overbalanced by the increase of the price of corn, which farmers would have to purchase for food for themselves and for feed for their cattle.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said that corn was the only article of agricultural produce, the price of which could have been enhanced by the imposition of a duty, yet the Government had only seen fit to tax it to the extent of 97c. per bushel. This duty would make a difference of \$750 in the price of the corn raised in his county, and this, divided amongst 3,000 farmers, would give them 25c. per family per year. If the Government intended to give the farmer any substantial protection in this matter, they should have given them a greater amount of protection than 7½c. a bushel.

MR. BAIN said that the moment hon. gentlemen opposite had an opportunity of putting their hands into the American farmers' pocket, in the same way that the Americans did into the Canadian farmers' pocket, that they were extraordinarily lenient to our American cousins. Whilst the Americans demanded 15c. per bushel on our barley, the Western farmer could send in his corn by paying only 7½c. a bushel. That he thought was the best illustration of who paid the duty, a subject on which they had heard so much, both inside and outside the House.

MR. ALLISON said the variety of arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite, in regard to the imposition of a duty on corn, showed that they had no clearly defined policy. The member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), had stated that instead of this National Policy having the beneficial effects that were predicted, prices had been tumbling since its announcement. If so, they would not ruin the poor consumer. The leader of the Opposition had said that the consumer would have to pay higher for all the articles he used—a statement which

contradicted that of the hon. member for South Brant, that the prices of farm produce had been falling.

MR. BORDEN said that it would have been more satisfactory if the hon. member for Hants had stated his own views on the question before the House, instead of criticising those of members of the Opposition. As the representative of one of the largest agricultural constituencies in Nova Scotia, he had no hesitation in giving his opinion, and saying that the proposed duties on corn, cornmeal and wheat flour, were exceedingly unjust to every portion of Nova Scotia, and particularly the farming community, who were weighted down by taxes on agricultural implements, clothing and everything that they could not raise themselves, including bread and cornmeal for feeding. Those taxes on breadstuffs would have to be paid by the people of the Maritime Provinces, while they would not have the effect of forcing them to buy the products of the Upper Provinces. The natural market of Nova Scotia was the United States, and the proposition of inter-provincial trade, as far as Western Nova Scotia was concerned, was absurd. They had to sell their products to the Americans, and purchase from them such articles as cornmeal and flour, which they did to a large extent. The extra duties that Nova Scotia would pay under this tariff, upon breadstuffs alone, would reach nearly \$100,000. Though the duties would not materially advantage the Ontario farmer, they would disadvantage Nova Scotians by causing higher prices. He hoped the hon. member for Hants would give the House and country a satisfactory explanation of his position in the matter.

MR. ALLISON said it gave him great pleasure to take up the gauntlet of the hon. member for King's, N.S., (Mr. Borden). He was prepared to take the tariff as a whole, though he would have been pleased if corn and flour had been allowed to come in free. He infinitely preferred the tariff, as a whole, to the old one; and was not afraid to go back to his constituents for an endorsement of his course. The only pledge his constituents asked of him was opposition to the late Government. He deprecated the

spirit of selfishness, sectionalism and jealousy engendered on the Opposition. As they were now one people, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with a common interest and a common destiny, let them have a community of sentiment. He believed that every man in Nova Scotia would, before many months, be in a better position to pay the slight increase on corn, flour and meal than he was at present. In reply to the hon. gentleman from King's, who asked how, he would state that it would be by the improved condition of the coal and iron industries of that Province, through the operation of the tariff, which would also revive sugar-refining. The people would thus obtain more employment and better wages.

MR. BORDEN said that the hon. gentleman from Hants (Mr. Allison) had just deprecated sectionalism, finding it very convenient to get on stilts and become a full-fledged statesman, because he dare not come down to the consideration of the individual parts of the tariff itself. In the very same breath he said he approved of it as a whole and objected to particular parts. It was very convenient for him to shelter himself under a deprecation of sectionalism, but the people of Nova Scotia would appreciate a little more patriotism and a little less pretence of statesmanship. The misfortune of Nova Scotia was to be represented by hon. gentlemen claiming statesmanship of that kind. The hon. gentleman had stated that the people of Nova Scotia would not object to pay higher prices, the certainty of that evil being thus admitted. He expected a great deal from the working of their coal and iron mines, which reminded him (Mr. Borden) of the prediction before Confederation that Nova Scotia would become the workshop of the Dominion; her industries had made less progress since then than before Confederation. The letter recently written by Mr. Lithgow, the champion of the coal interest, the Phipps of Nova Scotia, condemned the probable effect of the tariff on the coal mining interest.

MR. TROW said his constituency was not a corn-growing country, but a stock-raising country, and he did not see why the farmers there who raised stock should be called on to pay this additional tax.

MR. ALLISON.

He would like to hear what the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, who was endeavouring to promote our cattle trade with Great Britain, and had recently introduced a Bill for the prevention of disease among cattle, had to say on this point. This was a trade which ought certainly to be encouraged. In the year 1878, we exported to Great Britain 1,878 head of cattle, and 62,461 sheep and 1,798 horses. The Americans in the Western States had the advantage over us in the feeding of stock. Our stock, owing to the long winter, had to undergo a partial starvation through exhaustion of feed and length of confinement. Corn was an essential in the feeding of stock, and it was a matter of great importance, if we wished to have the advantage of placing them on the European markets, that no tax should be placed on any produce used in feeding them. Last year we imported seven and a quarter millions of bushels of corn, of which 2,400,000 bushels were used in the feeding of stock. He was not a stock-raiser himself, but there were quite a number of gentlemen in his locality who were engaged in that business, and used a large portion of corn. His neighbour paid weekly \$62 extra already on account of this rate, and he had used his influence against him (Mr. Trow) in the last election, because he was under the impression that the Americans would pay the duty.

MR. HESSON said he was here with the distinct understanding that he would support such a tariff as the one introduced, and that if such a tariff were not brought down by the Minister of Finance he was not bound to support the Government in this matter. He held that this tariff was in the interests of the farmers of Canada. He only regretted the duty had not been made 10c., instead of 7½c. He spoke from a knowledge of the wants of the people, and he represented a county equal in every respect to that of the hon. member for South Perth. This tariff was a question not for any particular Province, but for the whole Dominion. It was also a question of revenue. Hon. gentlemen opposite had not proposed any way in which the requisite revenue to meet our engagements could be raised. We ought to approach this question as statesmen desirous to place the country

on a sound commercial footing, and he knew of no better way to attain this result than to tax foreign products, and protect, by that means, our own. His Riding was represented by a Reformer in the Local Parliament, but he was elected on the National Policy to represent it here, and he was prepared to support that policy in all its details.

MR. RYMAL said he had repeated time and again, that he looked upon an attempt to afford protection to our farmers by taxing cereals as a snare and a delusion, and a fraud. There was not a single article of our cereals grown in Ontario, with the exception of corn, of which we did not produce a surplus, and exported millions, more or less, yearly, to foreign countries. He was sorry that a duty was placed on corn. True, it was said this was a tariff of compensation; that, while the farmer was taxed in a great many directions, he was to be benefitted in certain other directions. The only way in which, by any possibility, the price of farm produce could be raised, was by putting a duty on corn. To the corn-grower of Western Ontario, in the corn-growing belt, that would be a slight advantage, but even in the most highly favoured portions of Ontario, where they grew corn, there were three men who bought to the one who sold. In a portion of his Riding a good deal of corn was grown. He sold all his grain in the city of Hamilton, and he never yet saw a load of corn grown in Canada exposed for sale. When he canvassed his Riding he appealed to the farmers to know whether any of them had ever seen a load of Canadian corn exposed for sale in Hamilton, and they had to answer in the negative. If he went west from his residence, he could come upon a light, warm soil, and find, occasionally, from two to ten-acre fields of corn; but if he went eastward, he would travel over a heavy clay track, and might travel thirty-five miles before he could get altogether, enough corn to make a five-acre field. The soil that might produce an extra good crop of barley, might be entirely unsuited for the growth of corn; but he had never seen any soil that was calculated to grow a good crop of corn, where

you could not raise a good crop of barley. They sold their barley at an average of 80c., and bought corn in Hamilton at 50c. It was to their advantage to sell barley and buy corn for feeding purposes. Some of his neighbours, who were dairymen and cattle feeders, told him it would be almost impossible for them to compete with the American farmers, who had cheap corn. Instead of our buying their corn and feeding our cattle with it, they would come and buy our cattle and feed them on their own corn, and, instead of our getting the profits on the animal in the English market, the American farmers would drive this trade and get the profits. He believed the farmers had only one desire, and that was to be let severely alone. The Government did nothing, nor could they do anything, for him. He was, on the contrary, taxed for the benefit of purse-proud manufacturers, who went through our country to-day clothed in purple and fine linen. He knew of manufacturers in Hamilton, millionaires to-day, who, twenty-five years ago, were as poor as he was now. He did not begrudge them a fair share of prosperity, but this tariff could not be held as favourable to any class except the manufacturers. He was amused at the remarks of his hon. friend opposite, who said that oats, in the county of Grey, had gone up 10c. a bushel, and pease 10c. to 15c. a bushel, since the new tariff came in force, and he wondered how people could think of introducing American corn for the purpose of aiding the farmer in the way of feeding stock. He had passed through the hon. gentleman's constituency and had seen crops of oats and pease, but no corn; and surely the hon. gentleman would not say it was possible to feed cattle as cheaply on oats and pease as if he sold his oats and pease and bought corn to feed them on. It seemed strange to him that, in the back markets, the villages of the East Riding of Grey, the price of oats and pease should be higher than in the metropolitan market of the city of Toronto. The two things did not hang together, and the hon. gentleman's clumsy attempt at fastening them, showed he was not a master-hand at tying a knot.

Item agreed to.

On item—Wheat, 15c. per bushel,

MR. RYAN.

MR. HOUDE moved in amendment:

"That the said item be not concurred in, but that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of adopting the following resolution:—Provided always that any time when the Governor-General in Council has reason to believe that the supply of wheat, produced in Canada, will not be equal to the demand for its consumption, then it shall be lawful for the Governor-General, by Order in Council, to reduce or take off the duty on imported wheat, for such period as may be appointed and declared in such Order in Council."

He said he made this motion to meet an emergency not likely to present itself, but which was, nevertheless, possible. We produced already more wheat than we consumed, and we had a fair surplus. It was also probable that, in the future, at least, for many years to come, we should have a still greater excess of production over consumption, in respect to this cereal. However, we could not regulate the quantity of agricultural products, as we could those of manufactures, and we should, therefore, proceed very cautiously in placing duties on that prime necessary of life, and see that we gave protection to the producer without causing the consumer to suffer. An unfavourable season might greatly injure the crops in any year, and it was to meet such an emergency that he made this motion. He thought it was a very reasonable and prudent one, and trusted the Government would accept it. It was entirely in accord with the principle upon which we had advocated the present tariff. We had all along contended that the object of this tariff was not to make the consumer pay more, but to give the producers in every branch a larger market wherein to sell his articles more easily and in greater quantities. We wanted to give, as far as possible, the Canadian market to the Canadian producer. But if it happened at any time that there was a great deficiency in the production, then the import duties would cease having the same reason of existing, and in order to protect the consumers in such a case from being obliged to pay more than a reasonable price for wheat, he made his present motion. It might be objected that the motion tended to deprive the producer of high prices, when crops were short. This was true in a sense, but we

must not lose sight of the fact that, he who had wheat to sell, although in a reduced measure, was still in a better position than he who had to buy a prime necessary of life. He trusted the Government and the House would see the justice of this motion, and that it would be adopted.

MR. FISET moved in amendment to the amendment:—

“That all the words after ‘that’ in the said motion, be left out, and the following words substituted instead thereof: ‘the article under Breadstuffs, viz.: Wheat fifteen cents per bushel, be struck off, and transferred to the free list of imported goods.’”

He said that he believed he could show that Canada now imported more wheat than she exported, that was to say as far as the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec were concerned. We imported, at the present time, 5,625,000 bushels, whilst we exported only 4,341,887, which left a balance of 1,284,000 bushels. These figures were the best answer that could be given to the amendment of the hon. member for Maskinongé. He would, moreover, say that, on account of the peculiar position in which were placed his electors, as well as those of the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure, and even of New Brunswick, he believed it his duty to strongly oppose the proposed duty on wheat. In the county of Rimouski there was, to-day, a population of upwards of 33,000 souls, and out of this number there were hardly 300 or 400 who produced enough wheat for the maintenance of their families. This duty was the most onerous that could be imposed, and it would bear especially on the working class, and on the fishermen, without giving any compensation to the agricultural class.

Question put, and amendment to the amendment (Mr. Fiset) *negatived* on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messrs.

Anglin	Burpee (Sunbury)
Bain	Cameron (S. Huron)
Béchar	Cartwright
Bolduc	Casey
Borden	Casgrain
Bourassa	Chandler
Bourbeau	Charlton
Burk	Christie
Burpee (St. John)	Cockburn (Muskoka)

Coupal	Méthot
Desaulniers	Mills
Dumont	Oliver
Fiset	Olivier
Fleming	Paterson (S. Brant)
Galbraith	Perrault
Geoffrion	Pickard
Gillies	Rinfret
Gillmor	Robertson (Shelburne)
Gunn	Rogers
Guthrie	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Haddow	Rymal
Holton	Scriver
Huntington	Skinner
Killam	Snowball
King	Tellier
Landry	Thompson (Haldimand)
LaBue	Trow
Laurier	Vallée
Mackenzie	Weldon
McIsaac	Yeo.—61.
Malouin	

NAYS:

Messrs.

Allison	Hurteau
Arkell	Jackson
Baby	Jones
Bannerman	Kaulback
Benoit	Keeler
Bergeron	Kilvert
Boulton	Kranz
Bowell	Lane
Brecken	Lantier
Brooks	Little
Brown	Longley [P.E.I.]
Bunster	Macdonald (King's)
Bunting	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Cameron (N. Victoria)	McDonald (C. Breton.)
Caron	McDonald (Pictou)
Cimon	McDonald (Vict., N.S.)
Colby	Macmillan
CConnell	McCallum
Costigan	McCuaig
Coughlin	McDougall
Coursol	McInnes
Currier	McKay
Cuthbert	McLennan
Daoust	McLeod
Dawson	McQuade
DeCosmos	McRory
Domville	Massue
Dubuc	Mongenais
Dugas	Montplaisir
Elliott	Mousseau
Farrow	Muttart
Ferguson	Orton
Fitzsimmons	Ouimet
Fulton	Patterson (Essex)
Gigault	Pinsonneault
Gill	Platt
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Plumb
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Pope (Compton)
Grandbois	Richey
Hackett	Robinson
Haggart	Robitaille
Hesson	Rochester
Hilliard	Ross (Dundas)
Hooper	Rouleau
Houde	Routhier

Ryan (Marquette)	Valin
Rykert	Wade
Shaw	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Sproule	Wallace (W. York)
Stephenson	White (Cardwell)
Strange	White (E. Hastings)
Tassé	White (N. Renfrew)
Thompson (Cariboo)	Williams
Tilley	Wright—109
Tupper	

MR. CHARLTON moved in amendment to the amendment :

"That all the words after the word 'that' in the said motion be left out, and the following words be substituted instead thereof:— 'The articles of wheat, coal, and pig iron, paying duties, be placed upon the free list.'"

Question *put*, and amendment to the amendment (Mr. Charlton) *negatived* on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messrs.

Anglin	Holton
Bain	Huntington
Béchar	Killam
Borden	King
Bourassa	LaRue
Burk	Laurier
Burpee (St. John)	Mackenzie
Burpee (Sunbury)	McIsaac
Cameron (S. Huron)	Malouin
Cartwright	Mills
Casey	Oliver
Casgrain	Olivier
Chandler	Paterson (S. Brant)
Charlton	Pickard
Christie	Rinfret
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Robertson (Shelburne)
Coupal	Rogers
Dumont	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Fiset	Rymal
Fleming	Scrivner
Galbraith	Skinner
Geoffrion	Snowball
Gillies	Thompson (Haldimand)
Gillmor	Trow
Gunn	Weldon
Guthrie	Yeo—53.
Haddow	

NAYS :

Messrs.

Allison	Cameron (N. Victoria)
Arkell	Caron
Baby	Cimon
Bannerman	Colby
Benoit	Connell
Bergeron	Costigan
Bolduc	Coughlin
Boulbee	Coursol
Bourbeau	Currier
Bowell	Cuthbert
Brecke	Daoust
Brooks	Dawson
Bunster	DeCosmos
Bunting	Desaulniers

Domville	McQuade
Dubuc	McRory
Dugas	Massue
Elliott	Méthot
Farrow	Mongenais
Ferguson	Montplaisir
Fitzsimmons	Mousseau
Fulton	Muttart
Gigault	Orton
Gill	Quimet
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Patterson (Essex)
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Perrault
Grandbois	Pinsonneault
Hackett	Platt
Haggart	Plumb
Hesson	Pope (Compton)
Hilliard	Richey
Hooper	Robinson
Houde	Robitaille
Hurteau	Rochester
Jackson	Ross (Dundas)
Jones	Rouleau
Kaulback	Routhier
Keeler	Ryan (Marquette)
Kilvert	Rykert
Kranz	Shaw
Landry	Sproule
Lane	Stephenson
Lantier	Strange
Little	Tassé
Longley [P. E. I.]	Tellier
Macdonald (King's)	Thompson (Cariboo)
Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)	Tilley
McDonald (C. Breton)	Tupper
McDonald (Pictou)	Valin
McDonald (Vict., N.S.)	Vallée
Macmillan	Wade
McCallum	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
McCuaig	Wallace (W. York)
McDougall	White (Cardwell)
McInnes	White (E. Hastings)
McKay	White (N. Renfrew)
McLennan	Williams
McLeod	Wright.—116.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved in amendment to the amendment :

"That the article under 'Breadstuffs,' viz: 'Cornmeal, forty cents per barrel,' be struck off, and transferred to the free list of imported goods."

Question *put*, and amendment to the amendment (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) *negatived* on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messrs.

Anglin	Casey
Bain	Casgrain
Béchar	Chandler
Borden	Charlton
Bourassa	Christie
Bourbeau	Cockburn (Muskoka)
Burk	Coupal
Burpee (St. John)	Dumont
Burpee (Sunbury)	Fiset
Cameron (S. Huron)	Fleming
Cartwright	Geoffrion

Gillies	Oliver
Gillmor	Oliver
Gunn	Paterson (S. Brant)
Guthrie	Perrault
Haddow	Pickard
Holton	Rinfret
Huntington	Robertson (Shelburne)
Kaulback	Rogers
Killam	Ross (W. Middlesex)
King	Rymal
LaRue	Scrifer
Laurier	Skinner
McDonald (Vict., N.S.)	Snowball
Mackenzie	Thompson (Haldim'nd)
McIsaac	Trow
Malouin	Weldon
Méthot	Yeo.—57.
Mills	

NAYS :

Messrs.

Allison	Jones
Arkell	Keeler
Baby	Kilvert
Bannerman	Kranz
Benoit	Landry
Bergeron	Lane
Bolduc	Lantier
Boulthée	Little
Bowell	Longley (P.E.I.)
Brecken	Macdonald (King's)
Brooks	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Bunster	McDonald (C. Breton)
Bunting	McDonald (Pictou)
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Macmillan
Caron	McCallum
Cimon	McCuaig
Colby	McDougall
Connell	McKay
Costigan	McLennan
Coughlin	McLeod
Coursol	McQuade
Currier	McRory
Cuthbert	Massue
Daoust	Mongenais
Dawson	Montplaisir
DeCosmos	Mousseau
Desaulniers	Muttart
Domville	Orton
Dubuc	Quimet
Dugas	Patterson (Essex)
Elliott	Pinsonneault
Farrow	Platt
Ferguson	Plumb
Fitzsimmons	Pope (Compton)
Fortin	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Fulton	Richey
Gigault	Robinson
Gill	Robitaille
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Rochester
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Ross (Dundas)
Grandbois	Rouleau
Hackett	Routhier
Haggart	Ryan (Marquette)
Hesson	Rykert
Hilliard	Shaw
Hooper	Sproule
Houde	Stephenson
Hurteau	Strange
Jackson	Tassé

Tellier	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Thompson (Cariboo)	Wallace (W. York)
Tilley	White (Cardwell)
Tupper	White (E. Hastings)
Valin	White (N. Renfrew)
Vallée	Williams
Wade	Wright.—112.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it would be exceedingly inconvenient, at this stage of the proceedings and at this stage of the Session, to go back into Committee of the Whole, and, therefore, he hoped the mover of the amendment (Mr. Houde) would not press it. If he understood it, it was that the Governor-General in Council might deal with the subject. That was reasonable in itself, and would be given effect to.

MR. HOUDE said he was glad to hear the declaration just made by the right hon. the Prime Minister that the principle of his motion was accepted by the Government, who, when occasion would occur, if it did, would see to realize his suggestion. He was satisfied of that important declaration, and would, therefore, withdraw his motion, so much more that he remarked his seconder had voted for another motion to amend it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, before the motion was withdrawn, he desired to congratulate the First Minister on his return to those humanitarian principles which he believed the right hon. gentleman had at the bottom of his heart. But these were not the principles on which the hon. gentleman conducted the late contest, when he was endeavouring to gain the votes of the farmers of Ontario. He held in his hand a report from the hon. gentleman's own organ, of a speech delivered by him in the Eastern Townships, in which he dealt with the very contingency of a scarcity or a failure of crops and the unfortunate consequences falling upon the unfortunate inhabitants of those parts of the country that could not raise grain enough for their own consumption, and this was what the hon. gentleman said :

"In Canada, however, if, by an unfavourable season, the crops are scanty, we are without such resources, and then the farmers of the United States pour in their produce upon us, and we are defenceless. You (the farmers), who, in an ungenial season, might get some recompense for scanty crops in the enhanced prices they would bring, find that hope gone

from you. Even the little harvest the storms have left you, you find valueless when the products of the Western States are poured into the markets of the Dominion. Shall we suffer in this way? Shall we not say, Canada is for the Canadians, and protect our markets for ourselves? Shall we not say, If we have a short crop, our own people shall consume it, and pay us a fair price for it; and, if we have a large crop, let us not only have our own markets, but the distant markets of Europe? Let us say to the United States, We allow you to send the products of your country into our market; let us have the same privilege, and send ours to your own."

He congratulated the hon. gentleman that, now he was in power and responsible for the well-being of the people of this country, the humanitarian instincts which he really believed were in the bottom of his heart had so far prevailed that, when there was an ungenial season, when the people were starving, and when, by any possibility, this 15c. could be of the least use to the farmer of Ontario, the hon. gentleman would be willing to repeal it. His consistency was not very great, but as it was in the great cause of humanity, he (Mr. Cartwright) could not find fault with him.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he accepted the congratulations of the hon. gentleman as to his humanitarian instincts, in the same spirit in which he had given them. He had no doubt that the hon. gentleman was gratified to see that he was not utterly lost and so hardened in heart as to allow the people to starve if he could help it. One of the planks in the Conservative platform was that the Government could do something to help the people. That was one of the objects with which they went to the country. They did not say it was out of the power of a Government, or out of the power of a Parliament, to help any industries. They did not say that the Government were merely "flies on the wheel," and that just as the fly was powerless to turn the wheel, so the Government was powerless to help the people.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: You are leeches.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had sucked the life-blood of the country. The hon. gentleman and his associates with him had depleted the body politic. The pale and

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

languid cheeks of the body politic, the uncertain step of the people of this country, as well as the depressed and dejected spirit shown by the leeches on the other side, in bleeding the country—all this testified to what a state the country was reduced. The Government hoped, by generous treatment, and by generous diet, to restore vigour to a country that had been weakened, depleted and driven almost to a state of despair by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman said the Government were humanitarians. Yes, they were humanitarians; and what was the principle of his hon. friend's motion? It was simply this: that, after every farmer in Canada had sold his wheat at a good price, and there was no more wheat left in the country, then they would allow the Americans to come in. That was the principle. Every bushel of wheat would be protected to the extent of 15c. per bushel, until the last Canadian bushel was taken out of the last Canadian granary, and after all the Canadian wheat had been made into Canadian flour, and consumed by the Canadian people, then, if there were a deficiency, the Government would come to the rescue. They would not be "flies on the wheel," they would not view with indifference the suffering people; they would do in Canada as England had done in India, when she had come to the rescue of a people who were deprived of ordinary food by any unfortunate contingency or adverse climatic influences. That was the principle of his hon. friend's motion; that was the principle which common sense, humanity and good government demanded. His hon. friend would find that the farmers of this country would understand it so, that they were protected to the extent of 15c. per bushel so long as they had wheat to sell, and when they had sold their last bushel, then they could not object that the American should send down his first bushel.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had often had occasion to admire the ingenuity with which the hon. gentleman could get himself out of a scrape, but the hon. gentleman had not got out of this scrape yet. The hon. gentleman said now that he only proposed in that speech that, when

we had eaten up all the wheat in the country, he would then take care that we should get it without paying duty. But what the hon. gentleman proposed in that speech was this: That he would take advantage of a scarce harvest, by preventing other wheat being brought in; that is, to raise the prices for those who had not enough to eat. That was the point. If the hon. gentleman's explanation now of what he meant then was true, what benefit would it be to any person in the country engaged in wheat raising, if, in a time of bad harvest, foreign wheat was allowed to come in to take the place of that which he had not to sell? There would be no rise of prices under such circumstances, and it was a rise in prices that the hon. gentleman wanted and promised. He wanted to make wheat, the staff of life, dear in time of scarcity. His speech would bear no other interpretation. He (Mr. Mackenzie) granted the hon. gentleman was safe in taking the ground that he was not in earnest, that he was simply making one of his famous political speeches to serve the purpose of the hour, and was now willing to turn his back upon himself to serve another purpose at this hour. It was amusing to witness the political tergiversations of the hon. gentleman from one day to another. The farmers would understand perfectly well that in the Eastern Townships' speech he promised that the farmer should obtain high prices in time of scarcity, and now he would find that he could not carry his own followers from Lower Canada with him for the principle contained in that speech. They would perfectly understand that he was willing to abandon the position he took in the Eastern Townships, and if he had gone back on the position now, it was in order to meet the political exigencies which had arisen in the House to-night.

MR. ORTON said that, having taken some interest in the question of agriculture, he desired to express, to-night, his thorough accord with the sentiments uttered by the Premier. The principle for which the Premier had always contended for, was to give to our farmers the first choice of their own market, but not to starve those in our country who consumed the products of agricultural

labour. He believed there was not a farmer in the country who desired that Government should, in a period of extreme scarcity, insist upon having that duty still imposed. When that question was raised in his county, he had stated that he believed such would be the policy of the Government, as he knew the Premier was in sympathy with the people, and that the Government would, in time of scarcity, give a rebate of duty in order to relieve the consumers. He congratulated the Premier upon the noble sentiments he had uttered here to-night.

MR. ANGLIN said the speech of the hon. Premier was amusing in many respects. On that (the Opposition) side of the House they enjoyed it immensely; on the other side of the House, though it had provoked the laughter of hon. members, when they came to reflect upon its meaning, and on what the hon. gentleman from Centre Huron had read, the feeling must become painful. Although it was intensely amusing in its way, it seemed to him a most painful spectacle to see the Premier of this country make such an exhibition as this in the House of Commons of Canada. If he had squarely retreated from the position taken in that speech he made in the Eastern Townships, it would have been creditable to him, personally, whatever charge of inconsistency might otherwise be made against him. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman would have felt that, in taking that course, he had taken the only proper course for a Prime Minister of this country to adopt. But, after stating that the Government would be prepared to give effect to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Maskinongé, finding what the effect of that declaration was upon his own side of the House, he seemed to have lost—he (Mr. Anglin) would not call it the cunning—but the skill which had distinguished him on so many occasions, and he then proceeded to make the very extraordinary statement, which must have astonished even his warmest admirers—a statement that the proclamation reducing or removing the duty on wheat would not be issued until the farmers of Canada had sold all the grain they had to sell, at the very highest prices that could be obtained. In this way they would have all the advantages

of famine prices, and the consuming public must suffer in the meantime, nay, almost starve, until all the wheat in the country was consumed, and then, forsooth, wheat would be admitted from foreign countries duty free. Was ever so monstrous, so shocking a statement made by any man holding a responsible position? And yet there were found hon. gentlemen in this House ready to applaud and endorse this declaration of their leader, which the hon. gentleman who spoke last declared to be so creditable to the head and heart of the Premier. With regard to the proposition itself, it was exceedingly objectionable in its essence—objectionable because it would place in the hands of the Government of this country a power that no Government should be permitted to wield. They knew that when corn laws existed in England, and a sliding scale was introduced, by which the rate of duty was made to correspond with the price of corn, so that as the price advanced the duty was lowered; and when prices reached a certain figure, the duty was extinguished—not by the will of the Government, but by force of the Statute itself. In any scheme of that kind in our country, a similar sliding scale would be preferable to conferring arbitrary power upon the Government, which, it was fair to assume, some Government might possibly abuse under particular circumstances.

MR. CASEY said that, when he remarked in the general debate on the tariff that the promises of the Government of protection to the farmers were illusive, he had no anticipation that his words would receive such speedy proof at the hands of the Premier himself. Everybody in Ontario was perfectly well aware that the proposition made to the farmers was, that when there was a scarcity, the price of wheat would be raised by the operation of the duty, thus recouping the farmer for short crops, and that was the proposition they had voted for; and now the hon. the Premier declared that, at the very moment that protection began to operate in favour of the farmer, that protection was to be taken away by Order in Council. The only proof of scarcity would be an increase in price. The proposition now made was, therefore, that as

soon as the price of wheat began to rise, protection was to be knocked off, and the price of wheat left to be regulated by competition, as it was before. This was the very reverse of the proposition made to the farmers of Ontario, and showed that the promises of the Government were, as the Opposition anticipated, merely illusory.

MR. MACMILLAN said that the statement of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) regarding the promises made by the Government, was without foundation in fact. The Government had appealed to the people of Ontario on the grounds of Protection, and as far as it had been promised to the people of this country, he thought that every hon. member opposite would agree with him, that the hon. Premier and his colleagues had carried out their promises to the very letter. With regard to his own constituency and other constituencies adjoining, though it might not apply to every constituency in the Dominion, he would remark that there were times when it was announced in the newspapers that a certain price could be obtained for grain, and farmers came into the market towns expecting to realize the prices they had seen quoted in the papers. But, in the meantime, operators in grain discovered that, by sending to Chicago, grain could be got, say, 5c. a bushel cheaper, and they immediately brought on a train-load or so; and by the time the farmers got to town with their grain, they found the market broken down by grain brought in from foreign markets. What was the result? Simply that the farmer had to take four or five cents a bushel less than he expected, or else return home with his grain. In either case they were injured very materially by this competition. He believed that the duty proposed would be very beneficial to the farmer in this respect, that it would prevent these operators from breaking down the markets at any time they saw fit. The hon. member for Gloucester seemed delighted and astonished at the various turns that this debate had taken. He (Mr. Macmillan) was extremely astounded at that hon. gentleman being astonished at anything, after occupying the questionable position he did in this House upon occasions not

MR. ANGLIN.

very long gone by. The hon. gentleman should not forget that, not many years ago, he occupied a position in this House after the House had declared upon the evidence of the then Premier, and of the then Minister of Justice, that he had no right to that position. He contended that the promises made by the present Administration had been carried out to the letter, as was evidenced by the satisfaction with which these resolutions had been received in all parts of the country.

MR. MILLS said he supposed that this was a part of that paternal system of Government that Canada was to have in the future. A few days ago they had an Act relating to contagious diseases amongst cattle, and he presumed this resolution to be an Act for the prevention of famine throughout the country. As yet there was no indication that the country was going to be made prosperous by Act of Parliament. Hon. gentlemen would find that when wheat got scarce, the farmers would not be disposed to sell, and a system of compulsion would be necessary. The Government would also find it necessary to impose a fine on those farmers who would not report to them the quantity of grain they had on hand, in order that they might know what the resources of the country were, and what the country had to depend upon. They would find it necessary to go a step further and become themselves the purchasers, and establish Government depôts, in which the wheat might be stored, in order that the Government might know whether there would be a surplus or not. This would be necessary to enable them to fix the price at what they, and the farmers, too, considered a good figure; otherwise they would be unable to determine whether the reduction in the tax should be made by Order in Council or not. It was perfectly clear that this paternal system, once begun, would entail an enormous amount of administrative labour. The proposition of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) was a very extraordinary one. Seriously, how was the Government to determine whether or not there was a scarcity or superabundance of wheat in the country? How was it to decide how much reduction should be made? If

hon. gentlemen would look at British legislation during the period when the sliding scale was in force in England, they would find that the Administration had the power to make a reduction just in proportion as the price of wheat increased. It was by the market price of the article that the Administration had to be guided in their action. This proposition would give the Government the power of repealing this tax. It was an arbitrary discretion, which, if sanctioned, placed the power of taxation in the hands of the advisers of the Crown. In the case of a failure of crops in certain districts, the Government of the day could utilise this power to induce the people there or elsewhere to support them. This was a power which he (Mr. Mills) was not disposed to leave in the hands of any Government. He thought the proper function of this House was to restrain this tendency to legislate by Order in Council.

Amendment (Mr. Houde), with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

Item *agreed to*.

On item—Wheat flour, 50c. per barrel,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said this was an item that would require some explanation. The apparent result of this duty of 50c. a barrel on flour, and 15 per cent. a bushel on wheat, would be to throw the grinding of these articles into American hands, which was clearly contrary to the hon. gentleman's apparent intentions. It appeared to him that this duty was against the manufacturers of wheat flour.

MR. TILLEY said he found that during the last year, there were 314,520 barrels of wheat flour imported, against 479,245 exported, and a duty of 50c. per barrel had been imposed on it. The estimated revenue from that and from wheat altogether, was about \$30,000. It was very probable that, under the operation of the present tariff, there might be some periods, under peculiar circumstances, when it was just possible in some portions of the Dominion,—for instance British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces,—flour would be imported from the United States, but the opinion enter-

tained by the Government on this point was that there would be little or no flour imported from the United States under this duty. But, from the fact that we had a surplus of both wheat and flour, the estimate of the Government was that that duty would secure, beyond doubt, the market of the Dominion for the products of the Dominion, as far as wheat and flour were concerned. Therefore, it was supposed \$30,000 would be the outside revenue received from it. It was not expected to materially increase the value, although it might do so to the extent of 10c. a bushel, or so.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, in the event of there being a scarcity of wheat in the Dominion, this tariff would discriminate against the Canadian miller. In making a law of this kind, the hon. gentleman ought to provide for such a contingency.

MR. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman knew well that there had been but one year, during a long period, in which there had been a deficiency in Canada. This was not likely to occur again, when they looked at the increasing population of the North-West. He was satisfied there was no probability of a deficiency under any circumstances whatever. Of course, facilities would be given for the manufacture of wheat for export, as was done in 1871, so that foreign wheat could be brought in and manufactured in bond, and shipped from the country in bond. They desired to have the market of the Dominion for the wheat-growers and for the manufacturers.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : That is what you do not do by putting 15c. a bushel on wheat and 50c. a barrel on flour. You give the preference clearly and distinctly to the American manufacturer.

MR. TILLEY : It certainly secures a market for the producers of the Dominion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : That is certainly what it does not do.

MR. GUTHRIE said that, in years of scarcity, flour would be imported, not wheat. He would like to ask the Finance Minister whether any promise had

MR. TILLEY.

been made to reduce or alter the duties on wheat and flour. He had heard it stated that, in answer to the millers, the hon. the Finance Minister had said he would reduce the duty on wheat after the Ontario elections were over.

MR. TILLEY : I decline to answer any such question. I could do so most emphatically.

MR. GUTHRIE : If my hon. friend could do it, I should think he would.

MR. TILLEY : I can deny it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : It is a most insulting question, and does not, on account of its nature, demand an answer.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had characterised the question as an insulting one, and yet he had avowed his purpose of altering these duties by Order in Council. His hon. friend asked if a certain promise had been made, which had formed the ground of a rumour all over the country. One thing was certain, a number of millers came here grumbling and went away satisfied. How could the question of his hon. friend be insulting, when the hon. the First Minister had said it was their deliberate intention to reduce these duties by an Order in Council.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had asked whether a specific promise had been made to millers, other than the proposition submitted to Parliament. The Government was responsible for the proposition made to Parliament, and that answer ought to be accepted as an answer to any such remarks. The question of the hon. gentleman, therefore, was : " Did you make a promise to act at variance, in some way or other, to the proposition you make in Parliament ? "

MR. MACKENZIE : Did not the hon. gentleman claim, a few moments ago that he had the right to do this without an Act of Parliament ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The hon. gentleman knows the clause of the Customs Act I referred to. He passed it and is responsible for it.

MR. GUTHRIE said he merely wished to obtain a denial of the rumour from the hon. the Finance Minister.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Hon. gentlemen opposite, in the first place, get up a rumour and then ask if it is correct.

MR. GUTHRIE : That I may characterise as entirely incorrect. It was one of the right hon. gentleman's own political friends that first gave the information.

Several HON. GENTLEMEN : Name.

MR. GUTHRIE : I have no authority to give his name. I, however, am prepared to give his name privately to the right hon. the leader of the Government.

MR. CHRISTIE said he felt it his duty not to allow the tariff, and especially the specific duty upon breadstuffs, to pass with a silent vote, without saying a few words to record his protest against the injustice which was done to the agricultural and working classes in the Province of Quebec ; for he was fully convinced that the adoption of this policy would be disastrous to the interests of the whole Dominion, and doubly so to the Province of Quebec, and the county which he had the honour to represent. It would impose additional burdens upon them without any compensating advantages. It would cause them to pay more for every article they required, while the protection offered them on breadstuffs and live stock was only a delusion and a sham. His constituents depended in a great measure upon stock and dairy farming. They found it more profitable to make butter and cheese, and raise cattle, sheep, and horses, and grow coarse grains, than to grow wheat and corn. They did not grow enough of these grains for their own consumption. They required to import upwards of a million of bushels of wheat, and an equal quantity of corn annually ; and in his county they imported upwards of ten thousand barrels of flour, and a large quantity of corn. Now, to impose a duty of 15c. per bushel upon wheat, and 50c. per barrel upon flour, and 7½c. upon corn, was the most unwise and suicidal policy which could be adopted. It meant a tax of six or eight thousand dollars annually

to his constituents on these articles alone, and that under the guise and pretext of Protection to the farmer. That was the boon which was held out to them as an equivalent for the increased duties imposed by the tariff, and the increased prices which would inevitably have to be paid for cottons, woollens, groceries and hardware. It was like lighting a candle at both ends—taxing, on the one hand, all manufactured goods ; and, to balance that, taxing, on the other hand, wheat and flour, which most of the people had to buy. It was quite evident that the interests of the farmers and working classes in the Province of Quebec had been sacrificed. They would be heavily taxed ; millions of dollars would be filched from their pockets, not for the purposes of revenue—of that he would not complain—but for the purpose of bolstering up other industries from which they would derive very little benefit. He desired to record his protest against the great injustice done his constituents by the imposition of these enormous duties under the new tariff.

MR. CAMERON said the duty on flour ought either to be raised to 67c. a barrel, or the duty on wheat ought to be reduced to 10c. a bushel. He could not see how the two proposed duties could be reconciled.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said that, under this tariff, the duty on wheat would be inoperative. It took 4½ bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : No ; four bushels and five pounds.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said that would be 62½c., or a discrimination of 12½c. against the miller. He maintained that this duty would not increase the price of wheat, except in a year of scarcity, and it was a knowledge of this fact that satisfied the millers. This tariff, however, necessitated a bonding system, and that would enhance the rates of transportation, which must come out of the farmers' pocket, and if over-production was to lower prices, the farmer and the manufacturer would have to take lower prices than the present. There was only one way of protecting the farmer, that was by giving him a direct

bonus or a drawback on his products. Why should not the farmer receive that protection, if they desired to benefit him? He should have a drawback on the Indian corn used for feeding his cattle for the English market, and on his agricultural implements, on the same principle as the shipbuilder received a drawback on vessels sold abroad. Over-production would bring down prices, and Protection produced that, according to the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. HILLIARD said that, as he was a miller himself, he approved of the duty of 15c. on wheat, which was quite consistent with the duty of 50c. per barrel on flour. The duty on wheat would keep out of the Canadian market lower grades of American wheat, which displaced so much of the better qualities of the Canadian wheat. This country had been overstocked with inferior grades of American flour. They (the Americans) made three grades of flour, the high grade, suitable only to their own market, and out of which they did a profitable business. The lower grades could then be sold in Canada. If they made no profit on the lower the profit on the higher maintained the business. They had not stood, therefore, on a fair footing with the Americans. The 15c. duty on wheat would keep their second quality out of Canada and secure its markets for its own farmers. It was Protection to the farmer to prevent Canadians from being driven to a foreign market, a fluctuating market, with their wheat, a market up to-day and down to-morrow, being open to wheat from the whole world. The American duty, 20 per cent. on flour, gave the American miller an advantage over the Canadian miller, the Canadian millers having no market of their own for the extra class of flour, owing to the shutting of the American market against them. There was no inducement to procure an extra good quality of machinery. The Canadian miller was obliged to confine himself to the grade of flour this market demanded. The Government would be wise in adopting a 15c. duty on wheat. It was said it took four and a-half bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour. With fair wheat and fair machinery their mills could make a barrel of flour from

MR. PATTERSON.

every four bushels and five pounds; and having the offal free of duty, he considered 15c. a bushel on American wheat quite consistent, and equal to 50c. a barrel on flour.

MR. VALLÉE moved in amendment:

"That it is not expedient, in the public interest, to impose a tax of 50c. a barrel upon wheat flour, imported into this country, and that that article should be placed upon the list of commodities imported into Canada free of duty."

He said that in moving this motion he was fulfilling a promise made to his electors, and he believed that he was acting in the interest of the county he represented and of the district to which he belonged. The importation of flour into the Province of Quebec was very considerable. It was not only an article of local consumption, but it likewise constituted an important export trade. The National Policy should not suppress everything at one stroke. In certain respects, this policy should be applied by degrees during the period required for the establishment of new industries; regard must be had for certain classes. In his county, little wheat was produced, and there was a class of persons who earned their livelihood by navigation. A duty on flour would bear very heavily on his constituents. The men engaged in navigation would be deprived of a part of their transport trade without any equivalent compensation. He would be answered that it was necessary to make sacrifices in the general interest. He was ready to admit the principle if it were logically and impartially applied. Quebec's share of sacrifices in favour of the Dominion was a little larger than it was necessary it should be. If the concession he asked for in favour of his Province, and his county were granted, he would be able to show that it would be but a simple act of justice to Quebec, and that the interests of the other Provinces would not suffer in the least. But he would leave to hon. members the appreciation of his motion, and of their duty towards their electors. He did not wish to make any appeal nor claim any sympathy for the vast interests he was defending. The question had been exhaustively examined by all the members of the House, and every one had, no doubt, long since made up his mind.

MR. CASGRAIN said that he opposed this duty of 50c. per barrel on flour in the name of his county in particular, and in the name of the Province of Quebec in general. It was well known that in the Province of Quebec the yield of wheat had been very small for a number of years, and that in consequence thereof the importation of wheat and flour into that Province had become an absolute necessity, and this duty would bear especially on the poor man's family. That was why he opposed this duty with all his strength, being certain of the support of all the French-Canadians in the Province of Quebec. The putting on of a duty on flour, and thereby on bread, was certainly going to take away from the poor man a part of his sustenance, and his ordinary food; that was to say, that he would have to give to the State his tenth or twelfth loaf, according to the price of flour. In stating this, he but echoed public sentiment from one end to the other of the Province of Quebec, that repudiates this unjust taxation. He said that his voice would find an echo from the sources of the Ottawa to the shores of Gaspé, and in the humble thatched-roofed cottage as well as on board the fisherman's boat in the Gulf. He made this statement, and time would tell that he was right. It had been said that this duty of 50c. would not increase the price of flour. He had satisfied himself, a few days ago, that the merchants in the county of L'Islet had raised the price of flour 50c. per barrel. The Province of Quebec had to support, without any equivalent, the duty on wheat and flour in favour of the Upper Province, and the duty on coal in favour of the Lower Provinces. That was what was called Protection.

MR. LARUE said that he was not surprised to see the hon. member for Portneuf take such a determined stand with regard to this question, nor was he astonished at the support that was given him by several of his friends, who, like the hon. member for Portneuf, had been elected by the Conservative party in order to favour the establishment in this country of a Protective tariff. The stand taken by the hon. member for Portneuf clearly demonstrated that it would be difficult for the Conservative

party of the other Provinces to agree with the same party in the Province of Quebec. As had been justly said by the hon. member for L'Islet, this was a vital question for the Province of Quebec, and all the French-Canadian members knew to what an extent this question interested their constituents. He well understood why the hon. member for Portneuf felt himself obliged to separate from the hon. leader of the Government on this question of a duty on flour. It had already been remarked that the partisans of Protection had been, even during the late general elections, unfaithful to the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. He was inclined to believe that the hon. member for Portneuf had made the same promises to his constituents as the candidate who opposed him (Mr. LaRue) had made in the county that he had the honour of representing. That was to say that, while he proclaimed himself the champion of Protection, he solemnly bound himself, in every parish of the county, to resist any attempt to raise the duty on flour. He thought it his duty, in his own interest, and in the interest of the Liberal party, to which he belonged, to state that the amendment that had just been presented by the hon. member for Portneuf, had been taken from the Liberal party, he would even venture to say, with the permission of his hon. friend, that it had been. For the hon. member for L'Islet, had already risen to propose a similar amendment, which he had the honour of seconding, but he had not been able to move it because another member had got the floor before he had. It was, therefore, only by accident that the hon. member for Portneuf had taken the initiative in this matter. But it must not be supposed that the Liberals were vexed at seeing the friends of the hon. the Premier take the lead, and move motions of want of confidence in the Government. That was a formal proof of the justice of the Liberal cause, and the confirmation of the words and acts of the Liberal party during the late election. Upon the details of the tariff, as well as upon the tariff as a whole, he took pleasure in voting against the Government, so much the more so as all these questions had been thoroughly discussed before the electors of the county of

Bellechasse, that he had the honour of representing, and he had been elected by a majority opposed to the protection that was now being given to the country. Let not the hon. the Prime Minister be astonished at the desertion of his soldiers of the Province of Quebec; he would have several other opportunities of seeing them vote against his policy, for it was unfavourable to the interests of the Province of Quebec. He did not wish to take up any longer the time of this House, and he would conclude by warning the hon. the leader of the Conservative party that there still existed independent men in the Province of Quebec, and that these men would ever be ready to protest and rise up against his measures as often as they were opposed to the dearest interests of their Province.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could sympathise with his friends who had just spoken in French, and with the member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), who had spoken for his party. He was sorry that the action of the Government should make Quebec suffer so much; the people were going to be taxed on their flour and bread, the staff of life. But if the hon. gentlemen opposite had consulted their leader, the hon. member for Lambton, he would have told them that, no matter what the duty on wheat or flour, it would not increase the price. It was evident that those gentlemen did not coincide with their political or financial leader (Mr. Cartwright), but had struck out a new course of their own. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) could give them some little consolation, and a remedy for all the great evil they feared—that was, to use no American flour, paying 50c. a barrel, but eat Canadian flour, on which there was no tax.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. the Premier had promised the millers and farmers protection, and the Ministers of Public Works and Finance, in their respective Provinces, stated that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had proved conclusively, and, therefore, to their satisfaction, that the duty on flour would not increase its price to the non-producers. Notwithstanding that those hon. gentlemen and their leader now wanted the people of the West—who were interested in the manufacture of flour—that the price

would be increased for them by the duty put on foreign flour. Either they believed it or did not. If they believed it, then they were honest in putting the duty on to increase the price of flour for those who produced it, and if it did so it must increase the price for those who consumed it. His opinion had nothing to do in the matter. He still held the opinion he formerly expressed, but he said also that, while that was the case on the general line of travel and freight, through the country, it would increase the prices more where the markets required to be supplied from other sources—that was chiefly on the eastern coasts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. He was glad to hear the hon. the Finance Minister was compelled to advance his views two nights ago, although he had passed, to-night, another item which would compel the people on those same coasts to purchase tea at Montreal, that they were now allowed to purchase in Boston or New York. His hon. friends from Quebec—where the people were obliged to purchase their flour, not growing enough wheat—believed the duty would raise the prices, as did also the millers. The Government, in submitting the tariff must, if honest, have acted on their own convictions and belief, and not those of anybody else, and the duties must express their real convictions.

MR. GIGAULT said he did not want to go back to his constituents without having fulfilled the promise he made them in regard to Protection, and, to do so, a general system of Protection must be adopted. He wanted to be practical, and if such amendments were made by the members from one section, those from others would demand amendments agreeable to them, and so, at last, they would have nothing of that Protective tariff for which they had fought. The opponents of the tariff did not agree among themselves as to the nature and effects of the duties. He believed that the greater part, if not the whole, of the duty on flour would be paid by the American producer, and not by the Canadian consumer. They argued that part of the duty on wheat would not be paid by the American producer, being thus in contradiction with their own principles when they sent the Hon. George Brown

to Washington to secure a Reciprocity Treaty. If the duty on Canadian grain going to the States was not injurious to the Canadian producer, why did they try to obtain its removal? This tariff aimed at securing the home market for Canadian farm produce. If members from Quebec opposed the duty on wheat, members from Ontario might resist those on corn, barley and coal, to the defeat of the Protective party voted for in September last. The amount of duties taken off breadstuffs would have to be placed on other articles, such as tea, molasses, and other goods we did not produce, duties that we pay at a pure loss without drawing any advantage therefrom, while duties for foreign articles that we can produce or manufacture here, give the double advantage of giving a revenue to the country, and the choice to the Canadian producer of selling his products with more facility, or at more remunerative prices.

MR. HOUDE said that, since the hon. members for Portneuf, L'Islet and Bellechasse had seen fit to speak in the name of the Province of Quebec, and to declare that all the representatives of that Province who were devoted to its interests should vote for the motion of the hon. member for Portneuf, he thought it his duty, seeing that he was going to vote against this motion, to briefly explain his reasons for so doing. He trusted that his friends would believe that he was as sincere as they were in the different course he proposed to take. For his part, he did not question their sincerity, although he did not hold the same opinions as they did on this point. The hon. member for Portneuf, in giving the grounds for his motion, had stated that the Province of Quebec was obliged to purchase large quantities of wheat and flour because there was not enough of these articles produced for local consumption. That was true; but the Province of Ontario, together with the rest of the Dominion, produced a great deal more than the whole country could consume, and, in reality, there would be no duty on wheat and flour. And, if he had well understood the second part of the argument made use of by his hon. friend, he had said that the Province of Quebec exported considerable quantities of flour

and wheat that were brought into the country from the Western States of the neighbouring Republic, and that, if the proposed duty was put on, this export trade would be stopped. The hon. member seemed not to have read, or to have forgotten, that clause of the new tariff which clearly left to traders the same liberty as they had heretofore enjoyed of importing wheat in bond without paying one cent of duty, and of exporting it either as it had been brought in or turned into flour. It was quite true that, in the Province of Quebec, there was not enough wheat grown for local consumption; but it was not true, as the hon. member for Lambton had stated, that there was none grown there at all. On the contrary, especially within the last few years since the disappearance of the weevil, which for a long time had done much harm to the whole crop, there were considerable quantities of wheat grown in the Province of Quebec. There were even a great many farmers who grew more than they required for home consumption, and who sold more or less of this grain. It was to be hoped that this progress would not stay there. But whilst he would admit that the Province of Quebec did not yet grow wheat in sufficient quantity, it must be borne in mind that it did not cost any more to bring the wheat and flour that was needed from the Province of Ontario than it did to import it from Michigan or Minnesota. He saw by the returns of commerce and navigation for the last fiscal year, that Canada had sold to other countries 2,967,432 bushels of wheat, and 170,725 barrels of flour, which was equivalent to 3,693,013 bushels more than was bought. With such a production, equal to a surplus of six bushels for each family throughout the Dominion, was an import duty of 50c. a barrel on American wheat going necessarily to make the Canadian people pay dearer for their bread? Evidently not. Hon. members of the left had said, ironically, "hear! hear!" when his hon. friend the member for Rouville had maintained that, in certain cases, it was the foreign producer who paid the Customs duties. If they had taken the pains of reflecting a moment, and of studying the laws that really govern trade, they would have

known that it was not always the consumer who paid the import duties established by the Government of the country in which he lived. Import duties were paid by the consumer when the foreign article upon which a duty was laid was not produced in the country. But when there was a surplus of the article in the home market, the foreign exporter who wished to come there and sell the same article, was obliged to submit to the prices established by home competition, and, in that case, it was he and not the consumer who paid the Customs duties. When the difference between the offer and the demand—between the stock and the requirements—varied, it might happen that the producer and the consumer would both have to pay a part of the Customs duties. But with regard to the import duty on foreign wheat and flour, he maintained that it would not raise the price of bread in this country as long as there was a considerable surplus of this grain in Canada, as there was at the present time, and as there probably would be in the future; and he was happy to be able to agree, at least on this point, with the hon. the leader of the Opposition. As the hon. member for Rouville had remarked, hon. members should judge of the merits of this new tariff as a whole, and not endeavour to pick it to pieces in detail, under pretext of protecting local interests. For instance, if hon. members from Ontario refused protection on oats, would anything be gained by that? Most assuredly not. The country at large would lose as much by impoverishing the Province of Quebec as it would lose by impoverishing the Province of Ontario. The Province of Quebec, instead of buying her flour from the United States, would buy it from the Province of Ontario, who, in turn, would purchase from the Province of Quebec the oats that she had hitherto imported from the United States; these neither would pay any duty, as there was a surplus in Canada of these two articles, as well as all other agricultural produce, except Indian corn. Already this advantageous exchange had begun. For instance, he read in the *Daily Evening Review*, of Peterborough, Ontario, of the 15th inst. :

"In consequence of the National Policy, Cluxton has already brought two loads of oats

MR. HOUDE.

from Lower Canada to Peterborough, and Mr. Dundas is doing the same thing at Lindsay. Since the duty has been imposed, oats can be laid down in Peterborough cheaper from Quebec than from Chicago, thus enhancing the value of Ontario oats, increasing the demand for Quebec oats, and providing return freight, a very important thing for our railways."

The hon. members for Portneuf, L'Islet, and Bellechasse had said that it was against the interests of the country to vote for an impost duty on wheat and flour, because the consumer would have to pay for these necessaries of life dearer. The price of these articles might rise, but it would be on account of their scarcity on the foreign markets, especially the Liverpool market, and not on account of the adoption of this tariff, for wheat and flour would be subject to the same fluctuations if this tariff was not adopted. The new tariff had been in force for more than a month, and the price of wheat, which, as everyone knew, determined the price of flour and bread, was, to-day, lower at Montreal and at Toronto than at New York and at Boston. This would show that his friends, of whom he had just spoken, had grounded their assertions upon a theory that was neither supported nor justified by facts. He held in his hand this morning's issue of a paper that published, in its commercial review, the prices of wheat at New York and Toronto, and he found that the same quality of ordinary spring wheat was selling, the day previous, 8c. per bushel cheaper at Toronto than at New York. That was far from showing that the new tariff would cause a rise of 15c. per bushel in wheat, as well as a rise in flour and bread, for the reason already given, that the production of these articles greatly exceeded the wants of the country. These facts were the best answer that could be given to the theory maintained by the hon. members for Portneuf, L'Islet and Bellechasse. But, even supposing that a part of the population of Lower Canada had to pay a little more for their wheat and flour, on account of the new tariff, they would not complain, for they would find a compensation in the protection given to the industries of the country, and to the other agricultural products, such as animals, butter, cheese, oats, barley, pease, etc. He could understand the action taken by the hon. members for L'Islet and Belle-

chasse, because their aim was to destroy the Protective tariff if they could; but he had more difficulty in understanding the action of the hon. member for Portneuf, who, like all the other hon. members of the right, was elected on a Protectionist platform, and who now refused to grant protection to one of the main products of Canada. What would happen if the Conservative members of each section of the country adopted the same line of conduct, and refused protection to articles that were not produced in their respective localities, but were produced in other parts of the country? They would be destroying their own work; they would not be carrying out the policy with which they had gone before the people, and with which they had won the general elections on the 17th September last. For those reasons he could not approve of the proposition made by his hon. friend from Pontneuf, which motion, although it might seem, at first sight, to favour the interests of the people, had, in reality, a tendency to strike at the foundations of the National Policy, which was destined to give bread to many families who were, to-day, in need, by giving them the means of earning the price of it more easily.

MR. PLUMB said he fully endorsed the remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Rouville, who had effectively replied to those gentlemen on the opposite side who insisted that the producer paid the duty. That hon. gentlemen asked why the great chief of the party now in Opposition wrote to Washington to obtain a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1874, and why he offered to make such sacrifices to obtain reciprocity in agricultural products. It was the avowed object of all the negotiations which took place at Washington, from the time of Lord Elgin until the last futile attempt was made by the gentleman who was the dictator of the party, was to procure the admission of our natural products into the United States free of duty. The Hon. Mr. Brown, who had denounced the sending of commissioners by the previous Government, on the same errand, either was appointed, or appointed himself, sole plenipotentiary, and hurried to Washington in the autumn of 1874. There had been no indications

on the part of the people of Canada that this mission was in accordance with their wishes. On the contrary, he, himself, had very violently objected to the initiative being taken by Canada in any attempt at renewing the lapsed treaty. What did that gentleman do? In the first place, he proposed reciprocity in agricultural products. Not being able to secure that, he made one concession after another, until the loss of revenue to this country in the articles he proposed to receive free of duty would have reached \$2,300,000 for the year 1874, and these articles would have come into direct and probably crushing competition with our manufactures of cotton, of edge tools, and of agricultural machinery and implements. Basing the calculations on the exports for that year, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, he also offered to expend, immediately, large sums in building and enlarging our canals, to give up the fishery claim, and to concede the free navigation of our rivers and canals. For what did he make these reckless offers? Was it not to relieve our farmers, who he took under his special care, from the heavy duties levied by the United States upon the products which we exported to that country? Now, if, as gentlemen opposite constantly assert, the consumer always pays the duty, why did Mr. Brown offer to make such enormous, such humiliating concessions for the purpose of obtaining access to a market which, according to the Free-trade dogma, we have already at the cost of the consumer? The member for Bothwell constantly repeats that the consumer pays the 15c. a bushel on barley, the 20c. a bushel on wheat, the 15c. a bushel on potatoes, the 10c. a bushel on oats, the 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on horses, that must be paid upon crossing the frontier to seek our neighbour's market. He (Mr. Plumb) would not like to be placed in the position in which the friends of that great Reformer, who had offered to the United States everything except our nationality to secure reciprocity, had placed him. He was surprised to find what little confidence hon. gentlemen opposite had in the intelligence of the people, and how much less confidence the people had in them. For the last twenty-five years the *Globe*, the chief organ of those gentlemen, had

almost the sole circulation among the agricultural population of Ontario. He fancied the agricultural population had found out the *Globe* newspaper at last. It could not control public opinion. The people had supported, and would support, the party that promised little and performed much, rather than the self-styled Reformers, who promised everything and did nothing.

Mr. VALIN said that he had resolved not to take any part in this discussion on the duty upon flour, but he could not refrain from alluding to the fact, that the conduct of the hon. member for Portneuf was in contradiction with the opinion expressed by his journal, *Le Courrier du Canada*. He must state that a great many persons in the Province of Quebec were not in favour of this duty on flour. He would be opposed to it himself if there were no compensation. But the farmers in the agricultural counties had a compensation in the duty on other grains, such as peas, buckwheat, barley, etc. All that he wanted was to give the working classes the means of buying bread. He was one of those who endeavoured to give the people the means of paying for their bread. He was one of those who tried to give the people work, not only in his own county, but throughout the whole Province. He had their interests at heart, and he deplored their present destitute condition. For the workingman it was no trifle to pay a duty of 50c. per barrel on flour when he had already to buy his flour from five to six dollars a barrel. For the mechanic without work, two dollars were too much; means of earning his bread must, therefore, be given him. He would now quote what the *Courrier du Canada*, of the 14th inst., had said on the subject:

"Since the adoption of the tariff a new era has been commenced for Canada. In the Province of Ontario the effect has been instantaneous; many new industries have sprung up as by enchantment. The same may be said of the district of Montreal. At Quebec the progress is slower. Too much attention is paid to blue and red, and not enough to serious matters. Now is the time to profit by the advantages that the National Policy offers instead of wasting our time discussing two or three items of the tariff that are less favorable to us than others.

"We hope that our farmers, who are now protected against American competition, will improve their land in order to grow wheat.

MR. PLUMB.

We have rye, barley and oats in abundance; we do not harvest quite enough wheat. However, in this respect, there has been a great improvement within the last few years, and we would not be surprised to see by the next Census that the Province of Quebec grows more wheat than is required for local consumption. It is important that our agricultural classes should neglect nothing, in order to increase their own wealth and the general prosperity of the country.

"With a little good will, intelligent labour, and wise, prudent economy, the farmer can increase his harvest and procure at home all the necessaries of life. Let him buy less from the merchant, the shopkeeper, and let him apply to the production on his own farm of all that he requires, and he will soon be on the road to comfort, competency, and sometimes to fortune."

If, on the 14th, which was not so very far off, it was well to protect the farmer by putting a duty on wheat and flour, he could not see why it should be otherwise to-day. It was true that the hon. member for Portneuf had voted against the duty on wheat, but a moment afterwards he had voted against placing wheat on the free list. *Le Courrier* went on to say:

"The workingman is going to see the employment and the good wages of former times come back. Let us hope that the destitution that has been enduring, will have taught him to economise during the years of plenty, in order not to be in need during the years of want.

"Those we believe are useful observations that everyone may put to account. Let the people go earnestly to work, and let everyone, without wasting his time criticising at random a policy destined to bring about a revolution in the economy of the country, turn this policy to the best advantage he can.

"Commerce itself is organising on a new basis. The repeal of the present Insolvency Act will put an end to unhealthy speculation, protect the honest merchant, and indirectly favour the purchaser. Business will be conducted with more prudence and economy; a solid, lasting, and prosperous state of things will result therefrom.

"Thus equilibrium will be restored everywhere, and the disastrous effects of the crises that we have been undergoing will rapidly disappear.

"We have a rich country, if we only know how to profit by the advantages it offers us.

"It is for all of us, farmers, workingmen, merchants, manufacturers, etc., to take wise and energetic resolutions, to go to work and to practise economy and, in a few years, the face of the country will be changed. Instead of an impoverished population, as we have to-day, the people of Canada will then be rich and prosperous."

He would ask what was dearth if it was not the want of bread! For the workingman, need was the want of work, for when he had no work he was always in need. It was therefore necessary to give the workingman employment, and this could be done by protecting the industries of the country. How could the Government procure employment for the workingman if they had no revenue? This revenue could not be obtained without laying duties upon all products that came from abroad, including wheat and flour. Quebec would be very glad to see the works that the Government intended carrying out in the harbour begin, but how could the Government carry on these works without money? If the workingmen have employment, that will be their compensation for the proposed duty on wheat and flour, and, instead of complaining, they would rejoice.

MR. LANDRY said that it was impossible for him to give a silent vote upon the motion now before the Chair. The House had witnessed the great joy that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. LaRue) had not been able to contain. What had been the cause of this sudden and almost noisy manifestation? The hon. member made no secret of it; it was, he said, the spectacle offered to him by several members belonging to the Conservative party, who were deserting their flag and betraying their leader. He protested against this appreciation of the conduct of these members and of the motives that actuated them. They were not betraying either their party or their leaders, and that was what he would endeavour to show. What had been heard a few moments previous? The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) had told the House that, in voting against the amendment of the hon. member for Portneuf, and in favour of the proposed duty on flour, he was only doing his duty and fulfilling the promises that he had made to the electors of his county. This frank statement had brought down the applause of the House. He would not for a moment doubt but that the same approbation would be given him when he would tell the House that, in voting for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Portneuf, he was only doing his duty and fulfilling the promises

he had publicly given to the electors of his county. When he had presented himself as a candidate in the county of Montmagny at the late general elections, when he had discussed before the people this great National Policy of Protection, the question of putting a duty on wheat and flour had naturally presented itself for a solution. He would not seek to hide the statements he had then made. He had promised, before public meetings, that if ever he was asked to place a duty on wheat and flour, he would vote against the putting on of such a duty. He had not taken this determined stand with the intention of striking at the foundation of the National Policy, for which he had fought, and which he was still defending. Such had never been his intention, nor that of his friends; to make use of an expression employed by the hon. member for Maskinongé, they were not such sappers as that. But what was the stand they had taken? They had advocated Protection during the election, and their opponents had answered them by saying that by Protection the Conservatives meant an increased duty on the necessaries of life, on the flour, the wheat, the bread of the people. And in support of this statement, they referred to the motion made on the 2nd of April, last year, by Mr. Brown, and the position taken by the leader of the Conservative party, who, on the 9th of April, supported the views of Mr. Brown, and voted for this motion, which aimed at nothing less than the putting on of a duty on wheat and flour. He would quote:

"Mr. Brown moved in amendment, That all the words after 'that,' to the end of the motion be struck out and replaced by the following:—That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That, seeing that a large quantity of wheat and flour has been imported into Canada within the last five years, this House is of opinion that the placing of a duty on these articles would be beneficial to the farmers of Canada."

The answer that he and his friends had given was easy. They had pointed out to the people, in the journals of the House, what had been the position taken on this question by the representatives of the Province of Quebec, by the leaders of the Conservative party, inside and outside of the House. These votes were still there. Only twenty-eight members had asked for this duty. One hundred

and forty-eight had rejected it. Among the twenty-eight who had asked for this duty, there could not be found a single representative of the Province of Quebec, and only two of the hon. members now occupying the Treasury benches. All the representatives of the Province of Quebec, without distinction of party, and what was more, those who were then and now the leaders of the Conservative party, had publicly, by a unanimous vote, declared in the most formal and solemn manner, that they were opposed to placing any duty on wheat and flour. What, he would ask, had they (Mr. Landry, and his friends) done? They had followed in the footsteps of those who had gone before them. Having before their eyes the action taken by their leaders, they had not thought it impossible to promise to their electors that they would follow the course pursued by these friends of the people, and imprudently, perhaps, but at all events, in the best of good faith, they had sincerely given their word to vote against the duty that they were now asked to place upon flour. Should they now keep their word and fulfil the promises freely made to the electors of their counties? For his part there was no possibility of a doubt, and whatever might be the regret that he experienced in separating from his friends he considered that under the circumstances, he was in honour bound to do so. He would, therefore, vote for the amendment and against the placing of a duty on flour, as he had voted a few moments before against the placing of a duty on wheat. He remarked that two of the friends of those who were opposed to this duty had taken upon themselves to shoot harmless arrows at their (Mr. Landry and his friends' heads. If they (Mr. Landry and his friends) had not been wounded, they should not, at least, overlook the fact that their assailants had been actuated with the best of intentions. The hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) had called the motion they were supporting a "hollow theory," and a "measure that struck at the very foundation of the great National Policy." In the mouth of the hon. member these words were somewhat astonishing. Within the space of a few hours only, his conduct and his words presented the spectacle of the most com-

MR. LANDRY.

plete disagreement. Who had been the first in the House to move an amendment to the policy of the Government? Who had been the first in the House to move an amendment to the policy of the Government since the details of this policy were under consideration? Why, it was the hon. member for Maskinongé himself. Was not his amendment, if not a "hollow theory," at least a "measure that struck at the very foundations of the great National Policy?" He asked for fair play, and, since the member for Maskinongé had seen fit to attack the policy of the Government, by the amendment that he had moved, he ought to allow others to fulfil in the House the promises they had made to their electors, and he ought also to remember that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Valin) had also endeavoured to find the hon. member for Portneuf at fault. By what means? He had merely read a few extracts from the *Courrier du Canada*. That was the stone he had thrown, and it was needless to say that it had not wounded anybody. The hon. member for Montmorency had forgotten two things: first, to prove that the hon. member for Portneuf was the author of the articles in question; and, in the second place, that these same articles could in no way be applied to the question now before the House. As a matter of fact, these articles mentioned only wheat. That question was settled, and they said nothing of flour, a question yet to be settled. A little more attention would certainly have prevented the hon. member for Montmorency from shooting such harmless arrows at his friends. Such proceedings were not calculated to convince hon. members that they should trample their promises under foot. He would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Portneuf and against the placing of a duty on flour.

MR. DUGAS said the National Policy operated in a manner which tended not only to increase the revenue of the country, but also to foster our manufacturing, mining and agricultural interests. It was the duty of a wise Government, when the country was on the verge of ruin and starvation, to legislate so as to

alleviate the sufferings of the people, and relieve the distress under which the country laboured. This fact was pointed out to the ex-Minister of Finance by the Prime Minister of the day, but his opinion was that, as the general elections were soon to take place, it should be left to the people to decide whether the adoption of a Protective policy would be favourable to the interests of the country. How was it that these gentlemen, after having left the question to the decision of the people, should make factious opposition to the Government, which, in their wisdom, had taken means to relieve the condition of the country. As the hon. the ex-Prime Minister stated the other day, he was speaking of the country, which he wanted to render averse to the adoption of this policy. It was well known that those hon. gentlemen who now opposed this tariff, had, on many occasions previously, declared themselves in favour of Protection. The hon. the ex-Prime Minister had, on a certain occasion, expressed himself in public in favour of Protection. The ex-Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Laurier), in a speech in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, of which he was then a member, declared himself in favour of Protection, and stated it was the only remedy for the distress which prevailed throughout the country; and how was it when that gentleman had been chosen a leader of the country, he did not apply that remedy? The great nations of Europe, such as France, England and Germany, owed their riches and prosperity to the adoption of this system of Protection; and why should we, a young country that needed protection, as a child in the cradle needed the protection of its mother, not adopt this new fiscal policy which had made other countries so prosperous? We had a precedent in our own country. In 1859, the tariff was raised from 15 to 25 per cent. What was the result? Notwithstanding the prediction of the Liberal party, who pretended that the revenue of the country would decrease in proportion to the increase of the tariff, the increase of the revenue was over one and a half million dollars. He was sorry that certain hon. members from Quebec, belonging to the Conservative party, had, through a spirit of egotism, thought fit to submit amendments to the

tariff so ably framed by the Minister of Finance. The hon. members of this House had not been elected to protect only the rights of the Province of Quebec, but the rights of the whole Dominion. The hon. the Minister of Finance, in framing this new tariff, had protected the rights and interests of every Province, and mutual concession must be made in order to adopt this policy. He declared himself in favour of this policy which, he believed, commended itself to the approbation of hon. members of this House and of the majority of the people.

MR. FORTIN said he could not give a silent vote on this amendment. If the price of flour would be increased by the National Policy, the county of Gaspé would be one of the greatest sufferers of any county in the Dominion, but he did not believe it would have this effect. He would not go over the arguments that had been so ably brought forward by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault). Why, asked that hon. gentleman, did the Liberal party send an ambassador to the United States to offer the greatest concessions that could be given, including not only the right to American fishermen to fish in our waters, but the fishery award as well, amounting to five and a-half million dollars, in order to induce the United States Government to abolish, among other duties on Canadian produce, the duty on wheat and grain from Canada? If our farmers suffered so much by that duty, then the American farmers would lose by this new tariff on the grain and flour they sent to Canada. The duty would fall upon them, and the price of wheat or flour would not be raised in Canada on account of that duty. He (Mr. Fortin) adopted the National Policy in its entirety. He had always been in favour of Protection, for not only one industry, but for every industry. For the last five years, under the policy of the late Government, they had seen poverty everywhere, in the country and in the towns. Formerly, the fishermen of Gaspé and Bonaventure, and the other parts of the Province of Quebec, could find a ready market in Quebec; from 50 to 100 vessels came up annually with fish and oil, which they readily sold in Quebec and in Montreal, and brought

back goods and provisions for the winter, while, last year, but a dozen or so of vessels came, because they knew they had no longer a market there for their fish and oil, as there was no work or industries carried on, and money was consequently scarce. The people of Quebec and Montreal were poverty-stricken, and the result was that the people along the Maritime coast suffered equally. He (Mr. Fortin) would vote against the amendment, and he had voted before in the same way. He was in favour of Protection to the fishermen and mariners. He had asked from the Government Protection for these two important classes, and could not, consequently, refuse Protection to the operative, manufacturing, and agricultural classes. He would give his vote in a spirit of justice and equity. He would vote in favour of the tariff that would give justice, and help every class of society. If the policy of the late Government when they sent an ambassador to the United States, had been successful, what would have been the result? We would have been short of five and a-half million dollars, the amount of the fishery award, the loss of which would fall principally upon our fishermen, as he expected the Government would apply this amount, or at least the interest, to repair the damage and injury caused by the use of our fisheries by the Americans. The maritime population would not blame him for supporting a policy which would protect their interests and give them a market. Everybody knew the fishermen of the Province of Quebec had two markets, the foreign and the home market. The products of the spring and summer fishing were sold to foreign countries, while those of the fall fishery were sold in this country, principally at Quebec and Montreal. He was proud to say that the fish produce of Canada, especially the fish of the coast of Gaspé, was sent all over the world, nearly—to Italy, Spain, Portugal, Brazil, the West Indies, etc., and the products of those countries brought back in return. In speaking to these fishermen he (Mr. Fortin) asked them how they could expect to get good markets for their fish in Canada, if the other industries were allowed to run down as they had during the last few years. The answer he

MR. FORTIN.

received to this appeal to the electors of Gaspé, last year, was his election by a majority of 800. This showed that they approved of his way of thinking and acting on these matters. In shaping a policy for this country, they ought to follow the examples given them by the most enlightened nations on the globe in commercial and monetary matters. They should follow the example of England, France, Germany and many other nations. The policy of England was Free-trade for the last twenty or thirty years, because it was, under these circumstances, the greatest measure of Protection they could have for their manufactures. Previous to that, England had adopted a Protective policy for centuries, and under it had been enabled to accumulate more wealth than any other country in the world, and large amounts of money found investment at two and three per cent. interest. They became the manufacturers for the whole world. Then it was that England had adopted Free-trade, and it was one of the greatest measures of Protection that her statesmen could have invented for her. During the last few years other nations, through the international exhibitions, had found out that they could manufacture as well as England, and had closed their markets against her. What was the result of Protection in the United States? None but a prejudiced person would say that there was any other nation in the world that had enriched itself so rapidly as the United States, during the last five or six years, under a system of Protection. He would have great pleasure in voting for the policy of the Government, because it was one which he believed would make the country rich and prosperous.

MR. COSTIGAN pointed out that it was necessary to keep the tariff intact if the advantages of Protection were not to be lost altogether. In that belief he would support the duty as proposed.

MR. CARON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Ten minutes after

One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 21st April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CORRECTION.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he desired to correct an error in the report of some observations made by him on the 20th March, which appeared in the official report of the debates at page 602, and to which his attention had only been called this morning by a letter from Mr. Carmichael, to whom the report referred. The report read: "In 1874 he was approached by Mr. Carmichael, and was told that if he would vote for him he would retain his office." What he (Mr. McDonald) said was, that he was approached by a political friend or agent of Mr. Carmichael.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Keeler.)

FIRST READING.

MR. KEELER introduced a Bill (No. 84) To repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act and the Acts amending the same. He said he introduced this Bill on the score of economy. He thought we were governed a great deal too much in Canada, and that we could do very well without this Supreme Court. He considered it was established, in the first place, without proper reasons. He did not believe that the country required or wished for any such Court. He thought it was throwing away \$50,000 a year of the people's money; and having come here, pledged to his constituents to vote for economy and retrenchment, he had, with that view, introduced that Bill. It might be a bold thing for a member of his standing to introduce such a measure, but he thought he was justified, and that the people of Canada had the same view, that this Court was entirely unnecessary and useless. He believed we had better Courts in each of our Provinces, carrying more weight in their decisions than the Supreme Court which had been established

in Ottawa. He saw by the Public Accounts that last year the Supreme Court cost \$57,332, and that in that Court there were two Judges from Ontario, two from the Maritime Provinces, and two from the Province of Quebec. It was his opinion, from what he had heard, that the decisions given there were simply the decisions of two Judges in every case. In Quebec there were four or five Judges in the Court of Appeal, and in Ontario they had a Court of Error and Appeal, composed of one Chief Justice and three Judges. He believed the decisions of those Judges were much more reliable than those of the Judges who really ruled the Supreme Court here. He was not well acquainted with the state of things in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but he presumed the same thing applied there. He would not like to go so far as to say that this Court was established to make a refuge for political friends of hon. gentlemen, but he thought the salaries of the Judges were very excessive. There was a Chief Justice at \$8,000, and five Judges at \$7,000 a year each, which he believed corresponded with the salaries of the Ministers of the Dominion. It seemed to him that these gentlemen had very little to do for their money, and that the money of the people was being wasted. He hoped the gentlemen of the long robe in the House would not oppose this measure on the ground of class interests. The country people believed that we were lawyer-ridden. He did not say that we were, but it appeared to his constituents, who were agricultural people generally, that they were multiplying the Courts to too great an extent, and that because they had a large proportion of the gentlemen in this House who belonged to the profession of the law, he could not bring himself to believe that hon. members who belonged to that profession, would, on that account, forget their duty to the people. He hoped they would look upon this as members representing the interests of the country, and would see that this Court was an excrescence which might be very well cut off.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he took it for granted that his hon. friends behind him were amusing themselves by the proposition laid before the House;

therefore, he would not take it seriously, and he would scarcely be treating the House with justice, if he supposed that it would treat this question with seriousness. He hoped the Bill would be withdrawn.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was glad it was a supporter of the Minister of Justice who had taken this method to play practical jokes upon the House. The hon. member had said the Court was wholly unnecessary.

MR. KEELER said the people of Ontario and Quebec believed that the Act was introduced in order to provide comfortable places for the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends.

MR. MACKENZIE said there were six Judges, and only one was a friend of his.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there were friends of the hon. gentleman's friends there. The greatest reasons must be given before this tribunal could be abolished. He had been a party, as the hon. gentlemen opposite knew, to pressing the consideration of a Supreme Court Act for several Sessions.

MR. MACKENZIE : Six times.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they had not, however, been so strong, perhaps, as his hon. friend was afterwards. The Court was now established and was a recognised tribunal, and being so it must be sustained until it was proved decidedly that it was against the interests of the country that it should be continued. Although there might be some objections to the Court as being premature and expensive, yet it was one of the recognised tribunals of the country, and a good deal of the legislation in the Provinces had been passed on the supposition that there was such a Court. They must, therefore, support it, and give it all the countenance that Parliament could give it, until it was shown by the experience of a good many years that it was not for the interests of the country that it should not be maintained. However, his hon. friend's Bill would be duly considered.

MR. McDONALD.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought that not only was the Court a necessity in a general sense, but it was a necessary complement to our system of self-government in this country. He believed it was necessary for the Government of the country, and if it were only for the settlement of the disputes on the Intercolonial Railway, and other similar disputes, making, as it did, an independent tribunal, before which the Government and their contractors, and claimants could appear, it had rendered enough service to justify its establishment; while he was quite willing that all our legal cases should go to the Privy Council, he thought it desirable that there should be a Canadian tribunal of the highest character, to which our people would appeal, and he had no doubt it had rendered great service. He was not so capable of speaking about it as legal gentlemen, or, perhaps, the mover of this Bill, who spoke with a tone of authority, as if he had studied everything connected with the matter. It might as well be proposed to bring in a Bill to repeal the Act of Union, or something of that kind. One would be quite as unreasonable as the other. They had measures before Parliament which made use of the Supreme Court, and it was unreasonable to introduce this measure in this thoughtless and absurd fashion.

MR. HAGGART said that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, only spoke the feelings of a great portion of the people of Ontario in explaining it. There was a strong feeling in the community against the multiplying of the Courts, and it was being expressed in almost every portion of the country. The Supreme Court was regarded as entirely useless, while at the same time a great cost to Canada. Although he rose only to defend the conduct of the hon. gentleman in introducing that measure, he was against the abolition of a Court, when once established, in the manner proposed. This Court had been established, and the Judges had been appointed, and he knew of no way in which they could be got rid of, unless by giving them pensions for life, to the full extent of their salaries. But it was only giving voice to the strong feeling of the people to say

that the multiplying of Courts was proceeding to an extent that the people would not submit to, and especially believing, as they did, that the Supreme Court was established when there was no necessity for it.

Mr. MILLS said it seemed to him that the hon. the First Minister should have sustained the position taken by the Minister of Justice, who regarded the proposition as a joke. He (Mr. Mills) could see no difference between a proposition to abolish this Parliament and one to do away with the Supreme Court charged with the final interpretation of its laws. Without that Court what would be done in the case of conflicts between the other Courts? The Courts of Ontario might construe a Statute of Canada in one way, and the Courts of any of the other Provinces in a different way. With a tribunal like the Supreme Court at Ottawa they had provisions for securing uniformity. It decided finally as to the proper construction of the laws of Canada. It would be very unfortunate to have different interpretations of the Statutes and of the authority of the Dominion in the different Provinces, without any means of a final decision. Besides, litigants would be obliged to have recourse to the Privy Council, which they would find five times as expensive as proceedings before the Supreme Court; that Council knew but little of the practical working of the Constitution. He thought that this Court was highly necessary, and that the first Minister ought not to have encouraged this Bill or sanctioned the first step.

Mr. DESJARDINS said he believed it his duty to say a word with regard to the assertion made by the hon. member for Lambton, who had stated that the population throughout the whole country was satisfied with the working of the Supreme Court. He was not aware what was the feeling on this subject in the Province of Ontario, but he knew perfectly well that there existed in the Province of Quebec, and not without cause, a strong dislike to this tribunal, and more particularly to its jurisdiction as a Court of Appeal from the judgments rendered by the the Civil Courts. It would be easy for the House to understand the

cause of this dislike when it was borne in mind that whilst no one could sit as a Judge in the Superior Court, or in the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Quebec, without having first followed a course of law, and practised as a lawyer during at least ten years for this tribunal of last resort, and which was called upon to confirm or reverse the decisions of Quebec Judges, four out of the six Judges were chosen from the other Provinces, without being previously obliged to study the Civil Laws of the Province of Quebec. He would not deny that the hon. leader of the Opposition was right in stating that this Court had been useful to the Government on certain occasions, but this had in no way contributed to enhance the prestige of the Court in the minds of the people. Public opinion in the Province of Quebec was far from being disposed to accept the establishment of this tribunal, which had been prematurely forced upon the country. Under these circumstances, and on account of the complaints that were also made in other Provinces, he believed that the Bill now introduced should be read a first time, and that every facility should be given for a frank and free expression of opinion when this Bill would come up for the third reading.

Bill read the first time.

Mr. KEELER moved that the Bill be read the second time to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved in amendment, that the Bill be read the second time this day three months. He said that gentlemen who voted in favour of the second reading, and against the proposal to postpone it for three months, would be declaring that the Court ought to be abolished, and if the hon. the Premier accepted the logic of the vote for the second reading, he would give facilities for the passing of the Bill of the member for East Northumberland this Session.

Question put, and amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) *negatived* on the following division:—

YEAS :
Messrs.

Anglin
Borden
Brown

Burk
Burpee (St. John)
Burpee (Sunbury)

Cameron (S. Huron)	King	Plumb	Tassé
Cartwright	McDonald (Vict. N. S.)	Pope (Queen's, P. E.I.)	Thompson (Cariboo)
Casgrain	McDonell	Poupore	Tilley
Chandler;	Mackenzie	Richey	Tupper
Charlton	McIsaac	Rinfret	Valin
Christie	Malouin	Robinson	Vallée
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Mills	Rouleau	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Cockburn (Northbld)	Oliver	Routhier	Wallace (W. York)
Fleming	Paterson (S. Brant)	Ryan (Marquette)	White (Cardwell)
Flynn	Pickard	Rykert	White (Renfrew)
Galbraith	Robertson (Shelburne)	Shaw	Williams
Geoffrion	Rogers	Strange	Wright.—120.
Gillies	Ross (W. Middlesex)		
Gillmor	Rymal		
Gunn	Skinner		
Guthrie	Smith (Westmoreland)		
Holton	Thompson (Haldim'nd)		
Huntington	Trow		
Killam	Weldon.—44.		

NAYS :

Messrs.

Allison	Grandbois
Arkell	Hackett
Baby	Haggart
Bannerman	Hay
Béchar	Hesson
Benoit	Hilliard
Bergeron	Hooper
Bergin	Houde
Bill	Hurteau
Bolduc	Ives
Boultbee	Jackson
Bourassa	Kaulback
Bourbeau	Keeler
Bowell	Kilvert
Brecken	Kranz
Brooks	Landry
Bunster	Lane
Bunting	Lantier
Cameron (N. Victoria)	LaRue
Caron	Little
Cimon	Longley [P.E.I.]
Colby	Macdonald (Kings')
Connell	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Costigan	McDonald (C. Breton)
Coughlin	McDonald (Pictou)
Coupal	Macmillan
Coursol	McCallum
Currier	McCarthy
Cuthbert	McCuaig
Daoust	McInnes
Dawson	McKay
DeCosmos	McLeod
Desaulniers	McQuade
Desjardins	McRory
Dewdney	Massue
Doull	Merner
Drew	Méthot
Dubuc	Mongenais
Dugas	Montplaisir
Dumont	Mousseau
Elliott	Muttart
Fiset	Olivier
Fortin	Orton
Fulton	Ouimet
Gigault	Patterson (Essex)
Gill	Perrault
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Pinsonneault
Girouard (Kent)	Platt

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. HOLTON said no doubt the hon. gentlemen on his side, who had joined with some hon. gentlemen opposite—including the Minister of Justice and the First Minister—in this vote, had done so because they were sincerely desirous to see the Supreme Court abolished. That was the logic of their vote, and of the vote of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was perceptible to everybody that, if the motion for the second reading had gone on the Order-paper, it would never have been reached this year. It was infinitely more honest to declare at once, either that this Bill was to prevail, or that the Court was to be maintained and that the Bill should not stand upon the Order-paper. Nothing could be more calculated to demoralise that Court than that this Bill should be placed on the Order-paper for a second reading with the assent of the leader of the Government, with an overwhelming vote in this House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. member for Lambton had challenged his logic; he thought it was better than his rhetoric. The hon. gentlemen opposite had received a just punishment for their want of courtesy to the hon. member who had introduced this Bill. His request that the measure should be laid before Parliament, and discussed, might have been granted to an old member of Parliament. The House having given permission to lay the Bill before it, the next proceeding was a mere matter of course—that it might be set down for a second reading on a future day, when its principle could be discussed. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was very much amused at seeing that the hon. member for Lambton, like many another engineer, had been hoisted by his own petard. They saw the galleon of the commander of the Opposition floating in to fight that of the member for East Northumberland—to

crush his Bill out—the Opposition torpedoes exploding behind them—but the consequence was that that hon. gentleman had got the largest vote of the Session. The concession of little courtesies did no harm. Every hon. gentleman was a representative of the people, possessing certain rights, such as was claimed by this hon. gentleman. He had been allowed, by vote of the House, to introduce his Bill, but had it accepted the invitation of the hon. member for Lambton, would not have permitted its discussion. The principle of a Bill being discussed on its second reading, it was clearly a matter of course to allow it to reach that stage. The Opposition to that appeared factious. The hon. gentleman said his course was a very honest one—much more honest than that of the Government. Their course was simply an act of courtesy, while that of hon. gentlemen opposite was an act of discourtesy to an old and respected member.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that he did not admit that the hon. Premier was right. The hon. gentleman who had introduced the Bill had had an opportunity of discussing and explaining it, which he did. The hon. Minister of Justice then rose and declared he looked on the matter as a joke, and his leader declared that it would be improper to destroy a great established institution of the country until the gravest reasons for its abolition were given. He (Mr. Mackenzie) believed that the very mootng of the matter would be an injury to the Court, and that the second reading of such a Bill was calculated seriously to damage it. There was no party interest to gain by proposing the amendment, which was intended to prevent what he considered a mischievous proceeding. The hon. Premier believed that also, but in spite of his own declaration and that of the Minister of Justice, he and all his supporters voted deliberately on the principle of the Bill that the Supreme Court should be abolished. The hon. gentleman knew that Bills were not always allowed to go to a second reading. He thought he could find cases of the Premier's preventing such progress himself. Probably he (Mr. Mackenzie) would be able to show that he was in that, as he was in

many other cases, rather inaccurate in many of his statements.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I acknowledge I am not, like my hon. friend, infallible.

MR. MACKENZIE said of course not, but the hon. gentleman would be practically infallible if they were to accept his declaration always. He stated that second readings were never prevented, but he knew they were occasionally. When a Bill like the present, which, it was felt, ought not to pass to a second reading, or to be entertained, and could not be amended, so as to dispose of any part of its object, it was frequently disposed of at once; acting upon that well-known principle, he had moved the three months' hoist. The hon. gentleman opposite had accepted the responsibility of defending the principle of the Bill, and of the intention to proceed with it by the vote given.

MR. TUPPER said he only rose to protest against the doctrine laid down by the leader of the Opposition—that to give any member the opportunity of having his Bill discussed, was tantamount to the adoption of its principle. He thought that its acceptance would place a great many hon. gentlemen in a very false position. The practice of the House was uniformly to deal with the principle of the Bills in the second reading. He did not believe that any member on the Ministerial side was in the slightest degree committed to the principle of the Bill, by either voting for its first reading or for its subsequent consideration. He should be very much surprised if the hon. leader of the Opposition adduced a single instance, wherein it was decided that the voting for a first reading of a Bill prevented a member opposing its second reading. The friends of the Supreme Court had no ground of complaint against any member for this afternoon's proceedings but the hon. gentleman from Lambton. The only blow struck at that Court had been by the motion of the hon. gentleman. Why? Because every hon. gentleman knew that every hon. member who had voted against the three months' hoist—against an open, palpable act of discourtesy, such as was rarely witnessed—had simply voted that the member for East Northumberland

should receive the same courtesy as was extended to every hon. gentleman opposite, who wished to introduce any measure. The only indications of hostility to this Court, except those, no doubt, honestly manifested by the mover of this Bill, had been evoked by the discourtesy shown him by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentlemen who had opposed the amendment had been compelled by that unnecessary and unusual motion, either to express their own opinions, or vote as they had done in relation to it; and if that Court, and the House had any reason to complain of the position in which it stood to-day, it was due to the unusual course and tactics of the leader of the Opposition, which, designed to embarrass hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side, had but embarrassed himself and his own party.

MR. MILLS said he did not subscribe to the doctrine of the Minister of Public Works, because he (Mr. Mills) held that the House had a right to express its opinion on every measure, and at every stage of a measure. He would like to know how they could have avoided voting on the proposition that the Bill be read a second time on Tuesday next. If no vote had been taken the unanimous consent of the House must have been assumed; that was a well settled rule. He was opposed to the Bill, and did not admit that it could be amended in any way that would make it acceptable to him. Therefore, it was his right to vote against it. That view was supported by May. How had hon. gentlemen in Opposition exhibited discourtesy to the mover of the Bill? Was it by voting against a measure that they believed was wholly bad? By voting in favour of the motion of the member for East Northumberland, hon. gentlemen opposite had favoured the abolition of the Supreme Court, which was a great political institution, and a necessary part of our system of civil government; and the hon. gentlemen, in supporting a Bill for its abolition, which had but this object, and aimed at nothing else, had declared their hostility to the Court. It was established three years ago with the consent of hon. gentlemen opposite. They took no exception to it. It was true there were hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec

who were opposed to the constitution of this Court, but the hon. the First Minister and his supporters from Ontario and the Maritime Provinces were in favour of it, and deemed it a necessary tribunal for the purpose of giving a uniform construction to the laws of Canada. No more offensive, no more mischievous measure could have been introduced. No more damaging vote could have been given against the Supreme Court than the one just recorded. The hon. gentlemen opposite, in doing what they called an act of courtesy to one of their supporters, had done an act of great discourtesy to a very important institution in this country.

MR. MCCARTHY said he was not astonished at the warmth which the hon. gentlemen opposite displayed on this question. The establishment of this Court was one of those acts upon which they were wont to plume themselves as an evidence of the reforming tendencies of the late Administration. The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, had done nothing more than express, in its introduction, the feeling which was entertained, not merely in the Province of Ontario, but still more largely in the Province of Quebec, with respect to the necessity for its abolition. It was absurd for anyone to say that an hon. member of this House had not a right to bring a motion to introduce a Bill of this character, and have it discussed in the ordinary way. Unfortunately for the hon. gentleman opposite, he had only shown how unpopular his Court was, which had been established during his time. This was evident from the fact that, while many hon. gentlemen on this side voted, not on the principle of the Bill, but simply that it should go to a second reading in the ordinary way, many hon. gentlemen opposite voted against the motion of their leader, because they dared not vote otherwise, and go back to their constituents. It was plain the Court had not answered the purpose for which it was intended. It cost this country a very large amount. The only reason given by the hon. member for Bothwell for its existence was, that the law, by its means, might be expounded similarly in Nova Scotia as it was in Ontario or New

MR. TUPPER.

Brunswick. We were paying dearly for the uniformity which suited the philosophical mind of the hon. member. No constitutional question had ever yet been settled in this Court, and he believed that if it was question now of establishing a Supreme Court, we would hesitate in voting for its establishment, after the experience we had of the working of that Court. In saying that he did not wish it to be understood he was going to vote for the abolition of that Court; it was impossible to do that, but not to have the matter discussed on the second reading, and the objections against it duly considered.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he utterly repudiated the idea that this, or any question from the Chair, was to be treated as a question of personal courtesy to a member of the House. Every question put from the Chair, was one that should be answered honestly and truly by those by whom that question ought to be answered. It was quite true, as a general rule, when any motion was made to introduce a Bill, the motion passed without question; but if any hon. member thought proper to rise and put the question, that the Bill should not then be entertained, that it should be read a second time at some future date, that question, like every other, must be answered by the House in the ordinary way, by a vote, yea or nay. He believed that this Bill should not pass, and he opposed it at this first stage; and he denied that a question of personal courtesy entered into his vote. The Supreme Court was, in a great measure, interwoven with the administration of justice throughout the Dominion. His hon. friend who had just spoken (Mr. McCarthy) introduced his Election Bill the other day, and throughout that Bill, in all its clauses, there was reference to the Supreme Court. That Court was now the Appellate Court to try all the elections of members of this House, and to say that they were to entertain a Bill to repeal the Act constituting that Court, upon the motion of a private member, and when they had the honest expression of the Minister of Justice that the Bill was treated by him in a jocular sense, was taking an extreme view. He had voted in accordance with

his conviction that it was wrong to entertain a motion, at this early period, to abolish a Court which had performed efficient service to the State. His hon. friend had stated that no constitutional question had been determined by the Court. There was not a sitting of that Court in which grave constitutional questions had not been discussed and disposed of for good; and its efficiency should not have been attacked in this way through a motion brought in apparently without the sanction or assent of the Government, and certainly without the assent or support of hon. members who were members of the legal profession. It was wrong to say this question should be treated in any other way than upon its own merits, or that the plea of courtesy to a member should shield it from an honest answer by the House.

MR. KEELER said it was his opinion that if the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) were to ask the people who sent him here, whether they wished to see the Supreme Court continue to exist, they would reply emphatically, no; and that hon. gentleman would hear of that when he went back to his constituents. He believed that all those hon. gentlemen who represented the true feeling of the people, were in favour of the abolition of this Court. The people in his (Mr. Keeler's) constituency were very much disgusted with this Court. They considered that the Court of Queen's Bench in Ontario was a better Court, and its decisions were far more respected than those of the Supreme Court. He had heard of a case from Quebec, a short time ago, in which an hon. gentleman, who sat in this House, had brought a case before the Superior Court of Quebec, where it was decided by four Judges; and, on appealing to the Supreme Court, the two Judges in that Court reversed the decision of the four Judges at Quebec. That was enough to show the utter uselessness of the Supreme Court.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he regretted extremely the character of the discussion that had arisen on the first reading of this Bill. The hon. the leader of the Opposition, with his hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn), argued that it was desirable to

reject the first reading, because the acceptance of the Bill for the first reading might reflect upon the Court. In the first place, he did not think that was the case. He did not at all retract the opinion he had expressed when the Bill was offered to the House by his hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Keeler), an opinion which indicated that it was a pity it was introduced, and that at this period of the Session it certainly could not hope to become law. So far as he was individually concerned, he would endeavour to resist its becoming law, because he could not entertain the opinion, with reference to the Supreme Court, which he had heard during this discussion. Considering the period during which it had existed, the character of the work done and the character of the men who composed it, he believed it was gradually, and surely, working its way into public confidence, and he still further believed it was essential to the interests of the country, and must be sustained; still, he was quite well aware, and regretted to have become aware, during this discussion, that that was not the opinion universally entertained. He knew, for the first time, that there appeared to be a contrary feeling in some sections of the country, but that feeling which apparently prevailed was one reason why this Bill should be read a first time, so as to give an opportunity to members of this House to give expression to their views on this subject. It was far better for the Court and for the public interest, that latent feelings of dissatisfaction, which appeared to exist, should find expression, and that remedies, if any were required, should be applied, than that the dissatisfaction should be allowed to prevail. He was, therefore, pleased that the Bill had been read the first time, and that, on its second reading, an opportunity would be given to members to express their opinions with reference to the constitution of the Court, its character and position in the country, and enable the Government to apply a remedy, if one were found necessary.

MR. HUNTINGTON said everyone would be delighted with the remarks of the Minister of Justice, so far as he had been kind enough to express the opinion that the Supreme Court was a respectable

body. He was sorry, however, the hon. gentleman did not go further and express his regret that there was an appearance of partisanship in the attacks made at different times on the Supreme Court. If the principle was to be laid down, while we were trying to govern this country by two parties, that a Court which had been created while the one party administered affairs must be attacked by the other when they succeeded to power, that there was nothing sacred against these attacks, then they must adopt the principle that was suggested in a previous debate, indicating that, when a new party was in power, they must have new Courts. The attacks made upon the Supreme Court here and outside had apparently been made on account of political leanings. This was not the first time the Supreme Court had been attacked, but never before had anything so coarse or offensive been uttered against it as had fallen from the lips of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Keeler), who denounced the Supreme Court as an inferior tribunal, and cast insinuations upon the Judges. Meanwhile, the Premier sat quietly listening to it all, and, in fact, encouraged the hon. member for East Northumberland in his attack.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In what way?

MR. HUNTINGTON: By declaring that the hon. member who attacked that Court in the manner he did should have courtesy extended to him, that a great element in the Constitution of this country should not be so much considered as the courtesy to a partisan, when he outstepped the bounds of propriety to such an extent that it was necessary for the Speaker to rule him out of order, and, while the hon. the Premier was encouraging the hon. gentleman, the Speaker was compelled to interfere to stop the discourteous remarks of the hon. gentleman who promoted the Bill. If this Parliament was to be worthy of the position it occupied, if this Government was to be worthy of the position it occupied, then such a Court as this should be treated with respect in this House, and the Minister of Justice, the Prime Minister, or any other member of this House, could not, consistently with their dignity

MR. McDONALD.

and sense of duty, allow the Supreme Court to be attacked as it had been by the hon. member for East Northumberland. There should be some regard for decency.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Hear, hear.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was delighted if he had made an impression on the right hon. gentleman. There should be some subject so sacred in this country that the Prime Minister, even for the purpose of pleasing his partisans, would not hear it unjustly denounced. The Supreme Court was not the only institution which the right hon. gentleman had thus allowed, this Session, for partisan purposes, to be treated in this way. The attack which had been made on this Court was disgraceful.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not know that he had allowed the Supreme Court to be insulted. At the time the hon. gentleman from East Northumberland moved the introduction of the Bill, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not hear any remarks by that hon. gentleman disrespectful to the Supreme Court. As to the mode of procedure it was well understood that when Parliament gave an hon. member the right to introduce a Bill, and called it the first reading, he should have an opportunity of explaining it to the House on the second reading, although it might be considered an obsolete privilege. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Huntington) said some things were so sacred that they should not be attacked. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not know that his hand would be withered if he laid it on the Arc of the Covenant of the Supreme Court. That institution had been created by Parliament and amended by Parliament. Parliament might declare it to be inefficient, but that would not be blasphemy. He declared himself plainly and strongly when the matter came up on the first reading, his opinion that the Court ought to be sustained after having been established, unless there was a strong and clear case made out for its abolition. He was not going to deprive his hon. friend from East Northumberland of the opportunity of saying that he had made out a case for the abolition of the Court, or for its

amendment. The discussion could do no harm. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Huntington) said the Court had been insulted. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) happened to be out during a portion of the debate, but he he was sure the hon gentleman from East Northumberland would not willingly insult any individual or any institution; if he had made any remark against the Supreme Court that Court was of no more sacred quality than any other institution. The hon. member for Shefford stated that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) arose to protect a partisan. Now that was not a Parliamentary expression. If the hon. gentleman had been a Minister, he would have resented such language applied to a supporter of his. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) desired simply to extend toward one of his own friends a courtesy he was willing to extend to hon. gentlemen opposite, and he was not aware that the hon. gentleman opposite had a right to sneer at a member of the majority as being partisan. We were all partisans. He did not think it could be expected of him, as leader of the House, to extend less courtesy to his own friends than he was ready to extend to those opposed to him.

MR. RYKERT said that in voting against the motion of the member for Lambton, he desired to repudiate the charge of partisanship. Every time the member for Shefford arose in this House, he had to attack members of the Ministerial side for partisanship or indecency. No other member was less qualified to lecture them on manners than that hon. gentleman, in view of his past record. He (Mr. Rykert) failed to hear any observations of the hon. gentleman for East Northumberland casting reflections on the Supreme Court, but had he gone that far, he would not have gone further than public opinion would have justified. No other Court was so unpopular to-day, particularly in Ontario. They had a perfect right to discuss this question in Parliament. The hon. member for Chateauguay thought we had no right to discuss this question on a motion of this kind, but no one knew better than that hon. gentleman that the question of principle was not involved in this motion. On a former occasion, when a motion

was made to give the three months' hoist to the Orange Bill on its first reading, a great deal of feeling was aroused, and, since then, the first reading had generally been accepted as a matter of course. It was contrary to all parliamentary practice to compel a member to explain the principle of a Bill on the first reading. This view was taken by May, and that was the practice in England and in this country, except on a few occasions. He defied the hon. member for Lambton to quote one precedent in favour of the singular position he advocated. He (Mr. Rykert) had been in Parliament many years, and knew of no occasion when a motion was made against a Bill being placed on the orders after the first reading. It was quite competent for a member to object to the first reading, but it was not the Parliamentary practice. He did not think he should, under the circumstances, vote for the second reading, although he could justify such a course on several grounds. It could not be denied that a strong feeling existed against this Court in Ontario, and it was well that public attention had been drawn not only to the constitution of the Court, but also to the expenses connected therewith.

MR. BOULTBEE said representatives of the people were here to give expression to their wishes on public questions, rather than to guard any particular institution that the people were not satisfied with. The leader of the Opposition said the members of the Government would have to answer for the vote going in the way it did; they would be able to stand that, but they would not have been able to stand a charge of having assisted to crush out that Bill without allowing it to be debated. Whether rightly or wrongly, a strong feeling existed in Ontario that the Supreme Court was a heavy burden on the country, and, in his opinion, any constitutional question, which this Court was supposed to specially deal with, might be disposed of, in a less expensive manner, before another power. Further than this, the people of this country thought it would be a good thing if not only that the Supreme Court were done away with, but the Court of Appeal in Ontario were also abolished, believing they would get sufficient justice

MR. RYKERT.

from the Judges in the Assize, with a review, if necessary, by the full Court. He did not say he should vote for the abolition of the Court, but he thought the House had a perfect right to discuss the expediency of doing so. Some time, if not at present, the people might instruct their representatives to abolish that Court, and, in that possibility, there was no disrespect to that Court in discussing the question at present. He had heard nothing derogatory to that Court in this debate, except in the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Shefford. He it was who first started the idea in the House on the present occasion, that this Court, established by one party, was to be attacked by another. No such feeling existed in this House, and it would be a shameful thing if it did. Doubtless, the hon. gentleman from Shefford desired to stand well with that Court. Members supporting the Government merely voted with their leaders on the principle that the Bill ought, in courtesy, to be read a second time, but a large number of the Opposition, in spite of the appeals of their leaders, virtually voted for doing away with the Court.

MR. ORTON said he must challenge a remark which, he understood, was made by the hon. gentleman from West Northumberland, who charged the hon. gentleman from East Northumberland with being guilty of discourtesy and impropriety in introducing this Bill without consulting with legal members of this House.

MR. COCKBURN: I made no such charge.

MR. MACKENZIE: He said without consultation with the Government.

MR. ORTON said, as far as he knew, the people were opposed to the multiplication of Courts, and there was a strong feeling in the country that lawyers, as a class, were not the most disinterested and unselfish people in this country. He was not prepared to say that the hon. gentleman from West Northumberland was not an honorable man, and that his conduct was not inspired by the best of motives, but he did say there was a strong feeling in the country that the lawyers in this House had interfered too much in the legislation of the country.

MR. CASGRAIN said he entirely concurred in the remarks made by the hon gentleman from East Northumberland. He (Mr. Casgrain) could not understand why the hon. the Minister of Justice, who had a Bill before the House for continuing this Court, could allow the present Bill to be brought forward, unless he meant to oppose it. He thought the hon. the Prime Minister ought, in common parlance, to take the bull by the horns and vote down the present proposition at once. The mere fact of this discussion was no credit either to this House or to the Supreme Court.

MR. WELDON said that the hon. gentleman from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) had chosen to attack the legal gentlemen, but it must be allowed those gentlemen possessed the public confidence in a large degree, judging from their numbers in this House. The Supreme Court was of greater advantage to the Maritime Provinces than to Ontario and Quebec, as the latter Provinces possessed Courts of Appeals. He thought the Government had shirked the responsibility which devolved upon them in this matter. If the Supreme Court was not adapted to the wants of the people, the Government should have brought in a Bill for its abolition, instead of leaving that step to be taken by a private member. Or, if the Government thought that Court was inefficient, they should bring in a Bill for its amendment. So far as he understood the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Justice, he supported the Court, and said that, so far, it had done good work. So far as the Lower Provinces were concerned, he was surprised to find so many members from the Lower Provinces vote, as he believed, for the abolition of this Court, because they knew that the ordinary Courts were not infallible. Until this Court was established they were obliged to be content with the decision of one Court or go to England before the Privy Council. He was satisfied that this Court would be a great saving to the country, and be the means of establishing a uniformity of law from the Provinces on the Pacific to the Provinces on the Atlantic.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he thought the discussion of this question,

at the present time, was inopportune, and he regretted very much the tone that had pervaded it. It had been made, apparently, a question of party politics, rather than one of the highest character, which, he thought it was; because when they came to deal with the very existence of the highest and paramount Court in the Dominion, it was a subject upon which they ought to rise beyond party considerations, and look at it from a more extensive and impartial point of view. He thought, also, that it was much to be regretted that they should have dropped into this discussion on this merely formal motion for the first reading of the Bill. It was for that reason that he voted against the motion of the hon. member for Lambton, because he desired that they should have an opportunity of discussing the Bill on its second reading. He was not, by any means, prepared to accede to the view that the Supreme Court ought to be abolished, nor was he prepared to say he was satisfied with its present constitution. He wished to say nothing of the *personnel* of the learned Judges of the Court, but he was bound to say that, among the public and the profession of Ontario, there had been a good deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the constitution of the Court, and the manner in which cases from Ontario had occasionally been decided. For instance, a judgment was given the other day as a purely equitable question. The judgment of one of the learned Judges of the Supreme Court, who certainly stands second to none in his knowledge of equity law, was in accord with the judgment of the Court of Appeal, and of the Fall Court of Chancery of Ontario, but his judgment was reversed by the decision of four learned Judges of the Supreme Court, whose knowledge of that branch of law could not have been considered as equal to those whose judgment they over-ruled. These anomalies had created a feeling of dissatisfaction to a certain extent on what he might term the constitution of the Court. That it was desirable and proper they should have an ultimate Court of Appeal for the whole Dominion, he was prepared, for one, to acknowledge, but if the Court could be reorganised so as to be more acceptable to litigants and the public, he

thought it would be desirable. If some such arrangement could be made, the intermediate Courts of Appeal in the Provinces should be abolished. But it was absolutely necessary that the constitution of the Court should be altered, and greater strength, in fact, given to it. When he said greater strength, he did not wish to reflect on the Judges composing the Court. He thought it should be composed so as to be a tribunal in which every Province would have confidence, and be satisfied that those peculiar questions arising in the different Provinces would be determined by a Court of a sufficient number of Judges, skilled in those special questions, and such as to justify the public expectation of justice being done to the litigants. He would not have spoken at all on this subject, at the present time, were it not that in all probability another opportunity might not arise during the present Session, and after what had been said on it, he thought it might be considered right that members of the legal profession who had had some experience in the Court, should occupy the time of the House for a few minutes, and express their views upon it.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said he thought it would have been better if the suggestion of the Minister of Justice had been followed by the House. When the hon. member for East Northumberland introduced his Bill, and explained its objects, the hon. the Minister of Justice rose in his place and said he regarded the proposition of the hon. member for East Northumberland as a huge practical joke, and he trusted the House would so consider it. If the advice of the hon. the Minister of Justice had been followed, and the Bill treated as a huge practical joke, they would not have had what appeared to be an extremely unseemly discussion as to the utility of this Court. If the hon. the Minister of Justice was right in treating the matter as a huge practical joke, was it not absurd to ask Parliament not only to keep on its records this huge practical joke, but to give it a place in the Statute-book of the Dominion? The logical sequence, from the position of the Minister of Justice, was, that hon. gentlemen ought to have

voted down the motion of the hon. member for East Northumberland, though he was a supporter of their own. Then they had the First Minister himself tell them that this was not a Bill which he could allow to go upon the Statute-book; that it was not a wise nor judicious Bill, and that he could not sanction or support a Bill for the repeal of the Supreme Court, and that, in fact, that Court was now interwoven with our legislation and judicial system, and could not be interfered with. It appeared to him very extraordinary that the First Minister, after expressing the views he had expressed, should have allowed this course to be pursued in regard to this matter. He should not have permitted the Bill to go to a second reading. He (Mr. Cameron) regretted this discussion, because he thought observations had been made by members of the legal profession, respecting this Court, calculated to seriously prejudice the Court in the public mind. Notably so as to the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) whose words, as a prominent member of the Bar of Ontario, and as a prominent member of the House, carried more weight than those of an unprofessional man. The hon. member's statements, together with those of other hon. gentlemen, appeared to him to be exceedingly unwise, injudicious, and calculated to do very serious injury to this Court. The hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill said that the Court was unpopular throughout the country, and throughout the Province of Ontario. He (Mr. Cameron) denied that, and he defied the hon. the First Minister, the hon. the Minister of Justice, and the hon. member for North Simcoe, or any one else, to say that the Court was unpopular. In his judgment, there never was an Appeal Court in the Dominion that had served a better purpose, and given more general satisfaction. His hon. friend had referred to the differences of opinion that existed between the Judges of this Court, in cases that came before them, on legal points; that was to be expected. Every Judge would not take the same view of the law, or, if they did, there would be no necessity for any Court of Appeal. Everyone knew that the same thing existed with regard to the decisions of Parliament, the decisions in our Superior Courts and in our

Courts of Appeal, but he was not aware that such differences of opinion was ever urged as a reason for abolishing these Courts. It had been urged that the Court was expensive. True, it was. Every Court they had in the Dominion was more or less expensive. Was that any ground on which the mover of this Bill could properly argue that this Court had not served a wise purpose, and why Parliament should be called on to abolish it? The hon. member for North Simcoe said the Court had never served a good purpose. He (Mr. Cameron) held that if ever a Court created in this Dominion served a good purpose, it was the Supreme Court. They could not expect that, in a year or two, the utility and value of this Court would be apparent to everyone, professional and unprofessional, in the Dominion. That the Court would serve a good purpose was beyond peradventure. But, apart from that, the whole argument that had been adopted in Parliament that day by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House was calculated to materially weaken the influence of the Court in the public mind—to weaken the hold it was gradually obtaining in the public confidence—and to destroy, to a large extent, the utility of the Court. It had been stated that every attack that had been made on that Court had come from the Opposition side of the House. He (Mr. Cameron) denied that statement. Not one gentleman from that side of the House had, during the discussion, said anything offensive as to the *personnel* or constitution of the Supreme Court, or as to its usefulness and utility in the Dominion. But from the other side of the House they had had statements that afternoon reflecting on the Supreme Court—reflecting on its usefulness—and insinuating, if not more than insinuating, that the public had no confidence in its judgments, that, in fact, it was useless, expensive, and served no good purpose. He maintained that, considering the length of time the Court had been in existence, and that, in some sense, it was an experiment, the Court had served a good, wise, and useful purpose, and that it would be extremely prejudicial to the usefulness of the Court to suggest even that the Court should not continue its existence, and the Minister of Justice, as the guardian of the

judiciary of the Dominion, should have strenuously resisted this Bill. He regretted exceedingly the observations that had been made that day, because it would only spread abroad the idea that the Court was unpopular, and so increase its unpopularity; that it was unnecessarily expensive, and so create a popular prejudice against its existence; that it had served no good purpose in the past, and so lead the public mind to the conclusion that it could serve no good purpose in the future. If these opinions should hereafter prevail in the country, and the Court should become unpopular, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would be responsible—solely responsible for the result—a result that the House and the country would ultimately deplore.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had defied him (Mr. Rykert) to quote an authority, and he desired to do so at this point, with the permission of the House. In the first place May says, page 492, 1873 edition :

“There is no restriction in regard to the time at which motions for rejecting Bills may be made; but, if the House think fit, such rejection may be voted on the first, second or third readings, or on any other stage of the Bill.”

Then he desired to refer to a particular case in 1861, when Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and when Mr. Sheridan introduced a Bill for the purpose of arbitrarily reducing a certain duty. This was opposed by the Government at the initial stage, and Mr. Gladstone said, “The hon. member who last sat down appeared to think that it was a matter of courtesy to allow the introduction of the hon. gentleman’s Bill. I respectfully dissent from that proposition. If it were a matter of courtesy and nothing else, I am quite sure I am speaking for my colleagues as well as myself, when I say that we should be most happy to accord to the hon. gentleman that courtesy. But when the nature of a Bill does not, in any degree, turn upon its structure or form of expression; when the whole effect and purport of the measure is distinctly avowed in the title, which appears upon the notice paper, and in the speech of the hon. member who asks leave to introduce it, it is the ingenuous and straightforward course for the Gov-

ernment to adopt, to state, at the earliest moment, its opinion upon the measure." Accordingly, the Government of the day, to use the hon. gentleman's own words, were as discourteous as themselves (the Opposition), and would not allow it to be proceeded with, and it was set aside by a vote of 49 to 138. Now, if he (Mr. Mackenzie) had not proved his case, he would be prepared to prove it still further.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had not proved his case, he had simply stated that it was competent for the House of Commons to oppose a Bill on its first reading, as well as its second reading and third reading. Mr. Gladstone had simply stated that if a Bill was foreign in principle to the feelings of the House, the most straightforward way would be to vote it down on its first reading. If a Bill was introduced, which was, evidently, by a distinct majority, against the moral sense and feeling of the House, the most straightforward way was to vote against it at its first reading. But when the House actually voted to give the member leave to introduce the Bill, and not only that, but when the Bill had received its first reading, it was a discourtesy to the member who had received the previous courtesy of being allowed to introduce his Bill and have it read a first time. It was a discourtesy also to the majority that voted in favour of the first reading, not to be allowed an opportunity of voting again, on a future day, on the second reading. The authority read by his hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) had no reference to this point. Why? His hon. friend (Mr. Keeler) moved for leave to introduce the Bill; that leave was granted. He then moved that the Bill be read a first time, and it was read the first time. He then asked, in the ordinary course of practice, that a day be appointed upon which to discuss it.

MR. HOLTON said that, according to *May*, it was very clear that there was no restriction in regard to the time at which motions for the rejection of Bills should be made. But if the House thought fit, such rejection might be voted on the first, second or third readings, or any other stages of the Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This is not the first stage of the Bill.

MR. HOLTON said it could be done at any stage of the Bill. The motion was to appoint a day for the second reading of the Bill. It was an amendable motion, and his hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) proposed to amend it. Nothing could be more regular. The title of this Bill told the House all about it: It was a Bill to abolish the Supreme Court. Well, if the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) wanted to abolish the Supreme Court, the House need not go any further, and if the hon. gentleman wished to appoint Wednesday next, or any ulterior day, he might do so. But the amendment was equivalent to a rejection of the Bill. There was no act of discourtesy in making that amendment. There was no greater discourtesy in rejecting a Bill at any stage than there was in a member desiring to introduce a Bill without previously taking the proper precautions, and using those courtesies that were usual when an attack was made on one of the great institutions of the country, as this unquestionably was. He asked the right hon. the leader of the Government, whether he had been consulted about the introduction of this Bill? Whether it would not have been a simple act of courtesy, on the part of one of his supporters, to have consulted him before introducing a Bill to abolish this Court, one of the highest tribunals of the country? There was no question of courtesy. The hon. gentleman was right in introducing the Bill, and the House was right in making any disposition of the Bill they chose. If it were a complex Bill, a Bill that proposed to deal with some matter of ordinary legislation that could be amended, and a clause struck out here and another inserted there, the hon. gentleman might receive the courtesy of having his proposal considered. But he proposed to abolish the Supreme Court, and the very title of the Bill fully informed the House of its provisions. Unless they were prepared to consider that subject, there was no fitness or propriety in going any further with the Bill.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not state there was any irregularity in the hon. member for Lamb-

ton (Mr. Mackenzie) moving the three months' hoist. If it had been out of order, Mr. Speaker would not have allowed it to be put. He admitted that at any stage of the Bill, in every case where the House was asked by the Speaker to say aye or nay, the House might say aye or nay if they pleased. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was pointing out, as a matter of practice that, after the House had allowed a member to introduce a Bill, and after it had been read the first time, it was a most unusual and unheard-of thing not to allow the introducer to have an opportunity of moving the second reading of his Bill. The hon. gentleman said it was very wrong to attack a tribunal of this kind, and spoke about the sanctity of that tribunal. Why, the hon. gentleman was an extreme Liberal, yet if he had lived in the time of Charles I, or Charles II, and been in the Parliament of England, and, if there had been a motion to abolish the Star Chamber, he would, if he had been in the same mind as he was during the last five minutes, have risen in his place and said that this tribunal was well known in England, that it was the highest tribunal in England, the highest Court of Appeal for all civil, criminal and ecclesiastical causes, and he would have upheld the Star Chamber. There was no institution sacred against the—

MR. HOLTON : I did not say sacred ; I said important.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said of course it was of considerable importance that when one Parliament had taken such a grave step as they had, in regard to the Supreme Court, that a new Parliament should not invade it. He thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton) had had experience with him for many years,—though he was not always looking at the same side of the House—he was generally looking across the House at him—and he knew that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was of rather Conservative tendencies.

AN HON. GENTLEMAN : Erratic.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Practically. He thought the hon. gentleman would believe that, practically, he

was rather of a Conservative tendency, and the Supreme Court was just as safe in the hands of his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) friends, as in the hands of the hon. the leader of the Opposition.

MR. BUNSTER said it seemed to him that when there was a legal question before the House, the lawyers felt themselves called upon to occupy as much of the time of the House as possible, to the exclusion of business men. The last two hours and a half had been wasted in this matter, but if the Pacific Railway had been under discussion there would not have been half the consideration given it. No matter what question came up before the House, the lawyers occupied the whole time of the House, but if a business man got up, he could hardly get a hearing. This Bill had been voted as a Bill of the House, and he did not see there was any occasion for any more useless discussion.

MR. ANGLIN said that the right hon. the Premier was a Conservative in name, but with revolutionary tendencies. He (Mr. Anglin) had heard him of late years propound most extraordinary revolutionary doctrines. It was rather unfortunate that the right hon. gentleman had chosen to compare the Supreme Court of Canada to the Star Chamber. He wished to speak to the question of courtesy. That the hon. member for Lambton was perfectly in his right in moving his amendment, was now generally admitted. It was not discourteous for any hon. member to take such action as the leader of the Opposition had taken, particularly where the Bill was such a Bill as described by the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone, in the speech quoted as being a Bill, the title of which so clearly defined its scope and object that the House could at once determine whether or not they should take such a measure into consideration. When the mover of the Bill asked leave to introduce his measure, the hon. the leader of the House, in a few short words, expressed his disapproval of it, and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) did right in waiting for the hon. the Premier to propose the rejection of the Bill at the first stage. He (Mr. Anglin) expected that the right hon. gentleman would himself have moved that the Bill should

not be introduced. He did not do that, and then the hon. member for Lambton, on the very next opportunity, moved that the Bill be given the three months' hoist. He (Mr. Anglin) thought it was the only course which the hon. gentleman could do under the circumstances. He did not consider there was any discourtesy to the mover of the Bill. He believed it was a Bill that should not have been introduced.

MR. COURSOL said he did not rise to discuss the question raised by the hon. member for Chateauguy (Mr. Holton) as to whether the Government was right or wrong in allowing the motion to fix the second reading of this Bill, because he was sure that the hon. the leader of the Government was perfectly competent to defend his own course. His object was to protest against the allusion made by the hon. member for Chateauguy to the course taken by some hon. gentlemen on this question, who thought proper to abandon the leader of the Opposition side of the House. He (Mr. Holton) said he would give them all the benefit of the consciousness of their position. The hon. gentleman meant to say that gentlemen on the Government side of the House were not conscientious in their desire. He (Mr. Coursol) was not prepared to say, at this stage of the Bill, after hearing the arguments that had been brought forward, whether the Supreme Court should be abolished or not. It was a question that might be reserved, and could be better discussed when the principle of the Bill came before the House at its second reading. He would tell the hon. member for Chateauguy that many of his (Mr. Holton's) friends, who voted against the amendment of the hon. the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), would not vote against the abolition of that Court. He would be very much surprised if they did, because it would be the first time within the last five years that they voted against the desires of their leaders. As far as he (Mr. Coursol) was concerned, not being very familiar with the rules of the House, he thought the second reading of a Bill meant the stage at which its merits could be discussed. He thought that the Parliament which had created

MR. ANGLIN.

the Supreme Court had the right to discuss whether or not that Court should be abolished. Hon. gentlemen had been charged with not having prevented the Bill being presented to the House. How could the Government or the Minister of Justice prevent any individual member bringing in a Bill to abolish the Court? He had no desire to say a word against the Judges of the Supreme Court. It would be a want of decency, it would be a want of decency to which the hon. member for Chateauguy (Mr. Holton) had so often alluded to; but, at the same time, it was a matter of opinion whether this country ought to bear the expense of such a Court. It was a question for the Province of Quebec, of which he was one of the representatives, whether that Court was not too expensive for the country at large. It was a question to be considered on its merits, and not as a partisanship measure. There was one member of that Court to whom allusion had probably been made. His knowledge and ability, in the exercise of his duty, had been conceded. He had been recognised by Sir Louis Lafontaine, as one of the cleverest and ablest jurists in the Province of Quebec. But his presence on the Supreme Court bench could not materially alter the case. They had, as Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Quebec, Sir A. A. Dorion, who was assisted by other able Judges, and the people of that Province were perfectly satisfied with the judgments rendered by that Court, without going to the Supreme Court. Personally, if he had anything to risk, or his advice were asked, he would be satisfied to accept the opinion of that Court. He wanted his opinion to be recorded that he had voted for the motion fixing the second reading of the Bill, in order that when the Bill would be read the second time there might be a fair discussion on it, and if it turned out that it was advisable to abolish the Court, he would vote for its abolition.

MR. MILLS said he wished to call the attention of the First Minister to what he thought was a serious—

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order; the hon. gentleman has already spoken.

MR. MILLS: I spoke before the vote was taken.

MR. McCARTHY: The hon. gentleman has spoken since the vote was taken, and I replied to him.

MR. MILLS: I rise to a point of order. The hon. the leader of the Government was—

MR. RYKERT: I rise to a point of order.

MR. MILLS: It is to a point of order I rise.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has risen to a point of order.

MR. MILLS: Before I discuss the point of of order—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman has risen to a point of order, and he must state it.

MR. MILLS: I will speak to the point of order, and to other matters as well. I stand by my right.

Some HON. MEMBERS: The hon. gentleman has spoken four times on this question.

MR. MILLS: No, I have not. The hon. gentleman replied to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), then he again replied to the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin).

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the House should settle the point of practice. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) had risen to a point of order, or he had not. If he had risen to a point of order, he should state that point of order. Then, afterwards, the House could settle the question of the hon. gentleman speaking again.

MR. MILLS said that he had a right to proceed with the discussion apart from the point of order—he had the floor.

MR. SPEAKER said that so many members had spoken on this question that he did not remember whether the hon. member for Bothwell had spoken on the main question or not.

MR. MILLS said that the First Minister stated that the instance cited by the hon. member for Lambton was not in point; now the rule laid down by Mr.

Gladstone was this: that where the title disclosed the nature of the Bill, and it was in its whole scope and object objectionable, one was bound at every stage to vote against it. What was the title of this Bill? A Bill to abolish the Supreme Court. Any gentleman not prepared to abolish that Court had no right to support any reading of the Bill, and had committed himself improperly in so doing. The Minister of Justice had a Bill before Parliament to amend the Supreme Court Act. He could not take the first step with it until that vote had been rescinded by a rejection of the second reading. It was a rule laid down by May that, where the House had committed itself in favour of a proposition, it could not entertain another measure the very opposite, until that proposition was rejected.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: So, if a member votes for the introduction of a Bill, he cannot change his mind or vote against it afterwards.

MR. MILLS said that his voting for it committed him to the Bill, but not to every stage. He was at liberty to change his mind, but it must be on the same Bill. Supposing when the motion for the second reading of the Supreme Court Acts Amendment Bill was submitted, objection was taken that the House had already expressed itself in favour of the abolition of that Court, they could not, in his opinion, proceed further—they could not reach a vote, otherwise they might carry two inconsistent measures. The rules of the House, when invoked, would prevent such a proceeding.

MR. MACMILLAN said as one of the members who had voted against the Supreme Court Bill, he was very glad to see the Bill of the member for East Northumberland introduced. He did not desire to do away with that Court absolutely, but to take advantage of that motion with a view to the introduction of any amendments they might think necessary, and the placing of his views properly before the country. Speaking more particularly of Ontario, as had been stated by many of the lay members, they had too many Courts. Some few years ago they had three Courts of concurrent jurisdiction, the

Courts of Chancery, Common Pleas, and Queen's Bench, the nine Judges of which formed the Court of Error and Appeal. A new Court was formed, the Court of Appeal, by the Minister of Justice in the House at that time, which consisted of a Chief Justice and three Puisne Judges. There is now an appeal from either of the three Courts of original jurisdiction. The Court of Chancery, the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Queen's Bench to the Court of Appeal. From that, there was an appeal to the Supreme Court. It had been remarked that decisions of the Court of Queen's Bench had been systematically reversed by the Court of Appeals, and, as if the Supreme Court was desirous of showing their authority, they in turn, reversed its judgments. Consequently, they were in just as bad a position—and in a much more doubtful position than they occupied when before the old Court of Error and Appeal. His desire was that the Court of Appeal in Ontario should be done away with as soon as possible. If they were to have a Court of Appeal, let it be formed as before, the Judges of the three Courts sitting conjointly—three of whom were Equity Judges, the other six, Common Law. If they were to have an appeal from them, let it be to the Supreme Court. At this moment, he had considerable doubt whether they got judgments in that Court even equal to those given in the Court of Error and Appeal, in the Province of Ontario—for this reason: there were four English-speaking Judges on its bench, and two French-speaking, and instead of having a judgment of nine Judges as before, they had the judgment of the four or two, respectively, as the cases concerned Ontario or Quebec. It was made a condition precedent of the formation of the Supreme Court that two of the Judges should be from Quebec, the consequence being that all the other Provinces had the benefit of the judgment of but four of those Judges, and Quebec that of but its two representative Judges. He would very much rather have the judgment of the three Courts—of even that of the Court of Appeal in Ontario, than that of the Supreme Court. He was saying nothing against the Judges of

the Supreme Court, who might be men of as exalted ability as those of any Court; but the old principle, upon which they acted from Confederation up to 1876, should have been continued for a considerable time longer. It was not absolutely necessary to establish a Supreme Court which cost about \$70,000 a year; it could have been done without for some years longer. He would not have made those remarks had not the amendment been proposed; but he would have gone more fully into this question had he had the slightest expectation of their being compelled to express their opinions on this occasion. He thought the Bill would go to a second reading, and at that stage he would express his opinions much more strongly, and with the view of decreasing the expenditure of that Court.

MR. KEELER rose to address the House.

MR. RYKERT said he rose to a point of order. The hon. member had spoken twice. On several occasions Mr. Speaker had decided that no member could speak two or three times on the same subject. He wished the rule laid down.

MR. SPEAKER said it was very well understood that no member could speak twice, except on very special occasions. The hon. member for East Northumberland had moved the second reading of the Bill, and spoken on it, as he had a right to do; but he had no further right to speak. He knew that although it was the rule members should not speak more than once, their disregard of it was frequently overlooked. The hon. member was entitled to make personal explanations.

MR. RYKERT said Mr. Speaker had ruled differently the other day, and the next time he raised the question he would appeal to the House for its decision.

MR. KEELER said that the member for Centre Huron had commented upon his motion as that of a member who desired to play a practical joke. He had no such intention, feeling that he was not sent to Parliament for that purpose. He should be ashamed of himself, or of appearing before his constituents if guilty of any such practice. He intended

to follow this matter through to the end, and to ascertain whether there was a majority in the House willing to perpetuate such a system of extravagance and waste of public money as the Supreme Court involved. So far as the charge of his having been made a cat's-paw of by the leader of the Government, he repeated that no hon. gentleman inside the House had had a word with him on the subject. He was very proud to know that he had been enabled to elicit the largest vote taken this Session in support of his motion. As to the question of courtesy, he could well afford to excuse the leader of the Opposition for what he had said, after the defeat he had suffered. He thought he would survive all the discourtesy the hon. member could show him.

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

After Recess.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

In answer to Mr. BUNSTER,

Mr. TUPPER said that the moment the tariff was disposed of, or there was a suitable opportunity, the Government would be prepared to lay before the House their propositions with regard to the prosecution of the Canada Pacific Railway.

NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 64.]

(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he felt it to be his duty to protest against the legislation of the character which was sought to be enacted by the Bill now before the House. He protested against it on the ground that it was a violation of the compact between the parties concerned in this matter, which compact had been sanctioned by a vote of this House and by an Act passed by the Parliament of Canada. The object of this Bill was to set aside an arrangement which was made by the Act

of 1877, under which it was provided that the shareholders who now asked to have three directors, should have one director. That Act was passed as the result of an arrangement made between the bondholders and the stockholders at that time. The shareholders then were not in a position even to elect one director, except by the consent of the bondholders, because the previous legislation having provided that bondholders and shareholders should vote *pari passu*, the result was that, as the bonds so far exceeded the shares in amount, the stockholders had no power to elect even one director. They remonstrated against that in 1877, and, as a matter of compromise between the parties, the bondholders consented that the shareholders should have the right to elect one director from amongst themselves, that, in fact, the shareholders should vote separately from the bondholders, so that the bondholders should elect a certain number of directors, and the shareholders one. That arrangement was embodied in an Act of Parliament passed in 1877. On the strength of that Act, capitalists in England advanced very large sums of money, and the good faith of Canada was pledged to the maintenance of that arrangement. A large issue of bonds took place, the money was applied to the payment of the Government claim, the Government lien was wiped out, the bonds were sold upon the faith of that Act, and now it was sought to set the Act aside, and Parliament was asked to commit what the people in England, who had advanced the money, would look upon as a gross breach of faith towards them, and utterly contrary to the arrangement on the strength of which they advanced the money. In proof of this, he would refer to the petition which had been laid before the House, and which was signed by the bondholders of the company in England, representing £337,000 sterling they had advanced on the strength of the legislation. The first petitioner was the Right Hon. W. H. Smith, First Lord of the Admiralty, and the mere fact of his name being attached to the petition ought to convince the House that they should give the petition some consideration. The next petitioner was Sir Henry Jackson, a member of the British House

of Commons, one of the leading lawyers at the Equity Bar, and a man of immense influence in England, and the other signatures were those of men of high standing in the commercial world of England. If they felt so strongly as they had expressed themselves in this petition, that this particular Bill was an infraction of their rights and a violation of the good faith of the Parliament of Canada, on the strength of which they had advanced their money, he thought this House should pause before it sanctioned, by even allowing it to go to a second reading, legislation of that character, which had met with such strong disapprobation from these gentlemen. The object of this attempted legislation was to take the control of the affairs of the Northern Railway of Canada out of the hands of the bondholders, and to hand it over to the stockholders. He would ask the House to consider for a moment, whether that would be right. The shareholders represented, altogether, £85,000 sterling worth of stock, apart from the municipal stock, and that need not be considered, because the two municipalities which had stock in this railroad, the municipality of Toronto and the municipality of the county of Simcoe, were each entitled to a director; while the bond debt of the company only amounted to £1,233,000 sterling, so that £85,000 worth of stock sought to get the control of £1,200,000 sterling. The affairs of the company were managed by a Canadian directorate. It was true there were certain English directors, but, as they lived in England, they had no control over the management of affairs. This Canadian Board was elected by the English bondholders, to the extent of all, except the two municipal directors, and the one director elected by the shareholders. It was proposed to give the shareholders three directors, which with the two municipal directors who had the same interest as they, would give them complete control of the management of the affairs of the company. These bondholders had advanced them money since 1859 on the strength of this legislation, which gave them the right to vote in proportion to the amount of their bonds; and to pass this Act would be an utter and gross violation of the good faith of the Parliament

of Canada towards those parties. It would be introducing a very dangerous and suicidal principle into our legislation; it would be equivalent to telling the people in England that they should not have confidence in our Acts of Parliament, that when we passed an Act which gave them certain rights, they might expect that, in a year or two afterwards, all those rights would be taken away at the instigation of local and personal interests, because this Bill was promoted by local and personal interests in the Province of Ontario. He had examined the petition in favour of this Bill presented to the House, and he found that the petitioners, who were thirteen in number, represented altogether £2,600 of stock, if we struck out of the number the signature of one gentleman who did not own a dollar's worth of stock of his own, but was simply the representative of some American stockholders. Under these circumstances, the House should be very careful before assenting to legislation of this kind, which was calculated to have the most prejudicial effect on Canadian securities, and which was sought for by an insignificant minority of the parties interested in the company. He had at first intended to oppose the Bill *in toto* on its second reading, on the ground that, as a matter of principle, it was wrong, and, therefore, should then be opposed. He had since had reason to doubt whether, according to the practice which of late years had prevailed in Parliament in reference to Bills of this character, the fact of a Bill going to the Railway Committee was any recognition of its principle. If he suspected for a moment that the House, by allowing it to pass the second reading and to go to the Railway Committee, would sanction its principle, he would feel it his duty to move the rejection of the second reading. As of late years, however, it was considered that Bills of this character might be allowed to pass the second reading without that being any recognition of their principle, he felt he had done his duty as a representative in this House in condemning, in the most emphatic terms, legislation of this character, by saying that, while he did not now move the rejection for three months of the second reading of

the Bill, it was only right that the House, when asked to assent to the second reading, should express by its voice, if not by its vote, its condemnation of the principle upon which the Bill rested. And while he had perfect confidence that the Railway Committee, as well as the House, when the matter was investigated on its merits, would be prepared to say that no legislation of this kind ought to be passed, he did not think it necessary at present to move the total rejection of the Bill at the second reading. If the Railway Committee were not as large as it was, one which fully expressed the sense of the House, he would feel it his duty to move the rejection *in toto* of the second reading of the Bill; but as the matter stood, he felt he had sufficiently done his duty by calling the attention of the House to the violation of principle and the impropriety of the legislation now asked for.

MR. ROBINSON said he must take advantage of this opportunity, on behalf of the private shareholders, many of whom he knew personally, and also on behalf of the shareholders, who were represented by two municipalities—two of the largest municipalities, perhaps, in Ontario, the one the city of Toronto and the other the county of Simcoe—to take, in the first instance, direct issue with his hon. friend in some of his statements. The hon. gentleman described the introduction of this Bill to a desire to violate a distinct compact. He (Mr. Robinson) defied his hon. friend to show, to prove the slightest violation of any compact made at any time, in the request now before the House. If there was, why did not the hon. gentleman take up the Statute under which the company was constituted, and to which he referred. He did not do so, because he knew quite well that he could find no violation of any compact whatever through it. On the contrary, there had been no desire on the part of the shareholders to act with the slightest injustice towards the bondholders of the Northern Railway. If there was such a desire, they never had a better opportunity than they had under this Act, which his hon. friend could have quoted had he thought himself justified in so doing. The hon. gentleman had said that this Act em-

powered the bondholders to raise a certain sum of money for certain purposes, on behalf of the Northern Railroad. They could not have raised the funds for those purposes to which his hon. friend had alluded, the improvement and the paying of the debts of the railroad, unless the shareholders had given them that privilege; and when the shareholders gave them that privilege, it did not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for North Victoria to charge the shareholders with the slightest desire to do any injustice to the bondholders. Therefore, instead of throwing the slightest impediment under the operation of this Act, as far as the interest of any man on the Northern Railroad was concerned, were he shareholder or bondholder, the shareholders, with a desire to do justice to every right represented on that road, gave their unanimous consent to these bondholders to issue their £150,000 sterling for the benefit of that road. Without that consent, the bondholders could not have taken a step in advance with the road in any way whatever. When the shareholders had done that, he (Mr. Robinson) did not think it was right in his hon. friend to stigmatise them as a miserable minority of shareholders; and, to make them appear more miserable, he compared them to one or two agents who represented the bondholders in the Old Country. They were both men of distinction, but had no right to complain of any injustice done them, as far as the working of the railway was concerned. They had, from the very time they invested their money, certainly for the last eighteen years, got their six per cent. interest, and had purchased those bonds at 65c. on the dollar. While the shareholders had never got a single dividend of any sort on the money they had invested, these bonds, purchased at 65c. on the dollar, had given an interest of six per cent. on their face value, or ten per cent. on the investment. Those were the very gentlemen represented by his hon. friend from North Victoria, whom we must laud in this House, while, at the same time, he belittled those who represented the people of this country, those who had given one million dollars, the private shareholders, and those represented by the municipalities. The "miserable minority," spoken of by

his hon. friend, was represented here the other day by the Mayor of the City of Toronto, containing some 75,000 people. He believed there were not more than five or seven bondholders in England, though these might be some of the heaviest men in the country. Again, his hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) had stated that the shareholders, be they municipal or be they private, would have received at the hands of this House no justice whatever last Session; in other words, they would have had no director without the consent of the bondholders. That was only another instance of what little acquaintance his hon. friend had of the actual facts. He (Mr. Robinson) was in the House at the time, and they got one director, though they applied for two, in spite of the opposition of the bondholders. There was no consent on their part, and there was no desire, even then, to do the slightest injustice to the bondholders, but they thought the time had come when the House should give them two directors. They obtained only one director, but that one did not hesitate to state that he wanted to inform the Railway Committee that he could not, as the sole representative of the shareholders of the Northern Railway, do that justice which any man in his position, and with the responsibility which he had, would feel himself bound to do. Therefore, a great number of shareholders, backed by the city of Toronto, and by the constituency the hon. gentleman from North Victoria represented, desired to have three directors, but if the Railway Committee thought three was too many, then they asked it to give them two; but let those who represented a million dollars, who had never got any interest, let some justice be done to them when they brought to the attention of the House a Bill such as this. One other reason why the shareholders were entitled to some justice was, because they supplied the iron on the Northern Railroad from Toronto to Barrie—the \$400,000 of Toronto and Simcoe alone put the iron on the road from Toronto to Barrie. When the stockholders put on this iron and steel they took stock in payment, but this stock was so overloaded by the bonds which the bondholders themselves had, Act by Act, got from this

MR. ROBINSON.

House, that the stock was not of the value which it would otherwise have been. He would say that there was no desire on the part of the shareholders to injure any interest which the bondholders might have. He represented the good-will of the shareholders towards the bondholders, and if the bondholders, represented by his hon. friend, received no greater injury from the shareholders of this road than they had already done, they would never receive any in the world. He believed the Bill had been introduced with the best intentions, not only to serve the interests of the bondholders, but to secure to the shareholders an opportunity of defending their interests. They only desired an opportunity to approach the Railway Committee. It was not an extraordinary request to make, it was made every day by persons of every interest. If they could not substantiate these assertions which they had authorised him to make on their behalf, then, of course, their case fell to the ground, and they could get no increased representation. But, if they were able to show that they could not get justice at the hands of the representatives of the bondholders, then they would only pursue that course which every other person would pursue; but they only asked, as an act of simple justice at the hands of this House, a ruling upon the truth of their representation to the Committee, which they would take the first opportunity, if they were permitted to do so, to make to the Committee upon Railways.

MR. ANGLIN asked if the hon. gentleman would state what was the amount of capital stock paid by individual stockholders, what by municipalities, and what was the amount of the bonded indebtedness.

MR. ROBINSON said he had already stated that the municipalities represented an interest of \$400,000—that was to say, the municipality of Simcoe, some twenty years ago, took \$200,000 of stock, upon which they had never received one dollar in interest; Toronto, at the same time, took another \$200,000, upon which they had not received one dollar in interest—the private shareholders had taken \$450,000 worth of stock. He believed he might

say that they had \$450,000 worth of paid-up stock, dollar for dollar, when the bondholders only paid 65c. on the dollar for the bonds they held to-day, and they, the shareholders, had never got any interest upon it since. The amount, therefore, of the shareholders, altogether, was something like \$850,000. With the interest added, there would be quite as large a value as represented by the bondholders.

MR. ANGLIN asked what was the representation now on the Board of Directors.

MR. ROBINSON answered that there were twelve directors, of whom the shareholders had three; that was to say, nine in this country and three in England. Out of the twelve, the shareholders had three.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said the municipal stock had nothing whatever to do with the matter, inasmuch as the city of Toronto had its own director and the county of Simcoe had its own director, so that the municipality he was concerned with was out of consideration altogether. There was one shareholder director, one city of Toronto director, and one Simcoe director; the rest of the Board were elected by the shareholders' vote, and it so happened that every director the bondholders had elected, had been a shareholder, and first qualified as a private shareholder and not as a bondholder, so that the bondholders themselves had elected five directors.

MR. MACKENZIE said when this Bill was introduced, he called the attention of the Government, and particularly of the First Minister, to its extraordinary character. Would the hon. the Minister of Public Works, as the Premier was not in his place, state what course the Government proposed, to pursue towards it?

MR. TUPPER said that his right hon. friend the Premier, proposed to allow the Bill to go to a Committee, as it was one in which testimony was proposed to be offered.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was not aware that any testimony was to be taken; would the hon. gentleman state what testimony was to be taken?

MR. TUPPER said that objections were raised, and petitions were presented, and questions were raised that could only be conveniently discussed before a Committee. His right hon. friend the leader of the Government did not assume that the second reading of the Bill was to express at all the concurrence of the House in relation to it. In relation to Railway Bills, the House had, in many cases, allowed them to go to the Railway Committee without in the least committing itself to the principle of the Bills. It was proposed to take the same course in relation to this Bill, and allow it to go to a Committee, and there to hear the promoters of the Bill, as well as the objections raised against it.

MR. MACKENZIE said, as a member of the late Administration, he felt himself responsible for the legislation had during their period. He believed the introduction of this Bill, and its second reading, with the assent of the Government, under any condition, was a thing deeply to be regretted. Whether the proportion of directors, relatively to the stock, was enough or not, a solemn engagement was entered into by which the bondholders bound themselves to raise another million of dollars, in order to complete the undertaking, upon the faith that the arrangement entered into by the Government at that time, and the Bill which was passed respecting the Company itself, should not be disturbed. Now, he was sure the hon. the Minister of Public Works must see how undesirable it was to give any colour to the impression which must prevail in England, that we were wantonly trifling with the rights of parties under the legislation of the past few years. The hon. gentleman from West Toronto was, at the present moment, extremely solicitous to have the stockholders properly represented on the Board, and he made almost a pitiable appeal to the House to grant what he considered proper representation. Now, that hon. gentleman was, for a long time, President of this Company; at that time, the stockholders had less representation on the Board than they had now, and it was only when he ceased to be President that he discovered the representation was inadequate. By the changes made since the hon. gentle-

man left the Board, they had an additional director, the representation was, therefore, largely in excess of what it was when that hon. gentleman was President; but, even if it had been less, when the moral sanction of the Legislature of Canada was given to the arrangement, when the bondholders undertook to raise another very large amount of money to complete the undertaking, he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought it was the duty of every public man—and he simply spoke as a public man—to resist this Bill. In his capacity as a Minister of the late Administration, he felt himself responsible for the legislation had during that period, and it was only in that character that he raised a solemn protest against the Government promoting such a measure as this, or allowing it to pass even to a second reading. It was essential to the interest of the country that faith be kept with those who had advanced money for our railway enterprises; whether the bonds were issued at par or at a certain discount was another matter. He believed there was no transaction where the bondholders had done more for an enterprise than they had in this. It was well known that he had no sympathy with the manner in which the enterprise was managed as a railway; it was well known that he expressed his views respecting that management, and they had not been changed. He spoke solely as a public man respecting the influence which such legislation as this must have upon the public mind in England. We knew that four or five of the most prominent financial men in London were bondholders in this concern, one of them holding there a high official position in the Government, and others being members of Parliament or members of the Stock Exchange. This measure would be disastrous to the national interests and to every interest where we sought the aid of English capital; it would be disastrous to such interests if the Government of this country permitted such legislation as this to be carried on. He could not see, even if the Bill were passed, what benefit it would give, except that another director would be obtained, and another call would be made next year. These gentlemen wished to obtain control of the Board, where they had

very little money. In addition to what the hon. member for North Victoria had said, they might state that many of these stockholders bought the stock they held at one cent on the dollar. That was perfectly well known, and it was considered utterly valueless, and if it had any value at all, it was owing to the forbearance of the Canadian Parliament, in accepting \$1,000,000 in lieu of the payment of the entire debt. If the stock had any value, it was in consequence of the sacrifice of public interest that was made in order that the railway should not be finally closed. There was, therefore, no ground whatever for seeking the legislation that was now sought, and he must really appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to take such action with respect to this matter as would vindicate the fair fame of the country, and tell the English money-lenders that when money was advanced on the faith of Canadian legislation, that legislation should be held sacred against every influence that was exerted to upset it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not think the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had advanced the opposition to this Bill by the line of argument he had taken. He had stated that the bondholders consisted of some of the chief men in England; that one man was a member of Parliament, and that they should be very guarded. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was of opinion that they should carry on their legislation whether the bondholders were kings, princes, governors, or millionaires on change. He admitted that they ought to be guarded in their legislation, but legislation did not depend upon the first or second reading of a Bill. It depended upon the deliberate decision of Parliament, and he was quite sure that when this House, as one branch of Parliament, when they came to finally decide on this measure, would see that the public faith would be kept, and they would see further, that every corporation should observe due faith in every pledge made, and every obligation entered into. He did not see why the House should be troubled with these debates. It had been an understood arrangement since 1867, that every railway matter should be sent to the Railway Committee. This ought to have been done in this instance,

although his present impression was with the hon. member for Lambton and against the shareholders. He wished to give them every chance to be heard, and they could be heard before the Railway Committee. If it was to be understood, with regard to banking, insurance, canal, and railway Bills, that they were to have a long discussion in the House on the principle involved, before they went to their respective Committees, those Committees would lose their chief value. He thought this Bill, in common with others of a like character, should go to the Committee.

Bill read the second time.

DEATH OF THE PRINCESS ALICE.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

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

“LORNE.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons the accompanying copy of a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to a joint Address to the Queen from the Senate and House of Commons, expressing sympathy with Her Most Gracious Majesty on the death of Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice, Grand Duchesse of Hesse-Darmstadt.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, 21st April, 1879.

“Copy
“Canada. } Sir M. E. Hicks-Beach to the
“No. 85. } Marquis of Lorne.

“DOWNING STREET,

“1st April, 1879.

“MY LORD.—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No 55, of the 3rd March, transmitting a joint Address to the Queen from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, tendering a Message of condolence with Her Majesty on the death of Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice, Grand Duchesse of Hesse-Darmstadt.

“I have duly caused this Address to be laid before the Queen, who was pleased to receive it very graciously, and I am commanded to request that you will convey to the Speakers of the respective Houses, the thanks of Her Majesty for this expression of sympathy in her bereavement.

“I have, &c., &c.,

(Signed) “M. E. HICKS-BEACH.

“Governor-General,

“The Right Honourable

“The Marquis of Lorne, K.T., G.C.M.G.,

&c., &c., &c.”

CAMPBELL'S COVE BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

QUESTION:

MR. MUTTART enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the completion of Campbell's Cove Breakwater, in the Province of Prince Edward Island.

MR. TUPPER: I fear it will not be in the power of the Government to provide in the Estimates for the surveys this year. But a survey will be ordered and a report made in order to enable the Government to arrive at a proper judgment in regard to the matter for another Session.

ORDNANCE LANDS IN KINGSTON.

QUESTION.

MR. SKINNER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to dispose of, by sale or otherwise, any portion of the Ordnance Lands in the city of Kingston.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There are sundry lands belonging to the Ordnance Department which are for sale. The only exception, I believe, is in regard to those lands reserved for military purposes.

EXCISE DUTY ON BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

QUESTION.

MR. SKINNER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place an Excise duty on sugar made in the Dominion from beet-root.

MR. TILLEY: The Government have no intention of interfering with the legislation passed by the House of Commons in 1873.

CLEARING OF KOOTENAY RIVER, B.C.

QUESTION.

MR. BUNSTER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the clearing out of the sward part of Kootenay River, in Comox, B.C.

MR. TUPPER: Although I believe this question was asked a year or two ago, I cannot find any report in the Department in reference to the matter.

The local engineer will be directed to make a survey in order that the Government may have the necessary information to enable them to take the matter into consideration at a future Session.

DISMISSAL OF STE. FLAVIE ENGINE-HOUSE SUPERINTENDENT.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. Fiset moved for copies of correspondence between the Government and any person whatsoever, respecting the dismissal of Joseph Bourdeau, Superintendent of the engine-house at Ste. Flavie, together with a statement of the reasons for that dismissal. He said that some years previous, at the death of Mr. Fary, Mr. J. Bourdeau had been appointed Superintendent of the engine-house at St. Flavie. His capacity and his honesty had been his only recommendation. He (Mr. Fiset) thought that, since then, Mr. Bourdeau had fulfilled the duties of his employment to the entire satisfaction of those who had appointed him. Lately, however, he had undergone a first enquiry, and as it seemed nothing could be proved against him, Mr. Bourdeau had been maintained in his position. But that was not what those who desired to be revenged of Mr. Bourdeau wanted. A second enquiry was established, and this time Mr. Bourdeau was dismissed. He would not repeat what he had already said respecting the dismissal of public officials who might have taken part in an election. It was well known what tyranny was exercised in the county of Rimouski against those who had been favourable to him (Mr. Fiset). All he wished was to raise in public esteem those whose characters might suffer from these dismissals, made for political reasons, and he would consider himself recreant to his duty if he did not do so. This House was well aware that to dismiss an official was, generally, to injure his professional character, and, often, to turn him and his family out of doors by preventing him from finding employment elsewhere. He, therefore, ventured to hope that the Government would not oppose the motion.

Mr. TUPPER said he thought he would ask the hon. gentleman to with-

MR. TUPPER.

draw this motion, as, he believed, he could satisfy the House that all reasonable ground for making that application had been removed. He drew the attention of the House, a short time ago, to the inconvenience of having matters of this kind brought under the notice of the House in this very formal way. The ground on which he asked the hon. gentleman to withdraw this motion was, that it was already covered by a motion and a return granted to this House. The return included all the information contained in Mr. Schrieber's report, showing the cause of any changes. He was informed that, although charges of a very grave nature were brought against this man, such as habits of intemperance, as to entirely unfit him for the position he held, and they had been proven and sustained on examination—notwithstanding that, he was allowed to retire under the reorganisation. Mr. Schrieber's report, which would be submitted to the House, covered this case as well as others. In view of these charges, which had been sustained, this man would have been formally dismissed, even if he had not been allowed to retire under the reorganization.

MR. Fiset said that the hon. the Minister of Public Works having stated that all the papers concerning the dismissal of Mr. J. Bourdeau would be produced in the report of Mr. Schrieber, asked for at the beginning of the Session, he had no objection to withdraw his motion. But, at the same time, he must protest energetically against the insinuation that had been made, to wit: that Mr. J. Bourdeau was intemperate. He emphatically denied that assertion.

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

REMOVAL OF ST. FABIEN POSTMASTER.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. Fiset moved for copies of correspondence between the Government and the postmaster of the parish of St. Fabien, Mr. Vidal Roy, and any other person, respecting the change in the post-office of that parish, together with a statement of the reasons for which Mr. Vidal Roy was replaced by another

person as postmaster of that place. He said that the reasons for which he asked for the correspondence relating to the removal of the post-office and the postmaster in the parish of St. Fabien, were the following:—Mr. Vidal Roy, a respectable citizen of this parish, had been postmaster there for more than twenty-two years. That was the best proof that he had fulfilled the duties of his office to the satisfaction of the Government, and of the persons interested. He had always kept his office at the same place, that was to say, at a distance of five or six acres from the church, without there being any complaint made by the persons of the locality. This year, the Post Office Department had seen fit to order Mr. Roy to transport his office near the church. He could only conjecture at the reason for this action; but, what he knew better was, that the great majority of the parish of St. Fabien, which was favourable to him (Mr. Fiset), not to say the almost totality, had not asked for this change, and it was to please a few partisans that the Government might still retain in that locality, that this change had been made. The Ministry was certainly to blame for having acted thus. By obliging Mr. Roy to change his office, the Government, in reality, dismissed him, for the Department knew right well that it was not for \$30 or \$40 per annum, that this office might give, that Mr. Roy would consent to rent, outside of his own house, another office, where he would have been obliged to be continually present. At the same time the Government were depriving themselves of the services of an old and tried official, who was well known, and who had faithfully fulfilled his duties, in order to accept the services of another person who might be respectable, but who was completely unknown to the Department. Those were the reasons that had caused him to move the present motion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there could be no objection to these papers being brought down, and they would be brought down. He held in his hand a memorandum from the Post Office Department, to which, in the absence of the Postmaster-General, he would call the attention of the House. It ap-

peared that the post-office was so inconveniently situated for the people who were served by it, that on the 14th December, 1878, the Post Office Inspector at Quebec was instructed to call upon the postmaster at St. Fabien, to remove the post-office to a more central position for the accommodation of the people who were served by that post-office. On the 20th December, the Post Office Inspector reported that the postmaster would remove, but asked until January to do so. On the 24th January, 1879, the postmaster asked for further delay to remove the post-office to a more convenient place. On the 24th February, the postmaster, who had promised to remove on the 1st January, stated he could not remove without considerable expense, and added, that if the matter was pressed, he must resign. Well, on the 10th March following, a new postmaster was appointed, because the late postmaster would not remove, and had stated that if asked to remove he must resign.

MR. Fiset said he desired to know if a petition had not been sent by the inhabitants of that place to have the post-office near the church.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was unable to inform the hon. gentleman on that point. He did not know anything more about it than he (Mr. Fiset) did. He had no doubt that the matter was brought before the Postmaster-General by some application or petition from the parish of St. Fabien.

Motion agreed to.

NEW BRUNSWICK'S CLAIMS AGAINST THE DOMINION.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. BURPEE (Sunbury) moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of New Brunswick and the Government of the Dominion, relating to certain claims preferred by the former against the latter Government; also, all Orders in Council relating to the same, since the first day of April, 1878. He said he had, during the last Session of Parliament, moved for all correspondence between the Government of New Brunswick and the Dominion, with regard to

the Provincial claims. It being then late in the Session, the Government had consented that the rather voluminous papers should be examined by him, and a selection made from them, such as might be thought necessary, without waiting the formality of bringing them down. He had attended to that duty. During the present Session he had addressed an enquiry to the Government, on the subject of a certain piece of road built by the Government of New Brunswick, and now part of the Intercolonial Railway, and had been told by the Finance Minister that the matter had been before the late Government, and they had not settled it, and it had also been before the present Government and they had not done so either. The inference might be that because the late Government had not attended to this matter the present Government need not do so. He did not think this was the intention of the Government, although the answer of the Finance Minister might bear that construction. He (Mr. Burpee) did not mean to stigmatise the action of either Government in the matter. Under the late Government negotiations had been entered into on the part of the Government of New Brunswick in respect of a sum claimed on account of the construction of what was known there as Eastern Extension, which now formed part of the Intercolonial. In this work the Province had expended \$400,000 on the district, understanding that when the Intercolonial was built under the Imperial guarantee it should form a part. The road was taken as a part of the Intercolonial, when hon. gentleman opposite were in power in 1869, but for some reasons, which he need not now enter into, only \$250,000 was allowed in lieu of the \$400,000 the Local Government had spent on the work. The Local Government claimed, and the people of New Brunswick thought, they were justly entitled to receive the remaining \$150,000. Since the last Session of Parliament when a deputation from the New Brunswick Government were at Ottawa, the matter had excited a good deal of interest among the people of the Province. The deputation when here had interviewed the members of the Government, and had called a meeting of the representatives of the Province, placed the case

fully before them, and asked them to urge it as strongly as possible on the attention of the Government. In the pressure of Parliamentary work it was difficult to get time for the full consideration of so large a question, but some progress was made. In regard to the claim on account of the Penitentiary, it was proposed by members from New Brunswick, and assented to by members of the Government, that, as there was a constitutional point involved, the matter might be left for the decision of the Supreme Court. The contention of the Local Government was that, under the British North America Act, this Parliament had not power to pass an Act which excluded them from sending prisoners for a shorter term than two years to the Penitentiary, as they had formerly the right to do, thus entailing upon them the cost of maintaining these short-term prisoners, in violation of the original contract between the Province and the city and county of St. John. He (Mr. Burpee) had hoped this matter might have gone to our Supreme Court for a decision, and had himself spoken with the Attorney-General of New Brunswick on the subject, who had quite agreed with this view. Since that time he believed there had been a report made by the Deputy Minister of Justice, who had decided against the claim without leaving the matter to the Court. He thought the claim of the Province on account of the Lazaretto at Tracadie had been very strongly stated by the hon. member for Gloucester, and he would not go into it, but hoped that the hon. gentleman in whose county the unfortunate class for whom the Lazaretto was kept were located, would again discuss it. These claims had been put forward in 1874, and had been discussed from time to time since that date. They had been twice referred to by the Lieutenant-Governor in his Speech from the Throne, in opening the Provincial Legislature, and had again been referred to by the Attorney-General during the Session of this year. That gentleman had stated that it was not creditable to the present Government of the Dominion, nor to the late Government, that the matter had not been settled, nor did it add to the dignity of the Local Government that they should have this, year after year, to

ask for what was their undoubted right. It had been referred to by the late Lieutenant-Governor, now the Finance Minister of Canada, in his speech from the Throne, last year, in the following terms :—

"I have caused renewed representations to be made to the Government at Ottawa concerning the claim of the Province to the sum of \$150,000, in respect of the Eastern Extension Railway. This matter was brought under the consideration of the Dominion Government, in the month of December, 1874, and no conclusion having been reached, I deemed it advisable to send members of my Government to Ottawa, early in the present Session of Parliament, to endeavour to obtain, through the co-operation of the Senators and members of the House of Commons, respecting the Province, a settlement of this and other matters. I am glad to be able to say that, with few exceptions, the members representing the Province, cordially co-operated with the members of my Government. The Provincial investment in the Eastern Extension Railway was made for a work undertaken by the Province in 1865, as part of the Inter-colonial Railway, and in view of a previous assurance of the Imperial Government that New Brunswick should not be prejudiced by commencing that portion of the work in anticipation of a final arrangement for the construction of the whole line, and that the Imperial guarantee, when given (as it subsequently was given by the Imperial Government and accepted by Canada), should cover this portion of the road. The road was subsequently adopted by the Dominion Government as part of the Intercolonial Railway, but the Province has, this far, received from Canada only \$250,000 out of the \$400,000 put into the road by the Province. There can be no doubt of the right of the Province to receive the sum of \$150,000 on this account with interest."

It was true these were the sentiments of the Local Government, put into the mouth of the present Finance Minister, then the Lieutenant-Governor, but he had no doubt adopted them, and this he (Mr. Burpee) thought afforded a favourable omen for their future success. The President of the Executive Council, who was a member of the Legislative Council, in a speech before that body, had warned the representatives of that Province in the Commons, that the people would hold them responsible for the payment of these claims. That was just before the late elections. The people did hold them responsible, and it was particularly referred to during the campaign. He was aware of the difficulties that were in the way, and he thought

the late Government may have been tardy in the matter. He did not blame the present Government yet, but he thought the claim should be settled. He agreed with the Attorney-General of New Brunswick, that it was not creditable that these matters should be so long pending. The people of New Brunswick were not asking for better terms, they were asking for justice and nothing more.

MR. TILLEY enquired, Whether it was all the correspondence from the first, or only since last year, that was asked for.

MR. BURPEE said only the papers and correspondence since last year was what he asked for. The case submitted last year by the delegates of the Provincial Government only embraced the Eastern Extension, the Lazaretto and the Penitentiary. The papers referring to those claims had been selected and brought down up to that date. But he found that the Provincial Secretary of New Brunswick, in his Budget Speech, had preferred three additional claims, namely, one share of the Fishery Award, the \$10,000 claimed as due on account of immigration and colonisation, and the continuation of the \$63,000 subsidy which had expired. He presumed there must have been correspondence between the two Governments with reference to these claims, and further correspondence with reference to the old claim which was what he required.

MR. TILLEY said he had no objection to the correspondence coming down. The only communication he remembered was with reference to their share of the Fishery Award.

MR. ANGLIN said the hon. member for Sunbury had appealed to him to say a word in behalf of the claim that the Lazaretto should be taken in charge by the Government of the Dominion. He had the honour, several years ago, to bring that matter under the consideration of the House of Commons. At the time when Dr. Taché, one of the officers of the Department of Agriculture was sent to Gloucester by the Canadian Government, at the instance, he believed, of the Imperial Government, to make an enquiry into the origin, character, and extent of that

dreadful disease, known then to exist in that part of the Dominion, he (Mr. Anglin) had the honour to obtain an Order of the House that the report of Dr. Taché, which he supposed would have been submitted very soon after the rising of Parliament, should be printed during the recess. He thought that if that report were in the hands of members, he would have very little difficulty indeed in persuading a large majority that the Dominion should do something towards the relief of the unfortunate victims of that dreadful disease, and its extinction, if possible, in that part of the country, so as to relieve the Dominion from the evil effects that must necessarily arise from the knowledge that such a disease exists in it. He had then felt it his duty to state something of its nature, and of the suffering of those afflicted with it, and to describe the character of the building and of the relief afforded. He was sorry to say that, from that day to this, the character of the building had been very little improved, possibly because during the whole time the Government of New Brunswick felt that the Government of the Dominion ought to relieve them from the obligation of taking care of the lepers. The disease was peculiar in its character, and while it was true that under Confederation the Governments of the several Provinces were obliged to provide for local charities of all kinds, it was also true that this was a peculiar and special disease such as existed in no other part of the Dominion, and he trusted never would. It seemed, therefore, to be unfair that New Brunswick should be burdened with the charge of the victims of that disease, and that it was the duty of the Government of the Dominion to assist at least in dealing with that disease. The sufferers, who were found only in a small part of Gloucester, were Acadian French. So far as he could learn, the disease first existed in Chatham, on the Miramichi River, the original victims not being French; but since it had broken out in some families of Tracadie, and to that district it was now confined. It was at first believed that the disease could be stamped out by strict regulations; the report of medical commissioners on this subject were to be found in the journals of the New Brun-

wick Assembly. An asylum or lazaretto was built on Shattuck Island, at the mouth of the Miramichi. This was destroyed by fire, and, as the greater number of the afflicted were found in the vicinity of Tracadie, the second lazaretto was built there, being a mere temporary wooden building with none of the conveniences necessary for such an establishment, none of the pleasant surroundings that ought to be provided for the poor people immured in it. For very many years they were shut up in this building, as if in prison, nay, rather a charnel house or a tomb, to live a living death, and to rot away piecemeal. They were surrounded by an enormous fence to prevent their escape, which precautions were necessary; for so horrible was the condition of things, that the most wretched inmates would be glad to fly anywhere, even though without a prospect of shelter or food, to escape from it. He remembered seeing those poor people when in that condition; many of them appeared a mass of rags and filth, and vermin, with no one to give them the attention they so much required. Those in a less advanced stage of the disease did attend, as best they could, to the more helpless. The stench was perfectly frightful; the appearance of the whole place was most revolting, that of the poor sufferers being such as to require a very great effort of humanity and kindly charity, to enable anyone to look on them, even for a moment. It was perfectly frightful to look at them, as they lay or sat up, in that establishment, with their extremities rotting away, and in many cases their faces swollen, distorted out of all resemblance to the human face divine; the cartilage of the nose rotted away, the eyes gone, the voice hollow, piping, and apparently coming from a cavern; the extremities swathed in enormous masses of bandages, saturated with fetid matter exuding from their decaying limbs. In some cases the patients were mere boys and girls from ten to twelve years of age, and some of them looked remarkably beautiful, because of the action of the disease and the fever upon them, in its early stages, giving a peculiar lustre to the eye and bloom to the cheek. On the other hand, there were some, even at this early age, whose faces were sadly disfigured, and he had seen some who, if their coun-

tenances only were seen, would be set down as being eighty years old. Some years later, a colony of ladies of the Hospital of Montreal were induced to go down and devote their lives to the care of those unfortunate patients. A miserable house, which cost ten or twelve hundred dollars to the Province, was put up for their use and attached to this barn in which the patients were kept, and they at once wrought a wonderful transformation. They were able to get the place thoroughly cleaned and whitewashed, the old beds destroyed, iron bedsteads put in, and other improvements made; so that, from that time, there had been an entire change in the whole aspect of affairs. The old building still continued there, a tumble-down, miserable structure, scarcely sufficient to shelter them from the weather in the winter season, and insufficient to afford the accommodation which ought to be provided. Those ladies served there without fee or reward, and only for the love of God. Their food was of the cheapest kind, as was usual in religious communities; their clothing was of the cheapest possible description. They cost the Province very little more than was formerly paid to the one or two women who remained about the place to do a little washing. They every day washed and dressed the dreadful sores of the poor lepers carefully, kept everything clean and neat, and were untiring in their efforts to cure the disease with all the medical assistance and skill they had been able to command; but so far their efforts had proved ineffectual. The number of inmates, however, was not so large as some years ago, and Dr. Taché was of opinion that there were symptoms of a decline of the disease, and that this was the cause of the decline in the number of patients. At one time there were almost as many as, perhaps, thirty inmates, but latterly the number was as small as seventeen; still, outside the hospital, there was quite a considerable number of persons whom it would be desirable to have within the asylum, if proper accommodation were provided for them. Some ten or twenty years ago, this place was almost out of reach. It had very little communication with the rest of the world, unless by a few small coasting vessels that traded up and down the

Gulf; but latterly, since the opening of the railroad, a spirit of activity had manifested itself throughout the whole country, and, as communication between the different parts was opened up, a desire for change had reached even those liable to leprosy. A short time ago, one of those lepers, it was said, was found in Prince Edward Island, and, a year or two ago, one was found in the United States in a very deplorable condition, and sent back to Tracadie. The Dominion Government ought, he believed, to take the entire charge of the institution, because it was so peculiarly exceptional in its character that it injured the reputation of this country as a place for settlement if this disease was known to exist in it. It would be important, in that view alone, that the Dominion Government should provide for, if possible, the extinction of this terrible disease, and relieve the Government of New Brunswick of a very serious charge. Although the institution was so wretchedly insufficient, yet the support of that institution entailed a heavy burden on the Province of something in the neighbourhood of \$3,000 to \$4,000 per year. From the time when first he introduced this matter to the attention of the House, he had continued to press it on the members of the various Governments, and last year, through his very earnest representations and constant efforts, he succeeded in obtaining from the late Government a grant of \$1,500 to be employed by the ladies in charge of the hospital to promote the welfare of the inmates, and provide those comforts or absolute necessities, which, under the present state of things, were not otherwise provided. Even with that grant the lepers were in a state which was not creditable to the Dominion. Although the Act of Confederation did not impose on the Dominion Government the duty of providing asylums and hospitals for ordinary diseases, it nevertheless imposed on it the duty of providing for quarantine, of guarding against the spread of disease under certain circumstances. He had hoped Dr. Taché would have been able to discover the origin of this disease, but he was afraid he had entirely failed. There was nothing in the climate, soil, condition of the people of that part of the country, or in the quality of

their food, that could account for the existence of the disease. This disease had existed there now for some forty years or more, but for many years past had been confined to comparatively few families. Naturally enough, people of sound health would not intermarry into families in which there was any trace of the disease, and this, probably, was the reason why it had not extended more widely. But while Dr. Taché was at first of opinion that this disease was not contagious, he had since changed that opinion materially. Only one who saw lepers in the last stage of the disease, would ever imagine how great is the responsibility which rests upon those whose duty it is to do whatever can be done to extirpate that frightful disease, or to prevent its spread, if it cannot be extirpated.

MR. BUNSTER said that the danger of leprosy would exist in British Columbia so long as the Chinese were permitted to enter that Province. He fully sympathised with the hon. gentleman in his remarks on this loathsome disease, and the necessity for stamping it out by the most stringent measures, and he desired to call the attention of the Government to the fact that unless the Chinese were excluded the disease would extend in British Columbia.

Motion agreed to.

LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT CAPE BEALE,
BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. BUNSTER moved for copies of all papers and reports in relation to the appointment of Mr. Cox, keeper of the lighthouse at Cape Beale, and of all complaints against said lighthouse-keeper. He said it was his painful duty to protest against the injustice done his district, through the appointment of an incompetent man to take charge of the lighthouse at Cape Beale. The charges against that individual had been many and serious, but, strange to say, had been condoned by the late Government, and therefore, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not like to interfere. It was not creditable, to either the late or present Govern-

MR. ANGLIN.

ment, that neither had taken active steps to remove this incompetent person. The man whom he, as representative of the district, had recommended, unfortunately, had a great sin against him, that he was a Catholic. He could scarcely believe this at first, but became pretty well convinced so; hence the late Government appointed a person who was not at all capable of doing the duty, as the papers would prove. The light had been left for days without being lighted. When he named a competent man to the late Government, they said: "Bunster is not a supporter of ours," and referred it to a person who was in Victoria; and he appointed a man totally incapable of taking care of the light. This would be established by the papers when brought down, and if the distance did not preclude it, he would have witnesses brought here who would astonish this House, with the way in which they could prove that lighthouse was managed. The very first person whom he recommended was recommended by all the representatives from British Columbia to act as one of the Indian Commissioners in British Columbia. For a year the Government had it under consideration; but the Hon. Mr. Blake came into the House, and he had a friend whom he recommended, and his influence being greater than that of the whole British Columbia delegation, he got his friend appointed. There was strong feeling about this appointment, and he hoped, in common fairness and justice, the Government would bring down the papers, and show what charges had been unfairly condoned by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

SIR A. J. SMITH said Cox was appointed to the lighthouse at Herron's Island. He held that position as lighthouse-keeper until he (Sir A. J. Smith) left the Department. Some time in the previous spring a complaint was made against Cox, a copy of which he directed should be sent to Cox himself. He had no recollection of having received any answer from the lighthouse-keeper, but, at all events, he did not condone any offence of this man at all. He sent the charge to him, and required an explanation which he had not received, but his successor might know something about it.

If this light was not lighted for weeks at a time he knew nothing about it. The complaint was made in June last.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said there could be no objection to bringing down the papers, which could speak for themselves. His hon. friend was entirely mistaken in saying that this matter did not come before him. One of the charges preferred against this man was that he was in the habit of getting intoxicated and neglecting his duty. Another charge was that the revolving light was a fixed light during the whole of one night. When asked about it, he made the statement that the agent had told him that it would be better to allow it to remain as a fixed light. The agent entirely denied this, but Cox repeated his statement. During the hon. gentleman's (Sir A. J. Smith's) time he condoned this offence, and sent out a caution to this man, telling him in future to be more particular, and see that his light was properly kept. Other charges had been made against this man, but, his former offences having been condoned by the late Minister, he did not go into them again.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he thought the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was quite mistaken. There would not have been time for some of these complaints, at least, to reach him (Sir A. J. Smith) before he left the Department. It might be that the deputy at the head of the Department had written to this man, and cautioned him.

MR. BUNSTER said he was satisfied the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been made acquainted with charges against this man. It was quite natural for him to deny the charge of drunkenness. He (Mr. Bunster) could bring before this House evidence to substantiate his charges. Furthermore, he was informed that the late Minister did condone the offence, and that the papers would show it.

Motion agreed to.

WRECKING AND COASTING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. BUNTING, in the absence of Mr. STEPHENSON, moved for copies of all

correspondence in possession of the Government, received from all sources, since 1874, relating to wrecking and coasting in Canadian waters; reciprocity with the United States in these matters, together with the report of Mr. John Lewis, to the Minister of Customs, which he was authorised to make, with respect to wrecking and towing, etc., in Canadian waters.

Motion agreed to.

FRENCH COPIES OF THE TARIFF.

REMARKS.

MR. CASGRAIN said that he had placed on the Orders of the Day a notice of motion, in order to procure for himself, as well as for the other Quebec members, copies of the tariff in French, for distribution in the different counties, whilst the tariff was being discussed. This request which he had made at the beginning of the debate on this question, had been partly complied with, inasmuch as French-speaking members had since obtained a certain number of copies. But he could not allow this motion to pass in silence, and without remarking that it was by special request, and thanks to the kindness of Mr. Speaker, that he had been able, at the time, to procure ten copies of this tariff. No doubt it had been thought that members could dispense with French copies, just as the House could dispense with French Ministers, seeing that at this moment there was not one of them present. Under these circumstances, he would not insist upon his motion, since the object he had had in view had been partially attained. He would, therefore, consent to withdraw the motion. If he had made this request, it was in order to satisfy his constituents, whom he desired to consult, and he could state, as a matter of fact, that this tariff had been discussed in a great measure, without members having copies thereof to communicate to their electors. Now that the hon. the Prime Minister had promised that copies would be obtainable as soon as the tariff was reprinted, he desired to reiterate his request, that there should be copies in French. He would like to know whether the hon. the Prime Minister would give an answer to that question.

SIR JOHN A MACDONALD said he knew that orders were given that the tariff should be printed in a separate form, to a considerable extent, and that it should be printed in French as well as English. Whether the exact number of 650 was ordered, he could not say, but he believed there was a large edition of the tariff printed in both languages.

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

BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MCINNIS moved for copies: 1. Of all papers and documents, including specifications, relating to the construction of the British Columbia Penitentiary, from November, 1874, to September, 1878; 2. The minutes made by the Inspector of Penitentiaries on his visit of inspection, in September last; 3. The amount paid Mr. John Kirckland, late inspector of the building, for taking care of Penitentiary from December 1st, 1876, to September 27th, 1878; 4. A detailed statement of prices paid Mr. James Cunningham, of New Westminster, B.C., for stoves, etc., from completion of building in November, 1876, to 1st January, 1879; 5. The leasing of water frontage of Penitentiary grounds to Messrs. Cunningham and Holbrook, for fish-curing purposes, for a term of ten years. He said he moved for these papers for the purpose of bringing to the notice of the House, what he believed to be one of the worst pieces of jobbery that had taken place in this country for many a day, and which he sincerely trusted never would be repeated. In the summer of 1874 tenders were called for the construction of British Columbia's Penitentiary. In the fall of the said year the contract was awarded to Messrs. Kinsman and Styles, of Victoria, B.C., for the sum of \$149,000. The building was completed the last of November, 1876, according to the terms of the contract. The local engineer, Mr. Pierce, in selecting the site he did—disregarded the instructions he received from the Dominion Architect. The plans, specifications, and a sketch of the ground were sent to the local engineer, with the instructions that the building should be placed on the summit of the

MR. CASGRAIN.

hill, or table land, some fifty yards further back from the river than where it now stands. Instead of carrying out the instructions of the Chief Engineer, the local engineer took it upon himself to select a site some fifty yards further down on the side of a steep hill. The hill was so steep that fifteen feet of dirt had to be removed from the upper side before the first stone could be laid for the foundation. Owing to the large amount of surface water, especially during the rainy season, rushing down the steep hill, and the defective drains, the foundation was fast giving away, and now he was informed that the local engineer recommended a retaining wall to be built of from four to six feet thick, all around the Penitentiary up to the windows of the first story, in order to save the building from collapsing. Every drain in connection with the building was defective. They are, or rather were, intended to be what was called blind drains, and he assured the House they have succeeded admirably well—at least, as far as the name was concerned, for they are thus blind—choked up, and scarcely a drop of water can percolate through them. The outer walls of the building were constructed of a very superior quality of native free stone, with which he had no fault to find; but he regretted to say he could not say the same of the inner walls, which were built of what the contractors, the inspector of the building and local engineer were pleased to call brick, and for the want of a better name he supposed he would have to call them brick, too. They were little, if any, better than sun-dried clay. They were so soft that a person with an ordinary pocket knife could cut out half a dozen in almost as many minutes. They were fast crumbling away and the plaster falling off. Owing to the lower story being more under ground than otherwise, the plaster on the first two flats, especially in the lower story, was quite wet and dead. It had never dried, and he believed never would dry, and there was nothing left but to replaster the walls. He was credibly informed by some of the most reliable mechanics employed in the construction of the building, that there was great danger of a complete collapse of the building, on account of the inferior quality of the mate-

rial used. The wood work was on a par with the brick work. He was informed that the lumber used in the building was growing in the forests of British Columbia six months before it was used. At all events, the lumber was unseasoned and ought never to have been used in the raw, green condition in which it was. Every board on the floors was from a quarter to half an inch from its fellows, and it was impossible to scrub the floors without the water running through and ruining the plaster of the ceilings beneath. A number of the mantel-pieces and frame-work round the chimneys in the officers' quarters, fell down before the building was occupied two months. The local engineer recommended that either the present floors be taken up, or that the new ones be laid over those already existing. The only means of heating the convict portion of the Penitentiary was by one small stove. There were three other stoves there, but they could not be used, as there was only one chimney, the flue of which was only nine inches square, and into which the local engineer directed that four stovepipes—leading from as many stoves—were to be inserted. As a natural consequence, the whole building was filled with smoke, and the fires had to be discontinued in all the stoves but one. The three unused stoves still remain in their places—as so many monuments of the wonderful ingenuity of our engineers in endeavouring to pervert the immutable laws of nature. There were two very necessary closets in the building, which, from a sanitary point of view, could not be too strongly condemned; suffice it to say they were unprovided with valves, and disinfectants had to be used continuously in order to prevent an outbreak of typhoid fever. In the basement, and many other portions of the building to which prisoners had access, the windows were unprovided with bars necessary to prevent escapes. To show that he had not coloured his statement in the least, he would read a few clauses from the report of the Inspector of Penitentiaries for the past year. It was as follows:—

"This Penitentiary has been built on precisely the same plan as the one in Manitoba.

"A sad mistake was made in selecting the site. The building should have been placed

on the table-land, instead of on the side of the hill, where it serves as a dam to oppose the progress of the water, which, in the rainy season, percolates the gravelly soil in volume. The consequence is, the walls in the foundation and in the several apartments in the basement, including a range of cells, are so saturated with moisture that the plaster has become dead and must be replaced.

"The defects noticed in the Manitoba Penitentiary are still worse in this institution.

"Here, likewise, an engine or furnace room is likely to be a useless appendage for some time to come, as there are no appliances leading from it for heating. All the stovepipes from the prison proper and the drying room lead into one narrow chimney, the only one provided for all the stoves required to heat the corridors surrounding the cells, the basement, dormitory, and the drying room. The solitary chimney not being of sufficient capacity, there remains the alternative of discomfort from blinding smoke or piercing cold.

"The brick work in the interior is of the worst description, not having been properly burned, if burned at all, for it is said they were baked in the sun, the bricks are mouldering already.

"The flooring, doors, surbases and wood work, generally, are of unseasoned timber. The shrinkage is so great that it will be necessary to either replace the flooring to a large extent, or take it up and relay it anew. The tongue has so far parted from the groove as to render the use of soap and water for scrubbing purposes a process not to be attempted, unless to the irreparable damage of the ceilings beneath.

"A large number of windows in parts of the building to which convicts have access have been left unprovided with iron bars to prevent escape. Those windows that have been protected are very insecure, because the bars have been inserted in wood."

He had next to call attention to the fact that the entire water frontage of the Penitentiary grounds were leased some years ago to Messrs. Cunningham and Holbrook, of New Westminster, B.C. He found, on reference to the Penitentiary Act of 1875, the following. In section 16, it provided that:

"Every Penitentiary now established, and every Penitentiary hereafter to be established by virtue of this Act, shall be held to include all carriages, waggons, sleighs, or other vehicles for land carriage, and all boats, scows or other vessels for water carriage, being property belonging to such Penitentiary, or employed by hire or otherwise in its service; and likewise any wharf at or near the said Penitentiary, although not within the limits mentioned in the proclamation establishing the same, but used for the accommodation of such craft, when so employed in or about any work or labour connected with such Penitentiary."

And in section 6 of the same Act, it provided that :

"No raft, boat, vessel or craft of any kind, shall moor or anchor within 300 feet of the shore or wharf bounding the lands of any Penitentiary towards any lake, arm of the sea, bay or river, without the permission of the Warden thereof being first had or obtained; and any person violating the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof before a Justice of the Peace, be subject to a penalty of twenty dollars, to be levied in the usual manner upon such raft, boat, vessel or craft, in whomsoever the property thereof may be, as well as on the offender's own goods and chattels; and in default of payment of the same with the costs of suit, he shall be imprisoned at hard labour for a period not exceeding two months."

This water frontage was leased at a nominal sum for some few years, and to no other than Mr. James Cunningham, who was then a member of this House, and an unconditional supporter of the late Administration. Thus, the law could be violated with impunity, in order to confer a favour on a political friend. This wharf and entire water frontage being in the hands of Cunningham and Holbrook, consequently, if any coal or supplies were landed there for the Penitentiary, it was landed subject to the will or whim of Messrs. Cunningham and Holbrook. There was just another point he desired to call the attention of the House to. This building was completed in November, 1876. It remained unoccupied to the 27th of last September, a period of 22 months. From November, 1876, to September, 1878, not one dollar was expended in putting the building or grounds into a condition fit for occupation. During all that time the Government was paying 75c. a day for every prisoner in the jails of British Columbia, who were qualified, and ought to have been in the Penitentiary. He regretted to say that the jails were crowded all the time, but he was happy, in another sense, to say that only one-fourth of the prisoners were white men, one-fourth were Indians, and the remaining half were the miserable Chinese. They heard a little about those physical and moral lepers the other day—but half was not told. He would take the liberty of saying then, that the Chinese were a curse to British Columbia, and to every country in which they gained a permanent foothold. When it was taken into consideration that more

than one-half of the prisoners in British Columbia were Chinese, and that only one-fifth of the population were Chinese, exclusive of Indians, it would give the House a pretty good idea of the peculiar traits of the Chinese character. He thought it would be wise, if for no other or higher purpose, to check the immigration of this undesirable people, and thereby save the cost of their maintenance in the jails and penitentiaries of the Province. In the twenty-two months he had referred to, the Dominion Government had paid to the British Columbia Government, at the rate of 75c. per head, \$14,075. To the late inspector of works, who was appointed to take care of the building during the same period, at the rate of \$3.50 per day, amounting to \$2,345. This he considered was a great injustice to the prisoners and his district. In view of the facts he had given, and the imperfect manner in which the Penitentiary was built, in the first place by the local engineer disregarding the instruction of the chief engineer, the building was not erected according to the plans and specifications, and material was used contrary to what was laid down in the contract. He claimed it was the bounden duty of the Government to dismiss such an officer. He contended that it was in the interest of the Government, and the Province of British Columbia, that that course should be adopted. He (Mr. McInnes) had come to the conclusion that either Mr. Pierce was incompetent to fill the position he occupied, or was on extraordinary good terms with the contractors. He thought the papers, when they were brought down, would corroborate the whole of the statements he had made.

MR. TUPPER said he did not intend to follow the speech made by the gentleman, further than to say that the attention of the Government was called to the defective character of this work, and there was reason to believe, in fact the Department had no reason to doubt, that there was very good evidence of the defective state of the work. He had directed that measures should be taken to ascertain exactly where the fault lay, and to have a thorough examination of the whole matter, in order that the parties

who were to blame might be properly dealt with. The works were, of course, constructed at a very remote distance from the chief architect, who was primarily responsible, and, of course, it was extremely difficult, in the meantime, to ascertain what was going on. The Government had no reason to doubt that the work was of a defective character, and that there had been a very great want of care on the part of those directly responsible for the due performance of the work.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was never more surprised than to hear the statement made by the hon. gentleman, because he (Mr. Mackenzie) never had any reason to doubt, from all he could learn from the papers coming from Mr. Pierce, that that gentleman was competent and honest. That seemed to be the general character which he had. For his own part, he never had the slightest doubt of Mr. Pierce's competency and honesty. If the hon. gentleman's statement was correct, some of the parties concerned were liable to prosecution. It was inconceivable that such a statement could be correct, without implying criminal neglect on the part of some one. He did not know what the hon. the Minister of Public Works proposed to do, but if there was nothing more important to detain the chief architect, he (Mr. Mackenzie) would suggest that he be sent there. It was difficult to know what to do, unless an experienced officer were sent to the spot. It would be far better to do that than run the risk of not having the matter properly looked into.

MR. TUPPER said he had directed the chief architect to proceed to British Columbia to investigate this matter personally, at the first moment he could be spared from his duties here.

MR. MCINNES said, in reply to the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that he was not speaking from hearsay or from rumour. He was speaking from actual knowledge of the facts. From the time the very first stone was laid in the foundation until the building was completed, there was not a week passed during which he had not been on the ground, and everything he had stated was strictly correct. He wanted to have the matter

thoroughly investigated, and, if it were not proven that he had stated the bare facts, he would admit that he had been guilty of committing an outrage on this House and on the public.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am very sorry the hon. gentleman did not mention that a year ago.

MR. MCINNES said he was comparatively a new member, and had only been in the House some twenty-seven days last spring. He had mentioned the matter last Session, though he did not know that he had gone over the whole ground. He remembered mentioning the subject about twelve o'clock one night. He had stated that it was then some eighteen or nineteen months since the completion of the Penitentiary, and urged that the building should be occupied, and he had called the attention of the then Minister of Public Works to the fact that there had not been a dollar of money expended on the building during that time. He (Mr. Mackenzie) replied that the building would be occupied just as soon as it was completed, and that there had been a large sum of money expended on the building the year previous. He (Mr. McInnes) called attention to the fact that the money was not expended during the year previous, but that the expenditure had been made two years previous, and he had stated also that it ought never to have been carried into the year 1877-78. He would also say that the hon. member for Lambton would doubtless remember that he (Mr. McInnes) asked, last Session, when the Penitentiary would be occupied, and at the same time gave notice that he would move for all papers relating to the construction of the British Columbia Penitentiary, but the House was prorogued before the notice was reached. It will, therefore, be seen that he had done all he could to bring the matter before the notice of the House last Session.

MR. ANGLIN said he remembered very well the hon. member calling attention to the fact that the building was not occupied; but he could not recollect that the hon. gentleman spoke of the character of the masonry.

MR. MCINNES said he never mentioned the character of the masonry.

MR. BUNSTER said he rose for the purpose of calling the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the character of the masonry work that had been executed under the superintendence of the Dominion officials in British Columbia. He knew, from personal observation, that the remarks of the hon. member for New Westminster, so far as the Penitentiary was concerned, were perfectly correct. The masonry in the Government buildings in that Province was perfectly discreditable, and a great injustice was done the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion, in such work being allowed to be executed. The post-office at Victoria was built of such miserable stone that the walls were crumbling to pieces, and it was a disgrace to that city. This result was owing to the want of brains and capacity on the part of the local officer in charge. The whole of the buildings erected in that Province by the Dominion Government were of very poor construction.

Motion agreed to.

NEWFOUNDLAND CUSTOMS DUTIES.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. FORTIN moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, and between the Government of Canada and any person whatsoever, on the subject of the Customs duties which the Government of Newfoundland levies on salt, barrels, etc., used in the fisheries on board Canadian vessels resorting to the coast of Newfoundland, or that portion of the Labrador coast which is within the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, and in relation to the light dues levied from our fishing vessels resorting to the said coasts. He said it had been stated, inside and outside of the House, that Canada had been rather unfortunate in her commercial relations with foreign countries. As it was now, they could not trade with France, Spain, the foreign West Indies, Brazil, and other foreign countries; but it seemed to him that at least they should be able to have satisfactory commercial relations with the neighbouring colonies. It was a fact, however, that Canada's

MR. McJINNES.

trading relations with the other colonies were not at all satisfactory, and had been so for a good many years. He brought in this motion not only in his own name, but in the name of many sufferers in the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. When he explained his reasons, he had no doubt but that the Government and this House would be convinced that measures should be taken in order to have the grievance redressed. He was going to speak to only one part of the motion, that relating to the lighthouse dues levied on Canadian vessels in Newfoundland. The lighthouses built on each side of the Strait of Belle Isle, on the coast of Newfoundland, and on the coast of Labrador, which is under the jurisdiction of that colony, belonged to the Dominion, and cost nearly a quarter of a million to build them, and their maintenance may reach the sum of \$20,000 yearly. There were five lighthouses, one each at Belle Isle, Forteau, Crane Island, Cape Norman, and Point Rich. Besides, Canada contributed to the maintenance of Cape Race and Cape Bay lighthouses. Canadian vessels, in going to or from Newfoundland, were compelled to pay light dues there, whilst Newfoundland vessels were allowed to enter Canadian waters without paying any light dues. One would expect that as these lighthouses were maintained by the Canadian Government, that Canadian vessels would be admitted free. But it was not the case. They were charged 25c. per ton. If any person doubted this, he would read a receipt from one of the collectors on that Island. It was as follows:—

"NEWFOUNDLAND.

"Received of Antoine Joncas, Master of the Schooner *Maria*, from Montreal, (burden, per register, 89 tons) twenty-one dollars and fifty cents, on account of light dues.

(Signed), "WM. P. TAYLOR,
"Sub-Collector.

"Custom House, Flowers Cove,
"21st June, 1878."

This was a vessel from Montreal which happened to go for shelter, in order to save the vessel and crew, and the moment the collector saw her, he compelled the master to pay \$21.50. It was not fair play that Canadian vessels should be compelled to pay those dues when

the Dominion Government maintained those lighthouses. The trade relations of Canada with Newfoundland were not at all satisfactory. That was not the National Policy nor Protection. The case referred to was that of a vessel of 89 tons. Supposing a Montreal trader of about 800 tons happened to be caught in a gale in the Straits of Belle Isle, and was obliged to make for a port in Newfoundland, she would have to pay \$200 for light dues. He did not intend to speak just now on that part of his motion relating to Customs dues charged on Canadian fishing vessels that touched on any part of Labrador, which was under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, as he expected to receive papers which would illustrate the matter. Whilst Newfoundland injured Canadian trade in that way, what had the Dominion done? Canada had admitted Newfoundland fish free of inspection, whilst the law compelled fishermen of this country to get their fish inspected before selling or exporting it. The Newfoundland fisherman, by paying 2c. per barrel, could get his fish branded by our Fish Inspectors, without its being inspected, while our fishermen had to pay from 30c. to 60c. to get theirs inspected. What was the consequence? That their fish sold as well as ours, and only paid 2c., while ours paid 30c., and sometimes more. He did not call that reciprocity or fair play. He hoped that the remarks he had made on the subject would direct the notice of the Government to it, and that they would see that the grievances of our mariners were redressed.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said that this was a question of considerable importance to Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Gaspé had referred to one case of the charge of excessive light dues. They, in the Lower Provinces, believed that when the Canadian Government contributed so large a share of the cost of lighting the French shore of Newfoundland, that its Government had no right to charge Canadian shipping light dues. The hon. member for Gaspé was slightly inaccurate as to the charge on the Dominion for the lights on the coast of Newfoundland. He (Mr. Robertson) found that the annual amount paid by the Govern-

ment of the Dominion towards the support of those lights, and the expenses in connection with the fog whistles on that coast, amounted last year to nearly \$8,000. He could not believe it was ever contemplated by this Government that those lights should become a source of revenue to the Government of Newfoundland. Not only would it be right for this Government to ask that in future those duties be not charged, but, also, that the duties paid should be refunded. He had been credibly informed by a house engaged in the Newfoundland trade, that last year was the first instance in which its Government charged light dues to Canadian vessels entering ports on the west coast of that island, and it was a portion of the country, the ownership of which was even in dispute, between Newfoundland and the French Government. He trusted that the remarks of the hon. member for Gaspé would be considered by the Government, and that at a very early day our people interested in this trade would receive some redress.

Mr. TILLEY said that in submitting the resolution, the other night, relative to Newfoundland, he was acting after some communications with the Attorney-General of that Province, and it was distinctly understood that the arrangement which was the subject of the negotiations between the Governments of Newfoundland and the Dominion, relative to charges of this kind should be submitted to our next meeting of Parliament, and to that of the Legislature of the Island. The statements made by the mover of this resolution and the hon. member opposite (Messrs. Fortin and Roberston) would certainly engage the attention of the Government in discussions during the recess, as would also the remarks respecting the port charges and light dues.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that the lighthouse at the south end of the island was practically maintained by Canada, Newfoundland itself paying nothing. A small tax was levied on ships to pay expenses, but this Government assumed it, relieving even foreign vessels from the charge.

Mr. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he was bringing down the correspondence

on the subject. He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman as to the great wrong done the people of Canada by the Government of Newfoundland, in charging excessive light dues on vessels belonging to the Dominion, for many of those lights were maintained at its expense.

MR. MACKENZIE: Only one.

MR. POPE said that, as to the Cape Race light, they had to collect for the British Government; they did not pay the amount, some five or six hundred pounds; it was charged against vessels clearing out of the Dominion. But several lights on the coast were maintained at the expense of the Dominion Government, and yet dues on their shipping was charged by the Government of Newfoundland.

MR. FORTIN said that, on the north and west coasts of Newfoundland, all the lighthouses were built and maintained by the Government of Canada, and on the coast of Labrador, the greater part of which was under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, lighthouses had been built by Canada. Newfoundland did not contribute one cent; that was a place where they charged 25c. on our vessels.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): I think the Dominion Government supports and pays the expenses connected with two or three fog-whistles.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at

Ten minutes after

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 22nd April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMORIALS FROM OTHERS THAN
CANADIANS.

REMARKS.

MR. SPEAKER presented a memorial addressed to the House of Commons

MR. POPE.

of Canada by the Reciprocity and Free-trade Association of England, signed by John Saxton, President, by order of the Association. He suggested that it should be laid on the table.

MR. ANGLIN said it was an innovation to allow a foreign body to address this House of Commons.

MR. SPEAKER: Last year the House declined to receive a petition because it was signed by American citizens, but this is signed by British subjects.

MR. ANGLIN said it was introducing an extraordinary practice, which might be followed by extraordinary consequences. If people might address us on the subject of trade, they might address us on any other subject. We did not permit even our own people to address us except by petition.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know any procedure that regulates such a matter. I leave it to the House to decide what to do with it.

MR. HOLTON said he thought Mr. Speaker was quite right in submitting it to the House. This document was a mere letter, and, as a matter of Parliamentary propriety, he did not see how the House could receive letters unless they closed with a prayer.

MR. TUPPER: I think it would be well to let it lie on the table.

INSOLVENT ACTS REPEAL BILL.

(*Mr. Colby.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. COLBY introduced a Bill (No. 85) To repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and the Acts amending it, and to make provision for the liquidation of the estates of insolvent debtors.

Bill read the first time.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion for concurrence in item—Wheat flour, 50c. per barrel, of Resolution 11, relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from

Committee of Ways and Means, (April 9th); and the motion of Mr. Vallée in amendment thereto, (April 21st.)

MR. BERGERON said he had not intended to speak on the tariff, having confidence in the Government that introduced it; but after hearing the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from Portneuf, putting wheat and flour on the free list, he felt it his duty to explain why he intended to vote against that amendment. They were here to represent the interests of their electors, and if he asked the hon. the Premier how it was that he was surrounded by such an immense majority, the answer would be that he had earned that majority in advocating the National Policy. He might say, as many other hon. members had said of themselves in years past, that he was the youngest member in the House, but the county he had the honour to represent was one of the principal and oldest counties of the Dominion of Canada. In his election there was no question of Protection or Free-trade, because the people were so fond of Protection that a Liberal dared not put his foot in the county, and his regretted friend, the late Mr. Cayley, had been elected by a majority of 800 in favour of Protection. He would give the reasons why he intended to vote in favour of the National Policy. During the last five years a Liberal Administration had been working for a Free-trade policy, but the people of the country, although not very well educated, as had been said by an hon. member on the other side of the House, were still intelligent, and understood what was best for their interests, and came to the decision that the Liberal Administration was no longer worthy to conduct the affairs of the country. Under the late Administration they had seen trade languishing, bankruptcies numerous, many of our industries nearly extinguished, and many of our workmen obliged to go to the States to earn a livelihood. And so the people on the 17th of September, defeated the late Government, and returned to this House the immense majority of 80 members pledged to Protection. If we were in favour of Protection, we must give it a hearty support, and not a partial support, as the hon. member for Portneuf seemed inclined to give

by his amendment. We must support the National Policy all through, or go against it all through. The hon. member for Portneuf was opposed to the duty on wheat and flour, in the supposed interest of the Province of Quebec, but what if the members of the Maritime Provinces should get up and say they would not vote for a tax on wheat and flour, and those from Ontario say they would not vote for a tax on coal, and those from Manitoba should say they would not vote for anything else but a tax on wheat, where would we be then, and where would the hon. the Finance Minister be with his policy? We must not look at this great question solely from the point of view of our respective Provinces, but from that of the entire Dominion. Doubtless this amendment made by the hon. member for Portneuf, and supported by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, would afford a fine pretext for those gentlemen to go before the people and say: We voted against the taxation on wheat and flour. He heard his hon. friend from Quebec East say "hear! hear!" It was easy to say "hear, hear," in this House, but the hon. gentleman would not feel so confident if he was before his constituency, when he, himself, in the House of Quebec in 1871, advocated Protection, that is to say, a tax on foreign wheat and flour, or what we were advocating now. We must be true in this House to the National Policy and not desert it at this hour. If those hon. gentlemen replied that they were advocating cheap food for the poor, he would say that they were not consistent with their principles. If they objected to the duty on wheat and flour, why were they not also opposed to the tax on barley, on oats, tools and agricultural implements? They should not tax anything. They should go squarely against the tariff, just like the hon. member for Quebec East, who would not tax anything. He was afraid that some of his Conservative friends who were sitting on the Opposition side of the House, had imbibed some of the principles of the Liberal party, and were becoming as inconsistent as the members of that party. The hon. gentleman from Quebec East was a great Protectionist once. In 1871, in some of his eloquent speeches, he advocated Protection for his native

country; but since, he had lost those fine principles by associating with the Free-trade members on the other side of the House, it seemed also as if some of the hon. gentlemen elected as Protectionists on the 17th of September, had imbibed some of the Free-trade principles since they had been sitting on the other side of the House. He had heard it said by the opponents of the tariff that it was a selfish policy, that it was contrary to the interests of Great Britain, and that it was devised in the interest of a class merely. He was surprised to hear hon. gentlemen speak like that. He would refer those hon. gentlemen who spoke in favour of those great Free-trade principles, which they stated had made England so great and prosperous, to the speech of an English statesman, on the 11th November, 1877, in the *London Times*, whose remarks he thought would have some weight. The following was the language used by Lord Bateman:

"We cannot close our eyes to the universal stagnation of trade, whether in the mining, maritime, or agricultural industries. From one end of the country to the other there is a cry of depression. * * * Salaries must go down, and work must cease under our Free-trade policy, which has resulted in strikes, the closing of manufactories, and general distress. * * * We have tried Free-trade, and it has proved ruinous to us. Why should we persist in it?"

These were only a few quotations of a long speech against the Free-trade policy of England. This authority said it was time that England should abandon her Free-trade principles. He said: "Look at France, Germany, the United States; they all indulged in Protection." When Free-trade was thus denounced in England, it was high time that Canada, after the disastrous experience of the past five years, should adopt a Protective policy. If there was any one man who must be glad to be in Opposition, it must certainly be the ex-Finance Minister, when he looked back at the record of the past five years, and saw the state into which he had brought the country. He (Mr. Bergeron) had the greatest confidence in the present Finance Minister, and felt he must congratulate him in having successfully accomplished the immense work of condensing in one great National Policy all the wants of the different Provinces of the Dominion.

MR. BERGERON.

The farmers and the merchants in the county of Beauharnois were delighted with the tariff. The price of oats had gone up five cents a bushel there. There were in that county large manufactories, a large cotton manufactory, a paper mill, which was probably the largest on the whole continent, and cloth mills. Today the wages of the men employed in those manufactories had been raised. What did it signify to men if they had to pay more for bread, if they had plenty of money to pay for it? He had been talking but a few moments ago to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). He was just like the rest of them. They were all proud to see the National Policy. Of course, they had to vote against it on party grounds, but in their inmost hearts they were satisfied with it. The tax on wheat, he might say, he was opposed to at first to some extent, but the tax on flour he fully agreed to. If the Minister of Finance thought it wise to impose a duty on wheat because he had imposed a duty on something else in the other Provinces, which was in their favour in the Province of Quebec, they were bound to stand by him. An hon. member from Manitoba had told him that all the taxes were against them, except that on wheat, still he supported the National Policy. Those hon. gentlemen who supported the amendment said they had promised their electors not to vote for a tax on flour and wheat. Well, they had been imprudent and unwise in making such promises. He hoped these hon. gentlemen would come to better sentiments and vote for the National Policy. He was sure when he went back to his electors, they would approve of his course, because they had asked Protection on the 17th September, by 806 votes of a majority, and that was the same with the great mass of the people of Canada.

MR. PICKARD said the question had already been discussed by old politicians and young politicians, by lawyers and doctors, and professional politicians. When he first heard of the term National Policy, he thought it sounded very well, and had hoped that the Finance Minister would not forget one Province, but he had forgotten New Brunswick, and the

policy, instead of being a national, was a sectional one. The chief interests in New Brunswick were the lumber interest and the shipping interest, at which this tariff struck a serious blow. The lumber interest was most important, and, though depressed, it still made the great staple of the exports of St. John to the markets of the world. The Finance Minister had told them it was a waning industry, but no one should know its value better than he. The city of St. John, which he represented, would never have grown to its present position on the rock but for the lumber and shipping interest. That hon. gentleman had told the people the tariff would be so re-adjusted that all interests would be protected. He (Mr. Pickard) would ask in what way the lumbering and shipping interests were protected? He agreed with the opinion of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King), on its evil effect, as far as the lumber interest was concerned. The figures of that hon. gentleman had not been answered by any hon. member. There was not a lumberman in New Brunswick, or in the Ottawa Valley, but must know that this tariff would increase the burdens on that industry. He asked them to look across the river here at those piles of lumber, which had been lying there for the past four years, and to consider whether, by increasing the burden of taxation on lumber, they would stand a better chance of being removed. He entered his protest against the imposition of duties on flour, as well as all the articles which entered into consumption in the lumber trade, as well as our various other industries.

Question put, and amendment (Mr. Vallée) *negatived* on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messrs.

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Anglin | Charlton |
| Bain | Christie |
| Béchar | Cockburn (Muskoka) |
| Bolduc | CConnell |
| Borden | Coupal |
| Bourassa | Fiset |
| Bourbeau | Fleming |
| Burk | Flynn |
| Burpee (St. John) | Galbraith |
| Burpee (Sunbury) | Gillies |
| Cameron (S. Huron) | Gillmor |
| Cartwright | Gunn |
| Casgrain | Guthrie |
| Chandler | Haddow |

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Holton | Pickard |
| Huntington | Rinfret |
| Killam | Robertson (Shelburne) |
| King | Rogers |
| Landry | Ross (W. Middlesex) |
| LaRue | Rymal |
| Laurier | Seriver |
| MacDonnell | Skinner |
| Mackenzie | Smith (Westmoreland) |
| McIsaac | Snowball |
| Malouin | Tellier |
| Méthot | Thompson (Haldimand) |
| Mills | Trow |
| Oliver | Vallée |
| Olivier | Weldon |
| Paterson (S. Brant) | Yeo.—61 |
| Perrault | |

NAYS :

Messrs.

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Allison | Hay |
| Arkell | Hesson |
| Baby | Hilliard |
| Baker | Hooper |
| Bannerman | Houde |
| Benoit | Hurteau |
| Bergeron | Ives |
| Boulabee | Jackson |
| Bowell | Jones |
| Brecken | Keeler |
| Brooks | Kilvert |
| Brown | Kranz |
| Bunster | Lane |
| Bunting | Lantier |
| Burnham | Little |
| Cameron (N. Victoria) | Longley [P. E. I.] |
| Caron | Macdonald (King's) |
| Cimon | Macdonald (Vict., B. C.) |
| Cockburn (W Nthbrld) | McDonald (C. Breton) |
| Colby | McDonald (Pictou) |
| Costigan | McDonald (Vict., N. S.) |
| Coughlin | Macmillan |
| Coursol | McCallum |
| Currier | McCarthy |
| Cuthbert | McCuaig |
| Daly | McDougall |
| Daoust | McInnes |
| Dawson | McKay |
| DeCosmos | McLeod |
| Desaulniers | McQuade |
| Desjardins | McRory |
| Dewdney | Masson |
| Domville | Massue |
| Doull | Merner |
| Drew | Mongenais |
| Dubuc | Montplaisir |
| Dugas | Mousseau |
| Elliott | Muttart |
| Ferguson | O'Connor |
| Fitzsimmons | Orton |
| Fortin | Ouimet |
| Fulton | Patterson (Essex) |
| Gault | Pinsonneault |
| Gigault | Platt |
| Gill | Plumb |
| Girouard (J. Cartier) | Pope (Compton) |
| Girouard (Kent, N. B.) | Pope (Queen's, P. E. I.) |
| Grandbois | Richey |
| Hackett | Robinson |
| Haggart | Rochester |

Ross (Dundas)	Tupper
Rouleau	Valin
Routhier	Wade
Ryan (Marquette)	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Ryan (Montreal Centre)	Wallace (W. York)
Rykert	White (Cardwell)
Shaw	White (E. Hastings)
Sproule	White (N. Renfrew)
Tassé	Williams
Thompson (Caritoo)	Wright.—121
Tilley	

Item agreed to.

On item—Brooms and brushes, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. TILLEY said the duty was formerly 17½ per cent. The duty collected last year was \$8,360. It was not anticipated that any additional revenue would result from that increase; but it would increase the manufacture of those articles.

Item agreed to.

On item—Butter, 4c. per lb.,

MR. CHARLTON said he desired to enquire whether this duty was imposed for protective or revenue purposes?

MR. TILLEY: It stands just as it was before. It was for revenue and protective purposes both.

MR. CHARLTON said he wished to observe that there was no better illustration of the absurdity of imposing a duty on any article of which a surplus was exported, than this duty on butter. As the hon. the Finance Minister stated, this duty was the same as before, he would like to know whether, in consequence of this duty being enforced, he supposed that butter would sell for one farthing per pound more than without any duty? Canada exported last year 13,006,626 lb., and imported 111,557 lb., mostly into Manitoba and British Columbia. The price of butter was regulated last year, as it was this year, by the price of the market where the surplus butter was sold. Consequently, the imposition of 4c. per lb. had no effect whatever upon the price of butter in Canada. Neither would the imposition of such duties have any effect on the price of wheat, oats, barley, peas, rye, nor upon the price of any other agricultural product, of which this coun-

try had a surplus for exportation. This showed the utter fallacy of the agricultural protection afforded by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. MILLS said he had some letters from his constituents calling his attention to the fact that the price of butter had ranged as low as eight cents a pound during the last twelve months, also to the fact that the present price of pork was not at a paying figure; that the Government had promised the farmers better prices; and that the present Administration said that they were not flies on the wheel, but that they were prepared to legislate in such a way as to give good prices where there were poor prices before, and that they were going to make all classes of people prosperous by Act of Parliament. The farmers were now specially anxious that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches—those great medicine men who were going to work such a beneficial revolution in the industrial condition of the country—should provide a remedy for the present condition of things. They said they wanted not simply a protective duty that would result in nothing, but such legislation as would give them higher prices for their butter and pork—those two depressed industries of the country. The latter industry, he would, no doubt, have an opportunity of speaking about by-and-bye. The hon. gentlemen on the Government side, occupied their seats for the express purpose of usefully affecting the markets, by causing good prices to prevail where now the prices were low. The people wanted this remedy submitted. Hon. gentlemen should now bring forward those magic measures which were to produce such magnificent results.

MR. ANGLIN said that the farmers of King's County, and other counties in the Province of New Brunswick, long obtained high prices for their butter in the market of the city of St. John, but, of late years, enormous quantities of butter, some of inferior quality, had been brought down from the Upper Provinces, and prices had been reduced to such a degree that the farmers scarcely cared to make any more butter in those counties. They were dissatisfied with the prices they obtained, and they wished to be

protected against the competition of the Upper Provinces.

MR. FLEMING said he would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to the fact that he and his colleagues promised to attend to every depressed industry in the country. No industry had suffered more during the last two years than the butter industry. There had been millions of dollars lost to the country on account of this depression. Instead of additional protection to aid that industry, additional burdens had been put upon it; for example, the duty put on seed corn used for growing green fodder for feeding purposes, and also by the duty on English dairy salt. We had been competing with the Americans in the English market, and had been defeated in the contest. He asked if it was fair to make Canadian dairymen compete with the people of the United States, and, at the same time, impose these additional burdens upon them? It was a most unfair and unjust course.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he desired to call the attention of the Finance Minister to a complaint which was made on the part of certain parties now engaged in the establishment of creameries for the manufacture of butter. He was told that there were a great many persons engaged in this industry on both sides of the line, and adjacent to it, and those people desired it to be made known to the Minister of Finance the great injury it would be to them if milk were not allowed to be brought in free to the creameries on both sides of the line for the manufacture of butter. He merely mentioned the matter for the consideration of the Government. It was very desirable to give every encouragement to the manufacture of butter, which promised to be a valuable article of export. He thought that the Customs regulations could be so arranged as to allow the article of milk to come in free for the purpose of being manufactured into butter on each side of the boundary line.

MR. SCRIVER said that he had received similar representations from two or three creameries established in his county, under circumstances referred to, whose proprietors deserved to have it so arranged that milk, for the manufacture

of butter, could be brought in from the American side of the line, free of duty.

MR. TILLEY said the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) and other hon. members had called the attention of the Government to the matter, and it was under the consideration of the Minister of Customs, who would make such arrangements by which these matters could be conducted without any violation of the law. Some of these parties were interested in property lying on both sides of the line, and held farms half in the United States and half in the Dominion of Canada. No doubt means would be adopted to arrange this matter as satisfactorily as possible.

Item agreed to.

On item—Candles, paraffine wax, 5c. per lb.,

MR. TILLEY said this proposed to increase the duty on paraffine wax to 25 per cent. Formerly it paid 17½ per cent., and yielded a duty of \$81,546. As it was very probable that a large portion of the candles formerly imported would be manufactured from Canadian paraffine wax, he did not count upon any increased duties.

MR. MACKENZIE: What do you consider the duty on paraffine,—the per cent.

MR. TILLEY said it was 5c. a pound, which was about 30 per cent.

MR. MACKENZIE: The same on tallow.

MR. TILLEY: 1c. per lb. That was 30 per cent. also.

Item agreed to.

On item—Carriages, waggons, railway cars and carriages, sleighs, wheelbarrows, and other like articles, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked what was the total quantities, if the hon. gentleman could estimate them, of all these articles. They knew what was brought in under the head of carriages, etc., but there were a good many which came in under the name of the unenumerated list.

MR. TILLEY said he did not think many came in under the unenumerated list. The duties collected last year on these articles, as near as could be estimated, was \$14,952.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: That referred to carriages alone.

MR. TILLEY said there were very few other articles that came under that class. The duty was increased from 17½ to 30 per cent., and the Government did not estimate any increase of revenue from that source. It was expected that the increased manufacture of these articles of the Dominion would leave the duty at probably \$16,000 or \$17,000, an increase not worth making any reference to.

MR. MACKENZIE asked what arrangements had been arrived at with respect to railway stock, upon such roads as the Great Western, Grand Trunk, and Canada Southern, starting from Chicago and going on to New York. Were they to be made liable to a duty if built in a foreign country? As the hon. gentleman was aware, there was a matter in dispute some time ago as to the manner of levying this duty, as the railway companies claimed that it was impossible for them to continue business unless there was some mutual concession on both sides of the line.

MR. TILLEY said there had been no new arrangement that he knew of. As early as 1859, when railway communication was established with the United States, it became apparent that some arrangement should be made by which locomotives and cars connected with them should pass from Canada into the United States, and *vice versa*. Accordingly, an Order in Council to that effect was passed, and had continued up to the present time. There was no new arrangement necessary in that respect. He did not think that was what the hon. gentleman referred to. If he referred to a company on this side sending into the United States to have locomotives manufactured there, for the use of the company in the Dominion, those locomotives would be subject to duty.

MR. MACKENZIE said that frequently carriages were hitched on to a train at Detroit, taken over the bridge,

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

through to New York and left there. Now half of those carriages might have been built in the United States and half in Canada, and he knew the question had arisen whether all carriages used by the Great Western Company, upon the road of the Company, if built in the States, were subject to be seized for duty; whether, in other words, the officers were supposed to follow each carriage and ascertain where it had been built, and whether it was doing work in Canadian territory only, or occasionally passing through.

MR. TILLEY said there had been no change in the tariff in that respect.

MR. OLIVER said he would draw the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to the statement he had heard within the last day or two that American agents on the border had been pointing out to settlers going into Manitoba that all articles used for agricultural purposes were much lower on the American side than in Manitoba; and it had been stated that settlers, when they went into that Province, found out that the statement made by American agents was correct. It was stated that a set of agricultural implements cost from \$100 to \$150 more than they did on the American side, and that, in consequence of that difference, parties who had gone in there with the intention of settling had left that Province and settled in Dakota and Minnesota. The bonus of settlement, equality of soil and regulations with respect to settlement were the same on the American side as upon the Canadian side, and the difference in cost of agricultural implements had induced numbers of people to settle on the American side.

MR. TILLEY said the information had not reached him; but he doubted, supposing such were the case, that it would prevent emigrants from going into the country. They found that thousands were passing through that section of the country, and going to the North-West. As regarded their obtaining lands on precisely the same terms, he thought he had seen in the *Toronto Globe* a standing advertisement stating that land could be got in the United States for from \$2 to \$5 per acre, whereas it could be obtained in the North-West upon very different

terms indeed. Therefore, under the circumstances, and notwithstanding the great advantages which those persons experienced, according to the information the Government had, tens of thousands would probably go into that country this year, glad to get a home under such favourable prospects.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said he was quite sure that a great many people would be reassured by the statement of the member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver). They had heard, for a long time, of the enormous taxation that this tariff was to bring on the people of this country, and now they heard the complaint that, notwithstanding the American tariff on agricultural implements and all the materials entering into their manufacture, was much higher than the Canadian, the American article was sold much cheaper, and that that was to become a factor in determining the direction of emigration.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had forgotten that emigrants had to freight their agricultural implements from Ontario, nearly 2,000 miles, the cost of which had a great deal more to do with the purchases in the States than any other circumstance.

MR. OLIVER said he did not wish to complain of the arrangement in Manitoba, but to call the attention of the Finance Minister to a statement made to him by a gentleman from that Province, who saw, himself, a large number of emigrants return from Winnipeg, to settle in Dakota and Minnesota. He understood the arrangement with regard to settlement was the same as that on the Canadian side; the soil and climate, also, were much the same. If his information was correct, any arrangement that could be made by the Finance Minister to retain emigrants in Manitoba would be worthy of consideration.

MR. CASEY said he would like to know whether a duty would be levied on locomotives owned in Canada, repaired in the States, and brought here again for use. He asked this question on account of a rumour that the Canada Southern Railway, which had its headquarters in St. Thomas, intended, in future, to have

their locomotives repaired in Buffalo. If those repairs were made subject to duty, it would retain the work here.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said that the hon. member for Cardwell, instead of drawing the deduction he had, might learn a useful lesson from the duty on agricultural implements. They were very much higher in the United States than in Canada, and when people would deliberately settle there, because they could buy certain articles cheaper than under our tariff, it would be seen how onerous it was.

MR. BOWELL said that the arrangements in reference to this matter would be precisely the same as during the last five years, with this difference: it was the determination of the Government, instead of allowing the Canada Southern and other railways, which had their boats and cars in transit, repaired in the United States, and all such work done there without charging a duty, to endeavour to collect one hereafter. At present, if an American vessel received \$10 worth of repairs in Canada, she was charged a duty on it the moment she touched the American shore. It was the intention of the Canadian Government to carry out the same principle in return. It would be the same with cars and engines repaired in the States for use in Canada. There were flat cars and passenger cars of American build, in regard to which the practice had been to allow them to pass through Canada. That would still be permitted; but those brought into Canada exclusively for use, would be subjected to duty as would also their repairs.

MR. CASEY said it was rumoured that, as the Canada Southern and New York Central roads were under the same control, it was intended to have the engines of the Canadian roads re-marked as New York Central engines.

MR. BOWELL said that for years past engines passing from the one country to the other, also passenger, freight and flat cars used for carrying freight, had not paid duty in either country; that was a mutual arrangement. But it was the intention to collect in future not only duty on repairs, but to make the

roads that had the advantage of them for the last five years pay what they owed.

MR. ANGLIN said that, on Canadian roads connected with United States lines, cars and locomotives came and went continually. Was there any means of ascertaining that one of these coming into this country was to be used permanently? What was meant by the provision respecting cars built in this country, when they ran to the frontier and connected with railroads beyond the frontier?

MR. TILLEY said there was no difficulty in the matter. For instance, with regard to the European and North American Railroad connecting New Brunswick with the United States, any cars belonging to it coming into New Brunswick would not be meddled with; but if the Western Extension Company were to import cars and locomotives from Portland, they would be subject to the duty. Rolling stock belonging to New Brunswick, and of the line owned by English capitalists, passing backwards and forwards, would not be affected by the duty. They knew very well the rolling stock owned by a company, and it could easily be marked.

MR. MILLS said would it not be possible for one company to use the mark of another company? In this way American cars might be used in Canada to an indefinite extent. They had no means of determining the ownership. The cars of any one company ran all over the continent, and United States cars were used to a very much larger extent in Canada than those of Canadian companies. He did not see how the hon. gentleman was going to enforce the payment of this tax, in which he saw no propriety.

MR. McCALLUM said he saw no difficulty in enforcing this tax, which had always been enforced before. The same law that was applicable to a locomotive was applicable to a steamboat. If a boat from the United States, in any foreign port, met with an accident, she would have to pay no duty on the repairs effected to enable her to get back to that country; but if she went abroad for the purpose of repairs, she would pay $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the cost. It was the same

MR. BOWELL.

thing with locomotives or cars repaired abroad, to enable them to return home. He did not consider this Government would charge duty on such repairs. But they should charge that rate on repairs made under other circumstances, the same as the Americans charged in our case.

Item agreed to.

On item—Cement, raw, or in stone from the quarry, \$1 per ton of 13 cubic feet,

MR. MACKENZIE said there must be some mistake in the duties; there was no such thing as raw cement, and to charge \$1 per ton on stone that made the cement, was absurd. There was 128ft. in a cord of stone, and the duty would be \$10 per cord on it, which was simply prohibitory, as it was three times its price. If they were to have any mills on the frontier grinding cement, they ought to have the raw material, the stone, brought in at a very small rate. In one place 40c. per barrel was charged. Now the barrel held nearly 300 pounds. That would make $22\frac{1}{2}$ c. in one place and 40c. in the other.

MR. TILLEY said that these rates were for the purpose of the practical exclusion of the foreign article. The Americans on our frontier had been manufacturing cement, and bringing it in in an unground condition; it was brought in to be ground here. They had plenty of stone in different parts of the Dominion for this cement, and several establishments for grinding the burnt and unground article. The American establishments competed with ours. The 40c. per barrel included the barrel also, and the cement, Portland or Roman, which was imported altogether, and not manufactured here, was used for the construction of buildings and left on the 20 per cent. list. The whole duty collected on cement was \$10,000 last year. He did not expect the duty would much increase the revenue, but it would transfer the manufacture of cement, burnt and unground, from the United States to the Dominion. The only increase in revenue they expected was from the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the Portland or Roman cement imported.

Item agreed to.

On item—Cheese, 3c. per lb.,

MR. CHARLTON said this item afforded another illustration of the efficiency of the agricultural protection, or rather of the miserable humbug palmed on the agricultural community of Ontario during the late election. This duty on cheese, like that on butter, had never produced any effect as regards raising the value of cheese in the Canadian market, for the simple reason that, as in the case of butter, the country had always a large surplus to export. Last year the export of cheese reached 38,054,000lb., and the imports 88,434lb., more than half of which was used in Manitoba and British Columbia. They would find the price of cheese manufactured in Western Ontario, and the price of that made in the States, were, within a fraction, the same. The prices which governed these articles for the two countries was the price in England. We were continually exporting cheese to England, and in consequence of that, the English price governed the price in Canada. These two articles, butter and cheese, demonstrated satisfactorily the utter absurdity of proposing to benefit the agricultural classes of the Dominion, by the imposition of any duty, upon any article that was exported in excess of the imports. In the light of these facts gentlemen on the Government benches stood convicted of the fact of having used arguments that were fallacious in the last general election.

MR. WALLACE (South Norfolk) said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) knew well that before the duty was imposed on cheese, we imported it nearly all from the United States, and that the imposition of this duty created the cheese manufacture. As to the price of cheese in this country being regulated by the price in England, he denied it. The price in the English market was regulated by the production of cheese in the countries of the world where cheese was made. Competition between the sellers of cheese was what governed the price of that commodity. It was just as absurd to say the English market regulated the price of wheat, or cheese, or any other article, as to say the barometer regulated the weather. The Englishman

having to buy these articles looked around through the countries of the world where they were produced, and purchased where they could get them the cheapest.

MR. JONES said the duty was first placed upon cheese in 1865. At that time we imported from the United States nearly all the cheese used in Canada. In every corner grocery you could see cheese which had been imported from the United States. After a duty of 4c. per lb. was put on cheese, then commenced the manufacture in this country. He remembered well that a Mr. George Morton, in his county, was almost the first man in the country to start that business. Mr. Morton wrote to him in 1865, asking him to endeavour to put a duty on cheese, so that its manufacture might be started in this country. And what was the result of the duty then imposed? Now, instead of importing a large amount from the United States, we exported last year a surplus of 30,000,000 pounds of our own manufacture. We imported for our own use some 88,000 pounds of cheese, from England principally. He thought the farmers understood this question pretty well. All they wanted was our own market, since we could manufacture all the butter and cheese we wanted at home. The Opposition said it was a humbug to put a duty on these farm products, but the farmers of this country knew that it was not a humbug, and they stated so clearly at the last election, by turning out the Mackenzie-Cartwright Free-trade Administration.

MR. OLIVER said he wished to draw the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to a subject which had been discussed by the dairymen of his county. Before doing so he would like to state that whether the price in England regulated the price here or not, was a matter which had been decided long before this. The hon. the Finance Minister would admit that the price in England, where the surplus was consumed, regulated the price in the country of production. He (Mr. Tilley) had acknowledged that, and surely he was a higher authority than either the member for South Norfolk or himself.

MR. TILLEY : I said in England or the United States.

MR. OLIVER said every writer on political economy had decided the question in the same way. The hon. gentleman from South Leeds stated that the voters decided that question on the 17th September. If they understood in the hon. gentleman's county that there was no duty on butter and cheese, he had not been doing his duty toward them. The duty on butter and cheese had not been changed under the new tariff, it was the same as before. He (Mr. Oliver) had been in a good many counties and he had not found a single farmer who did not understand that there was a duty on butter and cheese. We already had a protection of three cents on the one and four cents on the other. Did that increase the price of butter to the farmers? If it did not where was the benefit of Protection? Where was the benefit of protecting this butter if it did not go into the farmers' pockets. Look at the other side of the line where wheat and oats were protected, one by ten cents a bushel and the other by 20c. Did Protection increase the price of those articles to the American farmer? If it did not, and if Protection on wheat and butter did not put more money into the pockets of the farmers, what was the use of Protection at all? It was all a fallacy. If we raised more than we consumed, the surplus must regulate the price of the whole. This principle was acknowledged by the Finance Minister himself, and, notwithstanding he was the promoter of this tariff, he (Mr. Oliver) was willing to take his opinion before that of a great many on the other side of the House. He wished to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that while he was giving Protection to the cheese manufacturer, he was increasing the cost of the cotton bands for cheese. During the last year or two the profit had been small enough without making it smaller. The duty on bands had been increased to 65 per cent. Nearly a million yards of cotton were used in the manufacture of cheese as bands; that cotton laid down in Canada cost two cents per yard, and the one cent per yard duty upon it, and the 15 per cent. *ad valorem*, raised the

price of cotton by 65 per cent. Then the price of salt was also increased. The question he wished to ask the hon. the Finance Minister was this: As the cheese industry was a young and struggling industry, would not the hon. the Finance Minister allow the farmers a drawback on these two articles?

MR. TILLEY : Certainly, any cotton wrapped on the cheese exported will be a drawback.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) said he could not see why the hon. gentlemen from North Oxford and North Norfolk held a different view now than they did last year, as there had been a duty on these articles for several years past. He was manufacturing cheese in two factories; last year they bought cotton for 2,400 cheese at 5½c. per yard. This year, a week or two ago, an agent came and offered him the same article for 4¾c. Consequently, the duty had not hurt the cheese makers. The different factories used from 12 to 15 barrels of salt per year, which were bought last year for a dollar per barrel, and which they had bought at the same price this year. A great many parties that manufacture butter do not take sufficient pains to make a first class article. Take the creameries, where they manufacture a first class article, and they got a good price for it. As for the article of salt, it was as cheap as it was last year, and they could purchase cotton cheaper.

MR. OLIVER said the cotton the hon. gentleman spoke of, was not the cotton he (Mr. Oliver) meant at all. The cotton he meant was that for cheese bandages, which cost from 2c. to 2½c. per yard, and not 4c. or 5c.

MR. HESSON said the cotton spoken of by the hon. gentleman from North Oxford cost three half-pence per yard in England, and could not be obtained in this country for 2c. per yard. Hon. gentlemen who now objected to the 5 per cent. duty on cheese, were quite willing to accept that duty five years ago, when the tariff was revised. That industry has, however, gone on steadily increasing; in fact, there was no industry in the country so marked in its progress as the cheese manufacture. He

MR. OLIVER.

believed protection of all our Canadian industries would have a similar effect.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman from East Hastings had stated that cotton had been offered him for 4½c. per yard; if he got it for that price, with the additional duty of 1 per cent., he either got it for a cent less than it was worth, or the man who sold it to him must have been selling it for less than its cost. The fact was not disputed that the duty was higher, and that was what was complained of. The price might vary from year to year. It might this year be lower, even with the additional duty, but still a duty was imposed on that particular article, and the cheese-makers had some reason to complain. It was no matter what price he purchased it at, it was a cent dearer than it would otherwise have been in consequence of this duty.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) said in the United States they manufactured what was known as skimmed-milk cheese, but in this country they did not do so. Years ago this cheese came in to compete with our cheese, and had hurt the market in this country. As far as the bandage cloth was concerned, "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof," if we could buy it cheaper this year than last, we had no right to complain.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said the point made by certain hon. gentlemen on this (the Opposition) side of the House was this: They were told that this tariff was the fulfilment of promises made to the people, and that it was to give encouragement to depressed industries. Now, hon. gentlemen supporting the Government knew quite well that the cheese industry was in a more depressed condition now than it had been at any previous time. The reason given by those hon. gentlemen to the farmers was that it was because Mr. Mackenzie and others were in power. Those hon. gentlemen were here to-day, not one of them rising in his place and demanding increased protection for this struggling industry, but every one of them were voting extra duty upon articles used in its manufacture. The hon. member for South Leeds said that the farmers of this country understood the question on

the 17th September; he could tell that hon. gentleman that they knew a great deal more about this question now than they did last September; they would know also that on one of the articles on which it was at all possible to give protection, this Government had failed to do it. When the hon. member for Stanstead made his very able speech on the wool question, he pointed out that the wool growing industry would be utterly ruined, unless there was a duty on wool. Hon. gentlemen cheered that sentiment, and they also cheered the sentiment this Session, that there would be no duty on wool. They had attained power through these promises, and had a right to do what they said they would do, and give protection to the cheese industry and raise the price of that article. It was no use for them to say they could not raise the price of cheese. They could do it, and that without adopting a principle more iniquitous than the one they had adopted already. They could raise the price of cheese by buying up all there was in this country, and holding it at a higher price. That proposition was not one iota more ridiculous than the whole ground on which they were proceeding, in reference to this tariff. He agreed with the hon. member for North Norfolk, (Mr. Oliver) that there were no two items which showed the utter fallacy of putting taxes on barley, oats, wheat, rye, and other articles more than the duty which for years had been imposed on butter and cheese. That duty was utterly impotent to raise the price of these articles one iota, because we had a surplus which we exported, and the prices obtained for which regulated the prices here, irrespective of the duty.

MR. TILLEY said, if hon. gentlemen on his side of the House wished for any evidence beyond what they already had, as to the justice and the wisdom of the proposition now before the House, and of the tariff generally, they would have it in the feeling manifested by hon. gentlemen opposite. Had the Government submitted a proposition which could not be sustained, instead of indulging in angry declamation, those hon. gentlemen would have beamed with delight, but it was because it was so equitable and just that they were so

terribly annoyed and excited. What was the fact? This was one of the articles, which, in examining the list, the Government thought was amply and sufficiently protected. One would suppose, from the speech of the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat, and others that this duty was a perfect outrage. If such was the case, why was it allowed to remain on the Statute-book for five years, during the term they were in office? If it did not increase the price of the article, why was the duty allowed to remain there? His hon. friend from Brant censured the Government because they had not increased the duty on butter from four cents, and on cheese from three cents upwards. To-day those duties averaged something like forty per cent. on the value. Was not that sufficient?

MR. PATERSON: No.

MR. TILLEY: There was something like eighty per cent. on paraffine oil, and 200 per cent. on crude oil. Those the Government did not disturb. While these hon. gentlemen said forty per cent. was not sufficient, they wanted to create a feeling in a portion of the country that their interests were being neglected. These duties, when compared with those on other agricultural articles, would be found equal to, if not above the great proportion of duty imposed on other articles. Last year \$4,462 was collected from butter, notwithstanding the low price, and \$2,653 was collected on cheese, notwithstanding its low price. The disappointment felt by hon. gentlemen opposite was due to their consciousness that the proposition was a just one.

MR. MILLS said the Opposition did not complain that a higher tax was not imposed on butter or cheese, but simply pointed out the fact that the representations of the Finance Minister were not likely to be verified. Those two articles were put forward as an evidence that the tax on an article of which we produced a surplus could not in any way protect the producers. The hon. gentleman knew that the price of butter and cheese would depend on the market in which our surplus production was sold. There was a larger tax imposed in the United States, and yet the prices there ranged as low as,

MR. TILLEY.

or lower than here; so that legislation of this sort would not increase the prices. Why did the hon. gentleman not make an honest attempt to fulfil his promises? He did not say he was going to impose further restrictions on articles which came into competition with those we produced, but that he was going to adopt such a legislative policy as would secure good prices and a home market. This proposition was not a fulfilment of that pledge. Hon. gentlemen opposite had told the farmers that the reason they did not get higher prices for their butter and cheese was because the necessary legislation was not had. Was the hon. the Minister of Customs the fly on the wheel in this matter? He called on the hon. Minister to propound a policy which would give the farming population better prices for their butter and cheese. This was simply a re-enactment of the old tariff.

MR. BOWELL said, so far as his section of the country was concerned, these two articles were given as an illustration of what a Protective duty had accomplished in the interest of the farmer. In every instance it was pointed out that, since a duty of three cents per pound had been imposed on cheese, its production in this country had marvellously increased. In 1860 when cheese was admitted free, we exported but \$3,000 worth, and in 1867, after the duty was imposed, we exported to the value of \$193,544, of which, however, \$8,144 was the value of American cheese shipped in bond. The exportation of Canadian cheese last year, amounted in value to no less than \$3,997,000, showing that the increase in the production had been marvellous since the imposition of the duty. The argument used against the late Government, in discussing these items, was that had the same policy been pursued upon all other articles as had been followed in reference to cheese, the production of those other articles would have increased in like ratio, and the stagnation of trade in the country have been averted to a very great degree.

MR. FLEMING said he rose to correct a statement made by the Finance Minister that he (Mr. Fleming) was in favour of higher duties on butter and cheese. No; that would do no good.

He would prefer that the duties were taken off, they served no purpose, unless to furnish manufacturers with a plea for increased Protection for themselves. Protection to the farmer was nothing but a bait held out with the view of placing him in a position where he could not consistently oppose the manufacturer's demand. This was the case in the United States; the American farmers had been fooled into this kind of Protection. What benefits did they get from the duty put on Canadian wheat? While these were his own sentiments, he (Mr. Fleming) had a perfect right to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to be consistent with their own professions. They professed to be able by increased Protection to give assistance to the depressed industries of the country. The butter and cheese industries were depressed industries, but there was no increased Protection for them. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) claimed that the increased duty put upon cheese a few years ago caused the erection of the cheese factories in the country. What was wanted now in the butter trade was the erection of butter factories. If the hon. gentleman's argument was good, he ought to advocate an increased duty on butter. That industry now was in the same condition the cheese industry was in a few years ago. Unless great improvement were made in the manufacture of Canadian butter, it would be swept out of the English market as an article of table use. The only remedy was the creamery system, as in the United States. Instead of the present policy being favourable to that system, it placed obstacles in the way. The agriculturists of the country were beginning to open their eyes to the false promises made to them, by means of which hon. gentlemen opposite had got into power. The farmer was beginning to see that he had been simply used as a cat's-paw to pull the nuts out of the fire.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he wanted to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Customs to a fact in accordance with his own argument. When there was no duty on butter, butter was 20c. a pound. Now the average price of butter was 10c. a pound. It was necessary,

therefore, in accordance with the hon. gentleman's argument, that they should go back to the old times, in order to make butter worth 20c. a pound. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones) had said there were no manufacturers of cheese in the country in times gone by. He (Mr. Cartwright) appealed to every hon. gentleman if every farmers' wife in the country was not engaged more or less in the manufacture of cheese. The introduction of the factory system of making cheese into the United States undoubtedly preceded the introduction of the system into Canada a short time. For a short time there was an importation of factory cheese into Canada, but the moment the Canadians woke up and understood what the Americans were about, they commenced making factory cheese for themselves. They afterwards became competitors with the Americans in English markets, as they would have done whether there had been a duty of 3c. or \$3 on cheese. They wanted the application of the same principle of drawbacks which was so liberally extended to other manufacturers, applied to the manufacture of cheese. They required a drawback on the bandages, the increased cost of the manufacturing implements, and other things which entered into the manufacture of cheese. It was only by granting this that hon. gentlemen could really promote the interests of the farmers of Canada.

MR. BOWELL: Will the hon. gentleman inform me what articles are imported that are used in the manufacture of cheese?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the bandages were imported, and the cost of manufacture was increased by the increased cost of the various articles used in the manufacture of it.

MR. ALLISON said he had an extract from a speech of the hon. member for Centre Huron, which he would read to the House. Speaking, no doubt, with an eye to the approaching Ontario elections, he said:

"The working man above all will feel the heavy duties. The price of farm produce will rise, and he must pay the increase. His loaf will be all the dearer, and his pockets so much the lighter."

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Where did you find that? The hon. gentleman has put in my mouth words I did not use. It is a dishonest and disingenuous trick.

MR. ALLISON said he thought he would be able to remind the hon. gentleman of the occasion on which he made the statement.

MR. TILLEY said, with reference to the article that appeared in the London *Times*, referred to by the hon. member for Centre Huron, he had no doubt it was inserted by some emissary or friend of the hon. gentleman. When he submitted a proposition for the consideration of Parliament, it was not a question with him as to what they would say in England in reference to it, but what the people of Canada would say in reference to it.

Item agreed to.

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

After Recess.

On item—Clocks, and parts thereof, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said this, he presumed, was a prohibitory duty. He could not, however, see any sort of use in imposing this tariff for the sake of one or two paltry manufactories.

MR. TILLEY said the amount of duty received last year on clocks was \$12,263, and it was estimated that this duty would give an increase of \$5,000. There were some manufactories in the country, the principal one being at Hamilton. This tariff would, no doubt, increase the production of that establishment, and probably might lead to the establishment of others.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: That is, the public will be charged \$12,000, and the additional revenue will be \$5,000.

MR. TILLEY said the price would not be increased. He had a statement in his hand which said that Canada-made clocks were sold wholesale at New York prices. Mr. George Lee said: "We have made no advance in price since the duty went on, and we do not intend to."

MR. ALLISON.

Hon. gentlemen would see that it was not intended to increase the price.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Where will you get your additional revenue?

MR. TILLEY: From the importation.

MR. MACKENZIE: That will not continue.

Item agreed to.

On item—Coal, anthracite and bituminous, 50c. per ton of 2,000lb.,

MR. TILLEY said, as he had stated before, the amount of anthracite coal imported last year was 406,971 tons, bituminous 487,827, making a total of 894,798. It was estimated there would be imported, on which duty would be paid, next year—this was an approximate estimate, and the actual importation might be over or under—350,000 tons of anthracite coal, producing \$175,000; and 200,000 tons of bituminous, producing \$100,000, making a total revenue of \$275,000. Then he estimated that the output of our own mines would amount to 340,000 tons or 345,000 tons.

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman tell us where this output is to go to?

MR. TILLEY said it would go to the different parts of the Dominion. He could not tell exactly where it would be placed.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then it is a mere guess?

MR. TILLEY said it was an approximate estimate, but he was satisfied it would not be very much out of the way notwithstanding. Under this proposition, Nova Scotia coal would be brought to the western part of the Dominion.

MR. MACKENZIE: How far west?

MR. TILLEY said he had no doubt a large portion of Nova Scotia coal would reach Toronto. There was no doubt, whatever, that it would be supplied to all the small towns this side of Belleville, certainly to Montreal, and Montreal would be enabled to supply a portion as far as Toronto. Perhaps there might be

a certain portion of English coal which would come to Nova Scotia. He thought last year there was about 120,000 tons, and, no doubt, a portion of that would still come out, but not more than half.

MR. MACKENZIE said that British coal was brought chiefly as ballast, on ships unable to find a cargo of general goods, and everything which took away cargoes from vessels coming to Canadian ports raised the price of freights going from those ports. And, depressed as the lumber trade was, it would be still more depressed, as the price of freights would have to be raised to compensate for the tax on vessels coming to Canada. One hundred and twenty thousand tons of coal would furnish ballast for at least 150 vessels, probably 200, and, if this tax were carried out, it would injure the trade of the country precisely to that extent. One of the greatest difficulties shipowners had to contend with was in getting return freight. Vessels going to New York necessarily had a much better port than vessels coming to Montreal.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not bring any coal back.

MR. MACKENZIE said they brought a great deal of general goods. They had a vast population at the end of their route—which this country had not—with a city containing, with its suburbs, nearly a million and a-half of people, with a large and populous country to the west, and they brought a vast amount of various classes of goods that Canadian vessels could not bring. There would be a very much larger amount of freight outward-bound if it were possible to obtain freight for Canadian vessels returning home. They would be obliged to carry gravel and other ballast which cost a great deal of labour in loading and unloading, having to go to out-of-the-way places to unload. The Government was deliberately imposing a tax upon vessels which brought coal, in order, apparently, to make freights dearer on outward-bound vessels than they were now. That was one of the evil effects of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. He would not take up the time of the House in denouncing, as he might denounce, the tax imposed as an unjust one, as one

which discriminated against one part of the country, apparently for the benefit of another—although he denied that it would materially benefit any part. It was simply an enormous tax raised from articles of prime necessity, and would to that extent increase the burdens of all those who had to use coal, and that was pretty much every one in the western cities of Canada, at least. He had only to enter his protest against the duty altogether, as one that was unjustifiable, and, as far as British coal was concerned, one that was not only unjustifiable, but mischievous, and more far-extending in its results than even the tax on that which came to Ontario.

MR. TUPPER said an ounce of fact was worth a pound of theory. He would read, for the information of the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat, what he hoped would satisfy that hon. gentleman that the fears expressed by him that this duty would not possibly promote the great coal mining industry of this country were without foundation, and that the Government had every reason to believe that beneficial results would flow from this tariff. Mr. Dobson, a member of the Board of Trade of Cape Breton, who had been interesting himself in this question, and who had furnished a very large amount of information in a compact form for the Government and the country, had just sent the following telegram to his hon. friend the member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDonald). The telegram was dated the 22nd April, 1879, from Montreal:

"We are competing with Americans for supplying gas coal at Port Hope, Belleville, Toronto and Hamilton, but by quotations received by Adams, this morning, afraid Americans will take the markets unless Government makes rebate of canal tolls. Prompt action necessary."

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) knew what a slight sacrifice it would be on the part of the Government to rebate the canal tolls which, otherwise, would be collected.

"Gas companies making contracts for the season. Tell Doull fifty thousand tons contracted for here from Pictou, against twenty-five thousand this time last year. We have contracts for twenty thousand from Cape Breton, against fifteen last year. Expect ten thousand more, and, with rebate of tolls, may get twenty-five more. Much depends on

prompt action. I want to leave town this afternoon, but will wait your reply. Do your best, it is a dead struggle at Western points, Americans are coming down in prices."

The hon. gentleman would, therefore, see, not as a matter of theory or opinion, what had been the effect upon the contracts actually made with the mine owners in Cape Breton and Pictou. He was quite certain that the hon. gentleman, with that patriotic desire which all hon. members of this House ought to feel for everything that promoted a great national industry—for coal mining was a great industry—would feel that the Government had every reason to be very much encouraged by the evidence afforded by this telegram of the beneficial effect of the imposition of this comparatively small duty. He knew that it was the opinion of a very large number of members of this House, especially a large number representing the Province of Ontario, that the Government would have attained their object completely and effectually by the imposition of a duty of 75c. a ton. The evidence of the largest coal importers in the city of Toronto went to show that 75c. a ton would not only tend to develop the whole of the coal mines of Nova Scotia, by giving them, to a large extent, the markets of Ontario, but that it would be further accomplished by the competition that would be induced between those mines and the American mines. The hon. gentleman knew that, owing to the condition of the labour market in the United States, American coal had been selling at very low prices for the last two or three years. The hon. gentleman knew that, if the prices of coal were to return to the point at which they were a few years ago—as there was reason to believe, from the improved condition of trade and business and the industries of the United States, that they would—the moment there was a return to the prices that existed a few years ago, the coal of Nova Scotia, with a slight Protection, would be able to compete successfully in the markets of Ontario with American coal. That was a result that every hon. gentleman in the House ought to view with the greatest possible satisfaction. He (Mr. Tupper) believed that the small Protection afforded in this direction would be a thousand times repaid to

all parties who would in the least degree suffer by it, if the prices of coal were slightly increased in consequence of that duty; but he believed that would not be the case. He believed that the duty of 75c. per ton, imposed by the American Government, on coals going in there, and by which the coal mining industry of Nova Scotia had been paralysed, by being shut out of that market, would be removed, in consequence of the imposition of the Canadian duty. Every hon. gentleman knew that that duty of 75c. a ton on Canadian coal going into the markets of the United States was imposed for the purpose of protecting American coal owners against the competition of Canadian coal, and the moment that the coal mine owners of Pennsylvania found Canada adopting similar measures, which they would find were going to stimulate Canadian industry, and to displace the products of their mines in Canada, it would become their interest to remove their duty of 75 per cent., and the duty on the Canadian Statute-book would be a declaration that, the moment they reduced their duty upon the coals of the Dominion, the moment they returned to the natural and rational principle that prevailed before the imposition of that duty, they knew that Canada would take off this duty on American coal coming into Ontario, and the Americans would then have the liberty of supplying this country to the extent of 700,000 tons, the quantity that was used per annum during the last two or three years. The Americans knew that the effect of this duty would, to a slight extent, increase the cost of coal to a certain portion of the Dominion, but that Canada would have the benefit of the quantity of American coal displaced by our own, and that it would be of immense benefit to the trade and business of the country, increase the revenue, and stimulate Canadian industry. They knew, also, that the country would have the benefit of the \$3,000,000 in gold that was sent out of this country, but which, under this tariff, would remain in Canada for the purpose of promoting wealth and carrying on the business of the country. The fact that the most influential men in this country, interested in the purchase of coal, and the great body of the coal consumers, upon

whom this tax would fall, if it was paid in the form of revenue—the fact that those parties were prepared to sustain and adopt a policy imposing this slight duty to protect this great industry was the best evidence that the fears of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) as to the bad results of this duty, were not well founded. He (Mr. Tupper) believed that the effect of this policy would be to give free coal to both the United States and Canada at a very early date. The whole object of the imposition of the duty on the part of the United States would fall to the ground the moment Canada adopted a policy similar to theirs. Then the natural result would follow that the coal mines of Nova Scotia would supply the Atlantic States, and the coal mines of the United States would supply coals to Toronto and the western portions of Canada. The result would be, also, that the industry which had been paralysed by the imposition of this duty on the part of our American neighbours, would be again revived and brought into a prosperous condition. The coal mines of Nova Scotia, in which there was something like \$12,000,000 of British and Canadian capital, must soon be destroyed, unless some means were adopted by which this great Canadian industry was to have such fair consideration at the hands of the Parliament of this country as every great industry was entitled to, and it was the desire of this Government to give it such consideration. He did not believe that there was any feature of the policy of the Government, in relation to the Protection of Canadian industries, which, when properly understood, would be more thoroughly sustained by the people, than their policy in reference to this matter. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had spoken about the effect on the importation of coal from Great Britain. He (Mr. Tupper) would say, without hesitation, if they had to choose between fostering Canadian and British industries, that they should foster Canadian industries. The hon. gentleman ought to know that, during the year that a duty of 50c. a ton was imposed on coal coming into Canada, so far from the people of Montreal and of the whole of the Province of Quebec, having to

pay an increased price, coal was sold cheaper than at any previous time. He believed that the effect of this duty would be to get free coal. But even if it did not affect the markets to any considerable extent, it would so increase the carrying trade between the Maritime Provinces and the Upper Provinces that it would provide cheap goods in both directions. Another point in relation to this industry was that over \$12,000,000 in capital had been already invested in developing the coal mines in Nova Scotia. It was well known to persons acquainted with the matter that, just in proportion as the coal mine was enabled to work up to its capacity, the cost of putting coal at the pit's mouth was lessened. The people of New Brunswick, for instance, were told that they would have to pay an increased price for coal. He denied it. Coal would be purchased more cheaply in New Brunswick with a duty of fifty cents, than if there were no duty. The miners would be able to put out their coal cheaper when they were encouraged to enlarge their operations. Suppose a coal mine had a capacity of putting out 100,000 tons per annum, whereas it now only put out 30,000 tons. The cost of management would be nearly as much for the latter as for the former quantity, but the aggregate profit on the larger quantity would enable the miners to dispose of it at a less price. The cost of producing the article itself would be considerably decreased when the miners were enabled to extend their operations. He believed that, taken in connection with the reduced cost of transporting freight both ways between Nova Scotia and Upper Provinces, would give a great stimulus to this industry. The cost of carriage, in consequence of providing for freight in both directions, would also be reduced, so that there would scarcely be any increase in the cost of coal to the consumers. He might add that the largest, the most energetic and ablest merchants in Toronto had had their attention drawn to this subject, and they had practically tested the question whether this could not be made a fair and legitimate industry between the two Provinces. The Minister of Justice had just handed him a copy of the *Toronto Mail*, of Friday last, which contained the following gratifying statement:—

"NOVA SCOTIA COAL.—Messrs. W. H. Howland & Co. have received several sample car loads of coal from their mines at Springhill, Nova Scotia. The burning qualities of the coal were fully tested in the *Mail* office yesterday, the engineer giving it as his opinion that the grade was equal, if not superior, to the best imported from America. Messrs. Howland & Co. state that they can lay this coal down in Toronto at the same price as that paid for the American article, the return cars carrying back to the Maritime Provinces shipments of flour. For house purposes this coal is on a par with that mined in Pennsylvania. Some doubt having been expressed that cars bringing coal from the Maritime Provinces could not be cleaned sufficient to ensure storing flour for the return trip, this was found, on examination, to be unfounded, not a vestige of coal dust being observable. Messrs. J. & G. Keith, of the Toronto Fuel Association, have undertaken to place the coal upon the market, and, so far, have met with gratifying success."

One of the most prominent coal dealers in Toronto bore testimony before a Committee of this House, two years ago, that he himself had imported several cargoes from Nova Scotia, and he found he could obtain 50c. a ton more for Nova Scotia coal than for the best coal he could obtain from the United States. So we should not only have the benefit of the imposition of a small duty, but we would have the advantage of using an article superior—certainly equal—to anything that could come into competition with it from abroad. He believed the House would have been better satisfied if this duty had been placed at 75c. a ton, and he was afraid they had made a mistake in not having adopted that duty. Able and extensive coal dealers in Toronto, who had gone carefully into the calculation were satisfied that a duty of 75c. would undoubtedly produce a keen competition in the markets of Ontario between the Nova Scotia and the best American coal, and he had every reason to believe that, in that competition, the Nova Scotia coal would not come out second best. He would say again that the obvious effect of this policy upon that great industry would be such as that this House could congratulate itself upon the success of the experiment.

MR. BROWN said that as he was in that business himself, he would make a few remarks. It was an experiment they were about to try, and it would be tried at the expense of Ontario. They

MR. TUPPER.

might put the duty at \$1.50 a ton, but the people of Ontario would still have to import American coal. He had tried the Nova Scotia coal and found it at least 25 or 30 per cent. inferior to the American coal. As to shipment of coal to Toronto, experience heretofore had not been favourable. He did not think they could bring coal from Nova Scotia in large quantities unless by water. It would not do to return flour and wheat in coal vessels, and they would have to find some other kind of freight for the return trip. The only coal they could use in all branches of manufacture where the smelting of iron was going on was the anthracite coal from Pennsylvania. It was also used in bakeries on account of its not smoking. That kind of coal could not be introduced from any other place except from Pennsylvania, and that coal ought to be exempted from a duty. If they taxed anthracite coal, it was compelling the consumer to pay that amount more than was necessary without benefitting the people of Nova Scotia one iota. He recollected when the Americans shut down on us in coal some time ago, they had a great deal of difficulty in Ontario to procure the right quality of coal for the use of their factories and smelting works. They had to bring it from Nova Scotia and Wales, and from England. As soon as that restriction was taken off, American coal again flowed freely and cheaply into the country. The Government proposed to put not only a duty on coal, but likewise on other articles used in the manufacture of iron, which would amount altogether to a heavy tax, and he did not see where the people of Nova Scotia were going to derive the benefit from it. He sincerely hoped that in the interest of the manufacturers of Ontario, anthracite coal would be allowed to come in free; if not, they would only have to pay that much more for it.

MR. DOULL said that, as a shipowner, he would like to say, in answer to the hon. member for Lambton, that, instead of a duty on imported coal injuring the shipping, he was of opinion it was going to benefit the shipping. Large quantities of coal were now carried out to ports in Quebec by vessels coming out for cargoes, and they took it as ballast. The

cost of its transportation in this way was consequently very little, still they had a margin of profit. But when they put 50c. on coal he thought that would destroy the margin of profit, and vessels coming out would take ordinary ballast instead of coal ballast. If the 50c. would give us an increased market in the Dominion of Canada instead of injuring the shipping, it would benefit them for this reason: If a vessel of 300 tons took a ballast of 300 tons of coal at 50c. a ton, it would only be \$150. They would now, instead of taking a ballast of coal, take ordinary ballast, and take coal at the port of Sydney at from \$1.50 to \$1.75, to Quebec and Montreal. A vessel of 800 tons would carry at least 1,200 tons of coal; that would give her \$1,800 for freight, instead of \$150. Therefore, he contended that, instead of its being an injury to the shipping, it would be a very material benefit. He regretted exceedingly that the Government had not given them a duty on imported coal that would secure for them the whole market of the Dominion. He believed that fifty cents would give them the larger part of Quebec, but if they had seventy-five cents duty they would obtain the market of the whole Dominion, without increasing the price of coal to the consumers either of Quebec or of Ontario.

MR. MACKENZIE: It has increased already.

MR. DOULL said it might have increased, but in a short time, when they had obtained the market, the price would go down gradually, and ultimately the price to the consumers in Ontario and Quebec would be no more than it was at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER: How could that be?

MR. DOULL said, as he said before, if they put out more coal they could afford to sell it for less than at present. Besides that, if they had a guarantee of obtaining the markets of Ontario they would put on a class of vessels that would carry the coal directly from the mines to the ports on the lakes at a less rate of freight than they carried it at now. The hon. member for West Hastings said that the coal of Nova Scotia was 25 per cent. inferior

to the coal of the United States. He (Mr. Doull) denied that, and he would refer him for proof to the report of a Special Committee appointed by the late House to inquire into that matter. That report stated that the Nova Scotia coal was equal to any of the bituminous coal that came from the United States, except that which came from one or two mines. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Brown) was opposed to a duty on coal, but he was willing to have a duty on flour and wheat. This was a kind of one-sided Protection that he did not believe in. If we were going to protect only one industry in the country, then we were not going to have the Protection which the country desired. He always understood that the policy of the party in power was to protect all the industries in the country. That hon. gentleman had also stated that coal could not be carried in grain vessels. He had had a little experience in that matter, and had carried both coal, and flour, and grain in the same vessel. That was done now by all the vessels in the trade, between coal ports and grain ports.

MR. JONES said it was not a question whether the coal of Nova Scotia was equal to the coal of the United States. The hon. gentleman from West Hastings complained of the quality of Nova Scotia coal. A few years ago that gentleman voted for the placing of a duty on coal, but, being a manufacturer, and using anthracite coal, he had changed his views, and now desired that it should come into Canada duty free. In the South Riding of Leeds they were mostly an agricultural people, but they had a few manufacturers, and in Gananoque, where he resided, they imported about 3,000 tons of anthracite coal a year. He, himself, used from 300 to 400 tons a year; he had before paid a duty of 50c. a ton on coal and did not feel it, and his constituents were ready to pay that duty again, feeling that this give-and-take policy would build up the industries of this country, give work to the mechanic and labourer, make a good market for our farm products, and tend to cement this Confederation from the Atlantic to the Pacific. His constituents were perfectly willing

to accept this tariff, which was not really a Protective, but more a revenue tariff, affording incidental Protection. For the best interests of this country, he fully supported it. As to the duty of 50c. a ton on coal, it was justified by the American duty of 75c. charged on Canadian coal. This policy was needed to produce the requisite revenue to make up the deficits we had had for the last four years. This proposed Canadian tariff would probably average a duty of 20 per cent. all round; it could not be called a Protective tariff, when compared with the United States tariff, which would average at least 45 per cent. Therefore, he held that the proposed Canadian tariff was a revenue tariff, but so adjusted as to assist all our industries. It was in the direction of Protection, and the duties on goods manufactured in this country would not be lessened; but upon the necessaries of life, such as tea, sugar, coffee, tobacco, etc., the duties would be lessened should we raise more revenue than was required. He felt that this policy was for the best interests of the country, and would, therefore, cheerfully support it.

MR. FLEMING said that the hon. the Minister of Public Works had stated that in 1870, when the duty was 50c. a ton on coal, its price was not increased to the people of Quebec. A return brought down to the House of Commons showed that the quantity of coal and coke carried to Quebec, from the 7th April to the 30th December, 1870, was 180,641 tons, the duty paid on which was \$93,820. Now, if that duty was paid, how did it come that the price was not raised?

MR. CASGRAIN said that coal came to Quebec in ballast in large quantities, ships that carried it coming there for timber. Therefore they bought their coal very cheap. Mr. Speaker would remember that, when the duty of 50c. a ton was imposed on coal a few years ago, it affected the trade of Quebec by compelling every passenger from that city to Montreal and back to pay an additional tax of one dollar or 50c. more on the fare each way. He did not see why they should protect so much the interest of the Lower Provinces to the detriment of Quebec. That city and Province was placed between two fires by this tariff—the coal fire burning over their heads

and the duty on flour threatening to starve them to death. That was the kind of Protection they got. He desired to enter his protest against the duty on coal as he did against that on flour, believing the people of Quebec and the shipping interest of Quebec were with him.

MR. CHARLTON said he found by looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the total importation of coal into Canada last year was 863,061 tons, of which 406,971 were anthracite, and 456,090 bituminous coal. Of that quantity there was imported into Ontario 266,432 tons of anthracite and 321,980 tons of bituminous coal, or a total of 588,412 against 277,749 for the rest of the Dominion. The Minister of Public Works read them a telegram a few minutes ago stating that the sale of Nova Scotia coal in Montreal this year was to exceed that of last year by 10,000 tons, and that with the remission of canal tolls, and other favourable circumstances, had some hopes of selling 20,000 tons more further west. For the purpose then of conferring that degree of benefit on the Nova Scotia mine owners, they were to have 266,432 tons of anthracite coal imported into Ontario, which could not be replaced by any other, and a great part of the 321,000 tons of bituminous coal brought into that Province taxed 50c. a ton. This sacrifice was to be inflicted in order to sell not more than 50,000 tons more of Nova Scotia coal. Any policy more absurd could scarcely be conceived. The Great Western Railway of Ontario consumed 60,000 tons annually, which must come from the United States, and this duty would increase its working expenses \$30,000 per annum; that loss would be made up, not by adding to the through freights, for it was engaged in a keen competition with American lines, and was obliged to accept the now prevailing rates, but by an additional assessment on the local freight, to be paid by the people living along the line. The same was the case with the Canada Southern, which would have to pay about \$20,000 additional for coal, which would have to be assessed on its local business; and the same with the Western division of the Grand Trunk, between Buffalo, Detroit and

Goderich. Their transportation lines would be similarly affected. The Beatty Line of steamers running between Collingwood and Thunder Bay and Duluth, would have to pay \$350 to \$400 a week in addition to the present cost of fuel, in consequence of this duty. They were competing with American lines, and would be hampered and injured by this policy in that competition. The tariff was a two-edged sword which cut in every direction to the detriment of Canadian interests. He saw no reason for anticipating a rise in the price of coal in the United States, but rather a decrease. In fact there had been a heavy decrease during the last four or five months, and this duty stepped in to deprive the Canadian consumer of all benefit he would otherwise have derived from that decrease. Of all the absurd features of this tariff, the imposition of the duty on coal, and especially on anthracite, was the most absurd.

MR. HESSON said he represented a Riding very far west, that must have a deep interest in this matter. He was sure that, if the coal tax fell heavily on any place, it would on his constituency. He had no idea that Nova Scotia coal would reach the county of Perth for a long time to come, unless the production and competition would be so great as to enable producers and shippers to forward it to them at a cheaper rate than was now possible. He should feel considerable anxiety about that duty, although he represented a town and county largely interested in the consumption of coal. He, himself, being a director of a gas company which consumed about 700 tons in the year, apart from the large quantity used at the Grand Trunk establishment; he, if anybody, should have felt some hesitation in voting for a tax on coal. But he could face that responsibility with a great deal of confidence, for the reason that the Finance Minister had come down with a smaller duty than he (Mr. Hesson) had expected; and he had told his electors that he expected to be called on to vote for 75c. a ton. He felt he was entirely justified in supporting this duty, and he would go further and say that, for the sake of consolidating the great interests of both East and West, it should be car-

ried. The question was not whether Nova Scotia, but whether the entire Dominion should be benefitted. This was a question of give and take, and, if the Lower Provinces should pay a duty on wheat and flour, the West in turn should reasonably be expected to reciprocate by a duty on coal. If his hon. friend opposite proposed an amendment hostile to the duty, he (Mr. Hesson) would stand by it, and defy him to go into his Riding and say he was not justified in voting for it. It was discussed everywhere in that Riding, and he had stated that, in order to get the Eastern Provinces to join the Western in this great scheme of Protection, they would be called on to support a duty of 75c. on coal, to which they had responded by sending him here. He thought their friends from Nova Scotia were reasonable in their demands, and felt perfectly justified in supporting this duty.

MR. VALIN said, as a shipbuilder, he was interested in obtaining coal at as cheap a rate as possible, but in many cases they took cargoes of coal in Sydney, and took them to Quebec with a better freight than from Liverpool, owing to the Atlantic passage, and thus far they were able to take a larger cargo to the port at Quebec and Montreal, and he believed that this duty, by giving an impetus to coal mining in Nova Scotia, would create a serious competition with the coal from England and the States, which would tend to materially reduce the price. As far as the interests of the agricultural population of Quebec were concerned, it would be an advantage to them that the energies of the people of Nova Scotia should be directed in the channel of the mining industries, and thus open a market for the oats and other produce of Quebec. Only yesterday he went to the office of the gas company here, and asked the President the rate of freight on coal from Sydney to Montreal, and his reply was that it was brought through, all rail, from Sydney to Toronto for \$2 per ton. He (Mr. Valin) had been offered English coal at a cheaper rate than Lower Province coal could be laid down here.

MR. MCCALLUM said he felt it his duty to make a remark in reply to the

hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. gentleman stated that the local freights in the Province of Ontario would be charged with the extra price which the coal would cost to the railway. Would no portion of that coal be expended on the through traffic at all; was it all going to be charged to the local freights? He could tell the hon. member that this duty would help the farmers. There was a good deal of wood in Ontario, and the farmers there, in many cases, had been selling their wood for little or nothing; but this duty would enable them to get a higher price than they could before. Although he was a consumer of coal, he was perfectly satisfied with this duty, and was sure it would meet with the approbation of the people of Ontario.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said, with reference to the prediction of the Minister of Public Works, the Opposition would rejoice if the effect of this duty would be to develop, in any degree, the coal interests of Nova Scotia. But what he rose to point out was, with reference to the duties on flour and coal, which were set the one against the other, that there was nothing to prevent the people of the Maritime Provinces from developing the flour industry in those Provinces; but it was impossible to develop the coal industry in Ontario, no matter what duty might be imposed. A coal mine could not be developed where none existed. Apart from that, a great injustice done was the imposition of a duty on anthracite coal, which could not be produced in Nova Scotia, and was therefore a direct tax, the injurious effect of which would be felt in almost every branch of commerce in Ontario. 404,000 tons of anthracite coal were imported from the United States last year, and 404,000 tons would have to be imported this year, so that the people of Ontario, to a large extent, and the people of Quebec to a limited extent, would be taxed \$202,000 on this article alone. It could not be called a revenue tax, for it was a local, sectional tax, and must arouse animosity in the minds of the people who had to pay it. If even coal and flour were set one against the other, the Finance Minister was not justified in including anthracite

MR. MCCALLUM.

with his bituminous coal. A great point was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) against even the tax on bituminous coal; that it would advance the rates of freight on our railways. That advance meant an increase of freight on the products of this country and a consequent diminution of the profits to the producer. He would not assume that the Finance Minister was so insensible to any argument from the Opposition side of the House that he would not see the injustice of this tax, particularly with reference to anthracite coal.

MR. ROBINSON said, as he had voted for the resolution last year to impose a tax of 75c. on coal, and as he had been unfairly attacked during the late campaign on account of that vote, and as he was perfectly willing now to vote a 75c. duty on coal, he would make a few remarks on the question. When his vote had been cast up against him, he cited the evidence that was offered to the Coal Committee two years ago, and proved to his constituents the justice of the vote. The evidence taken before that Committee, and given by experts, by respectable men in the coal business in the city of Toronto, proved that the Nova Scotia coal was superior, generally speaking, to that imported from Ohio and Pennsylvania. A few cargoes of Nova Scotia coal had been imported to Toronto, the result of which proved that consumers in Toronto would willingly pay 50c. to \$1 higher for Nova Scotia coal than for Ohio or Pennsylvania coal. This duty would encourage trade between the Lower Provinces and Ontario. According to the speeches of Sir Alex. Galt and Sir Francis Hincks, at the time of Confederation, it was evident that these Provinces were not confederated for the purpose of looking at each other. It was intended that business should be transacted between them. Taking the year in which the largest quantity of coal was turned out in Nova Scotia (1873), the output was something over 1,000,000, and 3,672 vessels, including 468 steamers, were engaged in carrying that coal. These vessels were manned by some 22,000 seamen. These figures proved the immense importance of encouraging this industry. The capital actually employed in working the

mines to this extent would probably be \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000, but the money employed in current expenditure, in the shipping and general business of the people engaged in the transfer of this 1,000,000 tons, would be about \$5,000,000. This was according to the testimony of skilled men, who had given this subject their serious consideration. He was willing that a duty should be imposed which would revive this industry so that it would equal the operations of 1873.

MR. MACKENZIE: Is the hon. gentleman interested in any coal mines?

MR. ROBINSON said he was slightly interested, and so was his hon. friend interested in business in Ontario. His hon. friend had been engaged in the petroleum and coal-oil business. But this question of personal interest had nothing to do with the argument as to the dimensions of the trade. It might be stated that the coal had to be carried too great a distance, the distance between Toronto and Pictou, to become profitable. Was it not true that Great Britain supplied Cuba with coal, although she could obtain a supply nearer home from the States? Great Britain also supplied, to a very great extent, as the hon. gentleman himself had pointed out, San Francisco. Did these facts militate against, or in favour of this 75c. duty on coal, and the encouragement of a business such as this? It was a matter of fact, that the Kingston Gas Works had taken a third of their supply from Newcastle during the past three years. He had heard it stated here that 4,500 tons of coal was consumed in Ottawa last year, from Sydney or Pictou, and 4,500 from the United States. These facts proved that there was a great chance of improving this business. Another fact which had been mentioned by his hon. friend was that, in order to engage in this business at a greater profit, a line of ships would have to be established for that purpose. Only two or three years ago a line of steamships had been established, running from Philadelphia to Baltimore, Portland and New York, in the coast trade. These ships carried a ton of coal 800 miles at 56c. a ton. If they could carry coal at that rate, why should we not show the same enterprise,

and compete successfully with the coal from the United States?

MR. MACKENZIE said his reason for asking the hon member for West Toronto the question he did was that he was at that moment taking credit for disinterested and patriotic action as an Ontario member. He was willing to have Ontario taxed in order that some benefit might be reaped by the coal owners. It was this assumption of patriotism that induced him to ask the hon. gentleman if he was not a coal owner himself. He (Mr. Mackenzie) knew he was from his own former statements. He (Mr. Mackenzie) did not think the hon. gentleman was quite the man, upon these statements, to talk about the patriotic feelings of the Ontario people, and he was not quite sure that, if the matter was put to a vote, the hon. gentleman would have a right to vote on it at all. There was another point he desired to call the attention of the House to, and it was this: He would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, when he was before the electors, he did not say that there was no intention of taxing anthracite coal.

MR. ROBINSON said he was very glad to have an opportunity of answering his hon. friend, although he thought the hon. gentleman had departed entirely from parliamentary usage in asking him what he was or what he was not engaged in. If he turned round to his Nova Scotia friends, and asked them if they were engaged in the coal business, of course they would say "yes." Did the hon. gentleman mean to say that they could not properly discuss such a question as this because they were interested in these enterprises in their own country? The hon. gentleman took it for granted that, because he had argued in favour of a tax of 75c., therefore it was going to make coal dearer. Did the duty of \$7 a ton on pig iron make it dearer to the people of the United States? The hon. gentleman wanted to know whether he would vote for a duty on anthracite coal. He (Mr. Robinson), in return, would give the hon. gentleman some little information. Out of 600,000 tons of coal used in Cleveland, only 8,000 tons was bituminous. Then, again, the large furnaces which were in operation in

Detroit and Chicago were being fed by bituminous coal. As to what he had promised his constituents, he would say that the hon. gentleman went to Toronto to dispute the chances of his election, and he (Mr. Robinson) thought the hon. gentleman went away pretty well satisfied that his principles of Free-trade would not be accepted by the 75,000 people of Toronto.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had spoken a long time, but had not answered his question. He (Mr. Mackenzie) would, therefore, tell the House that the hon. gentleman did say to the electors of Toronto that it was not the intention to put a duty on anthracite coal. He was sure, when the electors of Toronto looked at the hon. gentleman's political speeches, and at his political actions, they would be very much surprised. The hon. the Minister of Public Works also spoke for Ontario. He lived in that Province, and seemed to think he was calculated to speak for it. He said that this tax would produce benefits to Ontario a thousandfold greater than the amount of the tax upon coal. The duty on coal in Ontario would result in a tax of \$300,000, and, if Ontario was to be benefitted a thousand times more, she was to obtain \$300,000,000 in some manner. He could hardly vote against the duty himself, after such a statement as that. He desired, however, to especially call the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member for West Toronto not only said a tax would not be levied on anthracite coal, but he was pledged to vote against it. It was also understood generally, in the House, that anthracite coal was not to be taxed.

MR. TILLEY : That would be legislation against England.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was that all through. Hon. gentlemen had an intense hatred for England. Hon. gentlemen, by their policy, had declared themselves enemies of England. The whole tariff was against England, and hon. gentlemen seemed peculiarly gratified at being enabled to show the animus they had against the Mother Country. Hon. gentlemen had not better taunt anyone with being against England, when this

MR. ROBINSON.

tariff discriminated so greatly against England. But, to return to the point. Anthracite coal was dearer than bituminous coal, and the effect of this tariff would be to increase the consumption of anthracite coal, and diminish the consumption of bituminous coal, because the duty, if it were applied to the value of the coal, would be much less on the dearer coal than on the cheaper coal. The effect would be, instead of stimulating the consumption of the kind of coal obtained in Nova Scotia, it would limit the consumption of that particular class of coal. He conceived this tax to be chiefly a tax upon our railroads, and upon the poor people in the large cities and towns; also upon our manufactures. Many of them, no doubt, were obtaining advantages enough under the tariff. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones), himself a large manufacturer, honestly told them that he expected to be recouped in other ways. Therefore, he was quite as patriotic as the hon. member for West Toronto.

MR. JONES : I did not say I expected to be recouped. I said it was not a Protective tariff at all.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was surprised the hon. gentleman should have made that statement. The hon. the Minister of Finance had avowed over and over again that this was a Protective tariff. Everyone that had spoken on that side of the House had claimed that the hon. gentleman had redeemed his pledges to give the country a Protective tariff, and, so far as those pledges were made in Ontario, they had been redeemed. It was utter madness to deny that the tariff was a Protective one. Where was the member from Centre Toronto? Where was the member for Montreal Centre? Where was the member for Montreal West? Would any of them deny that this was a Protective tariff?

MR. GAULT said he could tell the hon. gentleman that coal would be laid down cheaper in Montreal this summer than ever before. The International Coal Company stated that they would be able to lay down coal in Montreal at \$3.75 a ton, and they would have anthracite coal delivered at \$4.50 a ton,

\$1.50 a ton cheaper than they had ever had it before.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was delighted at his efforts being so successful in trotting out the manufacturers on that side of the House. If a duty of 50c. had resulted in cheapening coal in Montreal to such an extent, a duty of \$1 ought to be imposed. No doubt, the hon. member for West Montreal would favour further protection of coal.

MR. GAULT said he would be quite willing to vote for a duty of 75c. a ton on coal.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had no doubt the hon gentleman would vote for anything that was proposed by his hon. friends, but that would not justify him to his constituents at the conclusion of the term for which he was elected.

MR. BRECKEN said it had been stated that this duty on anthracite coal was a sectional tax, and was very objectionable on that ground. He denied that it was a sectional tax. Anthracite coal was largely used in the Maritime Provinces. It was, he believed, used in New Brunswick in a greater proportion to its population than in any other Province in the Dominion. Then, anthracite coal was largely used in all the Maritime Provinces for domestic purposes. This was merely a tentative measure, and he thought it was well worth while giving it a trial, and seeing if it would not prove a benefit to the country, and his not being a sectionalist was one reason why he would be happy to vote in favour of this tax. He agreed with what was said by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that if the imposition of a duty of 50c. on American coal would open up the Canadian market to the Nova Scotia and Cape Breton coal owners, it would, he (Mr. Brecken) believed, have the effect of cheapening the price of coal, for already the greater part of the expense of working the mines had been incurred, such as sinking the shafts and providing the necessary machinery. The only additional expenses would be cutting the coal in the mines. He supposed it now cost nearly as much to place 50,000 tons at the pit's mouth as it would double that quantity; if that were the case, the greater the de-

mand for the article, the lower in all probability would be the price, bearing in mind that there was coal enough in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton to supply the whole of America.

Item agreed to.

On item — Copper rivets and burrs, and all manufactures of copper not elsewhere specified, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said there were two or three lightning rod manufactories in the country, and in speaking to one of the largest manufacturers, he ascertained that that gentleman seemed to be in doubt as to the duty levied on the copper used in the manufacture of lightning rods. He did not know whether a duty of 10 per cent or 30 per cent. would be imposed. That gentleman assured him that a manufactory would never be established in Canada that would manufacture the copper needed in the manufacture of lightning rods. He also stated that a duty of 30 per cent. would seriously cripple, if not entirely destroy, the existing industry of lightning rod manufactures.

MR. TILLEY said his attention had not been called to the matter. He did not know what kind of copper was used in the manufacture of lightning rods. Copper, seamless tubing, however, would only be subject to a duty of 10 per cent. If the copper required was in a manufactured form, the duty would be 30 per cent.

Item agreed to.

On item—Grey or unbleached and bleached cottons, sheetings, drills, ducks, cotton or Canton flannels, not stained, painted or printed, one cent per square yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked what was the total amount of imports expected under this tariff. The terms in the first proposition differed from the terms in the Trade and Navigation Returns.

MR. TILLEY said the whole imports of cotton last year amounted to

\$7,100,000, which might be classed as follows: Bleached and unbleached cottons, from Great Britain, \$430,337; and from the United States, \$536,337; printed, painted and coloured, from Great Britain, \$1,984,044; from the United States, \$896,000. Of the former, there were 179 American grades, and the average duty proposed on them was about 28½ per cent. Of the printed and coloured prints from Great Britain and the United States, \$400,000 worth would come under the highest rate of duty, from 28½ to 28½ per cent., the balance coming under 20 per cent., instead of 17½ per cent., as formerly. On gingham and plaids, of which there was imported last year from Great Britain \$28,384 worth, and from the United States \$4,363 worth, the average duty would be 28½ per cent. On denims, of which there was imported last year from Great Britain and the United States \$138,165 worth, the average duty would be 28 7-10 per cent. Of all others, there was imported from Great Britain \$1,761,293 worth, and from the United States, \$725,366. Of that a small portion, perhaps \$400,000 worth, would come under the highest rate of duty. Of the whole of the imports from Great Britain and the United States, \$7,100,000, a little under \$2,000,000 would pay the higher duty, and the balance would come under the 20 per cent. rate. As a portion of this was cotton cloth, which was formerly subject to a duty of 17½ per cent., but now 30 per cent., it was supposed it would give an increased revenue of \$100,000. It was also expected that, under the operation of this tariff, there would probably be \$1,000,000 worth of cottons manufactured in the Dominion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he quite understood that the people of Canada were not going to get any more revenue out of this tax. They would have the privilege of paying to sundry persons connected with manufactures an average tax of 28 per cent., not one cent of which would go into the Dominion Treasury. He quite understood that those manufacturers who were to be allowed to plunder the people to the extent of 28 per cent. would, no doubt, feel greatly obliged to the hon. the Minister

MR. TILLEY

of Finance. But he (Mr. Cartwright) wished to get some detailed information which did not appear in the Trade and Navigation Returns.

MR. TILLEY said, if there was any person to blame with regard to these returns, it was his hon. friend (Mr. Cartwright) who had had charge of this matter for five years past, and ought to have seen that the returns were made in such a way as to give those details.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he noticed that cotton or Canton flannels appeared under two heads, one 1c. per square yard, and the other 2c. per square yard. What was the reason of it being repeated twice?

MR. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman would observe that in one case it was not stained, painted or printed, and in the other it was dyed or coloured.

MR. ANGLIN said the hon. the Minister of Finance must be very much more credulous than he (Mr. Anglin) had supposed him to be, if he imagined that a manufacturer of cotton goods, or of any other goods manufactured in this country, would get any larger or smaller prices for his wares than could be got in the public market. One of the factories last year had declared a dividend of 27 per cent., and now they were going to get, on the average, 11½ per cent. more protection. On the cheaper description of cotton there was to be a protection of from 45 to 60 per cent., and that was precisely the class of cottons most largely used by the people who could afford least to pay the enormous taxation now to be imposed on the country.

MR. PLUMB: Will the hon. gentleman explain how the duty reaches up to that enormous figure?

MR. ANGLIN said the duty was easily calculated. The specific duty was one cent. per square yard, and where cotton was worth but 3c. or 4c. per yard, which was the price of a very large quantity imported, they could see it could run up to a high rate of percentage, and to this should be added the 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. He received, some weeks ago, letters from a gentleman largely engaged in the importations of cottons, who alleged that the system of charging

by the square yard would cause a great amount of trouble to importers. In the same bale would be cottons of a great variety of widths, it being impossible to bring from Great Britain all of the same widths in each bale; and the grades were very numerous, running from 25 to 60 or 70 inches in width. Not merely was the tax to be enormously increased, but the importer to be put to great inconvenience and trouble. Providing additional cash to pay the duties would also be a serious matter. He did not believe that anything he could say would change the intention of the Finance Minister, but he might remark that it was reported that there had been great differences of opinion among the importers themselves, who had advised the hon. gentleman with regard to this question.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said the Finance Minister, in referring to the classification of cotton goods, blamed the late Government for not having more details in the returns to make out the tariff in the manner they wished. The trade returns, as they existed five years ago, could not be used in any way for tariff purposes. The manner of compiling them was changed two or three times during the time of the late Government. Until then all cotton goods were entered under one class only in the trade returns; but they had been extended so as to make a different classification under different heads. The late Government could not be blamed for the returns not being more explicit to meet the wishes of the Finance Minister in making his present tariff; because under them there had been five or six different classes set down, where there was only one five years ago, when the hon. the Finance Minister would find the average tax on imported cottons much larger than he had led the House to believe. Importers throughout the country had found the duties on the cheaper cottons, and woollen goods had averaged from 30 to 50 per cent. A merchant in Toronto wrote him a few days ago that the cheaper classes of cottons and woollen goods would carry an average of 60 per cent.

Item agreed to.

On item—A cotton jeans, denims, bed-tickings, gingham, plaids, cottons or

canton flannels, ducks and drills, dyed or coloured, checked and striped shirtings, cottonades, pantaloons stuff, and goods of like description, 2c. per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had information which led him to believe that the tax on these cottons, particularly on the cheaper qualities, would be enormously in excess of what the Finance Minister supposed—would average from 45 to 60 per cent., falling, no doubt, to 22 or 25 per cent. on the more expensive; and here, again, the remarks of the hon. member for Gloucester, as to the inconvenience of entering and examining those goods, deserved considerable weight. It was quite true that a considerable quantity imported were goods of a rather valuable kind, but there was also a large quantity which must average probably not more than 7c. or 8c. per yard, on which the minimum duty would be 40 per cent.

MR. MACKENZIE: What is the average value of those articles?

MR. TILLEY said he had a memorandum, which he would read:

		15 p.c. & Price. 2c. per s. yd.
<i>Denims—30 inches wide.</i>		
Amoskeag.....	16	25 ⁵ / ₁₂ p.c.
Boston Improved.....	8	35 ³ / ₁₂ "
Waver Creek A.A.....	11 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂ "
C.C.....	10	31 ¹ / ₂ "
Clarks.....	15	26 ¹ / ₂ "
Columbian Heavy.....	15	26 ¹ / ₂ "
Everett.....	15	26 ¹ / ₂ "
Haymaker.....	9 ¹ / ₂	32 ¹ / ₂ "
Jewett City.....	10	31 ¹ / ₂ "
Oakland A.....	10	31 ¹ / ₂ "
A.A.....	11 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂ "
A.A.A.....	13	27 ³ / ₁₀ "
Old York Double Weight....	15 ¹ / ₂	25 ¹ / ₂ "
A.A.A.....	14 ¹ / ₂	26 ¹ / ₂ "
B.B.....	13	27 ³ / ₁₀ "
Eagle.....	17	24 ¹ / ₁₀ "
Otis A.X.A.....	12 ¹ / ₂	28 ¹ / ₂ "
B.B.....	11 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂ "
C.C.....	10	31 ¹ / ₂ "
Pearl River.....	15 ¹ / ₂	25 ³ / ₁₀ "
240 Blue.....	13 ¹ / ₂	27 ¹ / ₂ "
Uncasville.....	11 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂ "
Warren A.X.A.....	12 ¹ / ₂	28 ¹ / ₂ "
B.B.....	11 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂ "
C.C.....	10	31 ¹ / ₂ "
York.....	15 ¹ / ₂	25 ¹ / ₂ "

Tickings (American.)

Amoskeag A.C.A.	15	27 $\frac{1}{2}$	p. c.
A.	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	27 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
B.	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{5}{10}$	"
C.	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
D.	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	29 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
E.	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	31	"
F.	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	33	"
36 in.	20	25	"
Arasapha A.A.	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
Clarke Mills	30	26 $\frac{1}{10}$	"
Cordis, No. 1	16	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
2	14	28	"
3	13	29	"
4	11	30 $\frac{1}{10}$	"
5	10	31 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
6	9	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
7	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	34 $\frac{5}{10}$	"
Conestoga Extra	15	28 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
"	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	27 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
G.M.	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{1}{10}$	"
C.F.	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	29 $\frac{8}{10}$	"
C.C.A.	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	29 $\frac{1}{10}$	"
		32 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Premium A	17	26 $\frac{5}{10}$	"
B	16	27 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
A.A., 30 in.	10	31 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
X	9	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Lancaster	19	25 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Pennsylvania	12	31 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
Elmwood	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	34 $\frac{1}{10}$	"
Everett X	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
XX	14	27	"

Checks.

Caledonia XX	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	29 $\frac{2}{8}$	"
X	11	31 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
Farmers and Miners No. 5	10	31 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
6	11	30 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
7	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
8	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	27 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
9	15	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Kirkland, No. 60	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
90	18	24 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
100	20	23 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
Miners, No. 1	19	23 $\frac{3}{4}$	"
7	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	29 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Old York	13	27 $\frac{5}{10}$	"
Park Mills, No. 50	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	31	"
60	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	29 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
70	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	27 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
80	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
90	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	25 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
100	16	25 $\frac{5}{10}$	"
Real Caledonia, No. 30	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	29 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Reliance	10	31 $\frac{3}{8}$	"
York Blue and Brown	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
A.A. Extra	15	26 $\frac{5}{8}$	"

MR. ANGLIN: These are all American prices.

MR. TILLEY said they were the prices of United States manufacturers, but those were the articles made specific and *ad valorem*, and with which our

MR. TILLEY.

own manufacturers came into competition. With reference to printed cottons, it was different; none were made here, and the duty was 20 per cent.

MR. ANGLIN: A large quantity are imported from Great Britain.

MR. TILLEY: Yes; but we make those cheaper descriptions here.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said he would like to know what the oilcloth used by sailors—an industry in which his constituents were largely interested—would pay. It was charged 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. before.

MR. TILLEY said all cotton clothing would pay 30 per cent.

Item agreed to.

On items—Earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured, and Rockingham ware, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*,

Earthenware, white, granite or iron-stone ware, and "C. C.," or cream-coloured ware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. MACKENZIE said he would like to know how many manufacturers of these goods there were in Canada.

MR. TILLEY said he did not know; but there were many manufacturers of earthen and brown stoneware, which was made extensively in New Brunswick. There was a large establishment for earthenware at St. John's, Que., and another at Montreal. The imports of these articles reached \$80,000. They did not anticipate any increase of revenue from the new duties, being satisfied that a large portion of the importations would be replaced by the home-made article.

MR. MACKENZIE: The object is purely Protection?

MR. TILLEY: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE asked what was the percentage of Protection, adding the cost of transportation, duty, and allowance for breakage and exchange, on this cream-coloured and granite ware? He had seen a statement that the Protection afforded this interest would be 66 per cent.

MR. TILLEY said he had made no calculation on the subject, but, if he had, would not have counted the exchange, because they were dealing with currency, and converting sterling into currency was a most extraordinary way of forming a calculation as to the charges on the importation of goods. They would take, for instance, the coarse ware manufactured in the Province of New Brunswick and St. John. He supposed that the shipment to Montreal from St. John would cost as much as from Liverpool to St. John. Those goods, going from one part of the Dominion to another, had to be packed in crates, like similar articles coming from Great Britain. So the item of shipping and delivery, from one place to another in the Dominion, had to be considered in comparing the protection as regarded the goods from the different places.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the factory in St. John was in as convenient a position for delivery as the wholesale dealer in Montreal. He would pay precisely the same freight from St. John to Montreal, as a wholesale merchant would for carriage from Montreal to Toronto or Quebec. When the freight was paid from Great Britain to Montreal, that amount must be added to the value at Montreal, which was, in common with St. John, a distributing point. Therefore, everything that added to the cost of bringing goods to Montreal, must be added to the percentage of protection to the other party who made goods at St. John. The rate of exchange was not much, but all the other items must be added. According to the invoice sent him (Mr. Mackenzie) the Finance Minister might see that the protection to the home maker, apart from the exchange altogether, amounted to over 50 per cent. This was an unnecessary and extraordinary tax to impose on the Dominion for the benefit of two small manufactories, one of which at St. John's, Quebec, had a capital of not more than \$50,000 to \$80,000. He was told, besides, that none of the goods manufactured in Canada equalled the imported in quality. It might be good enough for the very poor classes, who could not afford high prices, but even then was inferior to the imported article; and it was

hardly fair to the vast body of the consumers that such an excessive duty should be levied and excessive protection given. He desired to ascertain specifically from the hon. gentleman whether he had calculated, or had any person calculated for him, the amount of Protection which this was going to afford, because he had himself avowed that it was imposed for the purpose of Protection. They (the Opposition) said there should not be such an inordinate rate imposed under any circumstances.

MR. GAULT said he was informed that the goods manufactured in St. John to-day were equal to anything manufactured in England.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had the pleasure of examining the best that establishment could produce at Philadelphia Exhibition, and he found it very far inferior to those produced in England.

MR. MACKENZIE said this was an item of immense importance, and he did think that they ought to have some more satisfaction than the hon. the Finance Minister had given them. If the duty was imposed for Protection purposes, he must have calculated how much that Protection would be.

MR. TILLEY said his remarks in reference to the manufactory at St. John would apply to others outside of Montreal, as far as supplying goods to the Montreal market was concerned. But a supply simply for Montreal, or its vicinity, was not all that was desired for a manufactory of that kind; the object was to supply the whole Dominion. It so happened that the manufactory of those articles was situated in the geographical centre of the Dominion. Suppose the goods were shipped to the western part of Ontario or to the Lower Provinces; he had explained that in their transportation there would be nearly the amount of breakage as in the case of similar articles imported from England. The ocean freight was also very small, those articles coming out almost as ballast, and, therefore, there was no more difference in cost, as far as the expense was concerned of packing, shipping, and

transmitting these goods from England to Montreal, than if sent from Montreal to the extreme west or to the Lower Provinces. It would be something probably in favour of the manufacturer here, and, therefore, it was considered desirable that an infant industry of this kind should be encouraged. The policy of the Government had been that, where an article was made in the country, where we had raw material in abundance here, it was considered desirable to give those industries not only such encouragement and protection as to keep up those already in existence, but to encourage the establishment of others. The policy was to extend these operations, and he believed the result would, through competition, give us the articles at as cheap or cheaper a rate than before.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman knew that, in the meantime, these factories were incapable of turning out more than one-tenth of the goods wanted in the Dominion, and it was therefore imposing an enormous tax on the people of the Dominion. It was impossible to find an article made in Canada that could take the place of those imported. Even the clay would have to be brought from England to produce certain kinds of crockery. An invoice had been placed in his hands which amounted to £274 16s.; the amount charged for packages was £28 17s.; the duty on the packages, £8 10s. 7d.; freight to Montreal, £30 12s. 4d.; charges, including inland freight, £17 7s. 3d.; duty on the goods at 30 per cent., £69 9s. 10d.; on a certain portion of the goods at 20 per cent., £12 18s. 11d.; adding five per cent. for breakage, £13 10s. 1d., making a total of duty and charges of £181 6s. upon an invoice of £274 16s. Now, the goods arriving at Montreal or Quebec—these were the distributing points—were on a par in that respect with the factory at St. John's; both had to lose breakage in sending to the retail dealers; both had to suffer whatever might be imposed in the way of inland freight; and therefore, the duty and charges on this invoice represented the amount of Protection that what the hon. gentleman called a native industry would obtain

MR. TILLEY.

under this tariff. This was a monstrous charge; it was the most outrageous thing in the tariff, and one that was wholly unjustifiable by the circumstances which the hon. gentleman himself had detailed. Rockingham ware might be made here, but cream coloured and granite ware could not be made of a quality equal to the English, because we had not the material here. When the hon. gentleman said that it was made here equal to anything in England, he (Mr. Mackenzie) could only say that, if any dealer, or any one who understood the business, would say so, he might accept the statement, but all whom he had spoken to on the subject had told him the very reverse.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre): Is it not Mr. Darling, of Montreal, who says that?

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes; Mr. Adam Darling.

MR. RYAN said he was aware that Mr. Darling had been making every effort to make the tariff unpopular. He was known as a very great partisan.

MR. MACKENZIE said it seemed, then, that, if a man was a partisan, he was not to be believed; that was the inference. He had no reason to doubt the respectability of Mr. Darling, and believed him to be, at least, quite as respectable as the hon. gentleman who sneered at him. He had both Mr. Darling's statement and the original invoice in support of the position he had taken.

MR. GAULT: It is well known that Mr. Adam Darling is one of the largest importers of crockery in Montreal, and, therefore, he is opposed to taxes of this kind.

MR. MACKENZIE: That cannot affect the statements of fact he presents.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said the protection afforded to this article was something enormous in its nature. He held in his hand a letter from a gentleman who had been connected with potteries in England and with the earthenware trade in this country for thirty years, and that gentleman bore out every statement made by the hon. gentleman

from Lambton. How could the invoice be disputed? The gentleman he referred to said he had a conversation with the manufacturer in St. John, who told him that the clay necessary for the manufacture of this article, laid down on the wharf of St. John, would only cost one shilling more per ton than the Staffordshire manufacturer had to pay. Yet the Government proposed to give him a protection of 40 or 50 per cent., and even more. And, over and above that, they had the anomaly, or the contradiction, of the hon. gentlemen themselves, with reference to their statement that this tariff would bear on the rich man more than on the poor man. Hon. gentlemen might say that the higher class of goods could not be produced in this country. He had the authority of this gentleman, for thirty years connected with this trade, for stating that china could be manufactured with as much facility in this country as could the common earthenware, and even with greater facility. And yet, in face of that, they found the 20 per cent. duty levied on the one, and 30 per cent. on the other—20 per cent. on the rich man's goods, and 30 per cent. on the poor man's goods. Hon. gentlemen opposite derisively cheered; he liked to hear them derisively cheer their own sentiments and their own utterances. But they could not prevent these things being pointed out, and, while they (the Opposition) failed in accomplishing anything in this House, the constituents of the hon. gentlemen were taking cognisance of their sneers and their inconsistencies.

MR. SNOWBALL said he had every opportunity of knowing about this matter, but he had never heard of these factories except on one occasion. He was then shown some of these goods, which were certainly of the rudest description he had ever seen of the class, and utterly unable to compete with other goods. He had imported a large quantity of such goods from England, and he knew that the protection on the packages alone was equivalent to 25 per cent. The goods manufactured in this country, to be sent to the different parts of the Dominion, he presumed would be merely packed in straw in the cars, the system adopted in

England, thus saving the crate and expensive packing to the manufacturer, making the difference of 25 per cent. These goods were not made in New Brunswick to such an extent as would justify the policy pursued with regard to them.

Item agreed to.

On item—Fruits, green,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked what did the hon. gentleman compute the increased duty on fruits to be.

MR. TILLEY said he estimated it at \$20,000. Last year the amount collected was \$50,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said these fruits were imported from the United States where they ripened earlier than in our country, and did not compete with our fruits. It was inexpedient to tax articles of this kind, which were a cheap and wholesome luxury in the early part of the summer.

MR. TILLEY said those fruits were bought, not by people in straitened circumstances, but by people of ample means, who could afford to pay the increased cost.

MR. ANGLIN said this duty would fall on all classes in New Brunswick, as those fruits, with a couple of exceptions, were not grown there.

Item agreed to.

On item—Furniture, house, cabinet, or office, including hair and spring mattresses, show-cases, caskets and coffins of any material, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that no revenue could be expected from this tax, except in the matter of coffins. There were many millions of dollars' worth of furniture manufactured in Canada, and the total importations were \$400,000 worth. To get the votes of one or two manufacturers this tax was imposed.

MR. PLUMB said the low prices of the imported furniture, though but \$400,000 worth, affected the prices of the millions of dollars' worth made here. If, for the sake of getting the votes of one or two wealthy manufacturers, the

Government taxed the people, then they must suffer the consequences; but he denied that statement.

MR. GUTHRIE asked why protection was given, in some cases, 35 per cent., and in others, 30 per cent.

MR. TILLEY said, as he had already pointed out, the additional duty was imposed on these articles because the marble and other material which entered into their manufacture were taxed. It was pointed out that these increases added to the burdens of the people; but, in framing this tariff, the Government had to look to see that two millions of dollars were raised.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he did not admit the statement that two and a-half millions of dollars additional would be required. But, assuming that to be true, for the sake of argument, the Finance Minister was taking, at least, seven millions out of the pockets of the people for the sake of getting two. It was one of the simplest axioms of political economy that, if the raw material, which went through half a dozen men's hands before it reached the consumer, were taxed \$1, the consumer had to pay \$2 or \$3. The hon. Minister did not say whether he expected any revenue from this. The total amount of importations was between \$300,000 and \$400,000. A great portion of that would not be imported, and consequently they had a hundred per cent. added to the existing tax, with the strong probability that it would not bring any increase of revenue, if it did not cause a loss.

MR. CASEY said the hon. Minister had given as a reason for not taxing walnut and other fine woods, that they were raw materials for furniture, but he had also given as a reason for the tax on furniture, that the raw material was taxed. He (Mr. Casey) did not think that it was taxed more highly than the raw material which entered into the manufacture of several other articles, of agricultural implements for instance, and other articles made largely of iron. One of the most important articles used in the manufacture, black walnut, an article produced in his section, and which had to compete against the same wood from the United States, was admitted

MR. PLUMB.

free. By putting a tax on this article, the Finance Minister would benefit the farmers of Western Ontario. Either this should be done, or the tax on furniture should be reduced.

MR. ANGLIN said it was amusing to find the Finance Minister at one time alleging that the duty would increase the price, and, at other times, that it would not. When it was necessary to look for an excuse for giving a protection of 35 per cent. to furniture, it was suddenly discovered that the duty on the small quantity of iron used, and the brass and other articles used in its manufacture, justified his imposition of this enormous tax, and, thereby, gratifying a few large manufacturers. The locks were to be manufactured in this country; if there was any truth in the promises of the Finance Minister, the brass was to be worked up here, so that, taking the duty on all these, and on the marbles in any set of furniture worth, say \$400 to \$500, the whole additional cost, because of the duty on marble, brass and iron, would not exceed \$10—would, perhaps, not be \$5.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said the hon. the Minister of Finance had urged, as one of his reasons for this high duty on furniture, that the new material required in the manufacture was heavily taxed. He would call the hon. gentleman's attention to one raw material which he found on the free list, and which was manufactured, to a considerable extent in his county. If it was necessary to impose a duty of 35 per cent. on furniture, because the raw material was heavily taxed, why admit veneers free?

MR. HESSON said the opposition of hon. gentlemen to this item was an attempt to defend the rich man at the expense of the poor man this time, as common furniture, such as was used by the poor man, was not imported from the United States. It was only expensive fashionable upholstery that was imported from across the line, and that was the class of goods they wished to keep out, with a heavy duty; as a more substantial and useful article could be made in this country, giving employment to our own mechanics.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was a very strange thing that, while common

lumber was taxed 20 per cent., the fine woods that were used in cabinet-making were admitted free. There were parts of the Dominion where large quantities of ordinary pine lumber were imported, and of course they would have to pay a duty of 20 per cent. upon it. He ventured, with the greatest possible diffidence, to differ from the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) when he said there was no kind of cheap furniture imported, and defied contradiction. He was able to contradict the hon. gentleman in that statement, because he knew there was. There was a very large quantity of cheap furniture among the total \$400,000 worth imported from the United States. New Brunswick, notably, was a large importer of this kind of furniture. Canada possessed an advantage in manufacturing the dearer classes of furniture. The damasks and other cloths used were cheaper in this country than in the United States, as there the cloths were nearly all brought from Europe. The hon. member for Montreal shook his head. The hon. gentleman knew better than he (Mr. Mackenzie), but that was his impression. He did not know what kind of furniture had been exported from Canada, perhaps the Finance Minister did. It was a well-known fact that great manufactories were enabled to turn out goods at a price considerably less than they could be produced for in smaller concerns, and those Provinces that did not have any extensive manufactories of their own had to purchase from those that had. In procuring furniture for the public buildings in Manitoba, they were obliged either to purchase it at Toronto or St. Paul, and they found that, in the exceedingly dry climate of the far West, the furniture made in Toronto did not stand so well as if it had been made in the place where it was to be used. A very large portion of the furniture that had been brought into the country, he had no doubt, went into the North-West, and into British Columbia. In these special taxes, they were imposing upon those Western Provinces, which could not for a long time to come have manufactories for producing the articles they required. The expense of transporting the goods West was very great, and the result of these duties would be that the

articles would be made much dearer than what they could be obtained for in St. Paul, and other parts of the United States.

MR. TILLEY said that, with regard to cedar and other woods, they entered largely into other manufactures besides that of furniture. Coach-builders for instance, and others, required those woods which were not in the country. He denied emphatically the assertion of the hon. member for Centre Huron that this tariff would give rise to an increased taxation of \$5,600,000 or \$6,000,000. He (Mr. Tilley) said that it was unbecoming of the hon. gentleman, considering the high position he held in the country, to use the language he had applied to them on that side of the House. The humblest men, either on the hustings or in the House, had not used, with reference to their opponents and those who differed with them, the language which had been applied by the hon. member for Centre Huron to the men now carrying on the Government of the country. He had spoken of them as robbers and scoundrels, and he (Mr. Tilley) held that such language was derogatory to the character of the House, and derogatory to the character of a gentleman who had held so high a position in the country.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he was delighted to find that hon. gentlemen understood thoroughly the light in which they stood before all honourable men who comprehended what this particular mode of plundering the people meant. Whatever might be his faults, he was not likely to conceal his views on any policy which appeared to him likely to wrest a power confided to this House for the benefit of the people, but which was used to the gross injury of the people. So long as he saw men coming to Parliament who, under the guise of aiding and assisting the poorest class of his fellow countrymen, burdened them with the heaviest burdens, under the name of Protection, he would define it as a system of legalised robbery, by which a few rich men were being enabled to dip their hands into the pockets of the poorest class of the community; and to add to fortunes, already excessive, large additional fortunes, as dishonestly got as it was possible for men to obtain them.

So long as that was the policy of hon. gentlemen, just so long would he continue to describe it as he had described it, whether there were fifty or five gentlemen behind him; so long as he held a seat in that Parliament, so long would hon. gentlemen hear their deeds spoken of as they deserved. The infamy was not in describing these deeds, but in doing them. He found that, out of the total importation into this country, of \$390,000 worth of furniture, Province of New Brunswick. It would \$167,000 worth was imported by the be seen, therefore, that the hon. gentleman had certainly a right to say that he had not spared his own Province.

Item agreed to.

On item—Cannon and musket powder, in kegs and barrels, 4c. per lb.,

In reply to MR. MACKENZIE,

MR. TILLEY said that these duties last year brought in \$23,021, and it was estimated the increase of revenue from the present duties would be \$7,000 to \$10,000. The duties on cannon, and musket, and blasting, and mining powders, would be from 20 to 22 per cent.; on giant powder and nitro-glycerine, 20 to 30 per cent. Some establishments on the other side were proposing to remove to Canada for the manufacture of glycerine. If they did, they might not collect the amount mentioned; but he expected about that sum.

Item agreed to.

On item—India rubber, viz: Boots and shoes, and other manufactures of, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. MACKENZIE enquired if the Finance Minister had letters from manufacturers of those goods, stating that they were now selling at the same prices as before the new tariff.

MR. TILLEY said he had not, but he thought such was the case.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked if the hon. gentleman meant that 25 per cent. as a Protective or revenue duty.

MR. TILLEY said they did not estimate from it any additional revenue, but about the same as before. The increased

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

duty would only about make up for the decreased importation.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, as the matter stood, the rubber shoes manufactured in Canada were not too good. This increased duty was simply putting them at the mercy of manufacturers, who, he was sorry to say, had not availed themselves of the opportunities to turn out a particularly good article.

MR. TILLEY said that his experience had shown that the inferior rubber goods were imported from the United States. Their low priced articles competed with the better class in Canada. If Canadians were manufacturing an inferior article, they were forced to it by American competition and undervaluation.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said his experience was different to that of the hon. gentleman.

MR. ANGLIN said that one of the dealers in those goods in Montreal had made great complaint about being compelled, by competition in the United States, to change and manufacture more popular patterns, as the American article met with the approval of the people.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had not heard anything about ordinary overshoes, but he had heard millers who used gutta percha belting, say that they were obliged to go for the better article to the United States, the importation of which, last year, was about \$25,500; and he was also informed that the belting used for agricultural implements had to be brought from the United States. He would much rather not have made such remarks, but, when an exorbitant duty was put on such articles, it had a direct tendency to make the manufacturer in Canada careless, as he would be independent of competition. Undue Protection would only produce an inferior article, instead of stimulating the manufacturer to produce a better.

MR. ROCHESTER said they had just as good rubber belting made in Canada as in the States, with the exception, perhaps, of the Boston Rubber Factory, large belting 24 to 30 inches. As to the ex-Finance Minister's remarks about the inferior shoes, perhaps he bought a cheap

pair, and might have been fully satisfied had he bought a dearer article.

Item agreed to.

On item—Pig iron, \$2 per ton,

MR. BOURASSA moved in amendment, to abolish all duty of Customs on pig iron, and to reduce the duty on bar iron from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 10 per cent.; and that the duty on the following articles, viz.:—Tinned, glazed, or enamelled hollow-ware of cast or wrought iron; hardware, viz.: builders', carriage makers', and saddlers' iron work: bolts, washers, rivets, tacks, brads, sprigs, Hungarian and clout nails, horse-shoes and horse-shoe nails, iron wire nails, called "Pointes de Paris," iron and steel screws, commonly called wood screws; scales, balances and weighing beams; nails and spikes, wrought or pressed, whether galvanised or not; cut nails and spikes; shovels, spades, and hay, manure and potato forks; rakes and rake teeth; carpenters', coopers', and joiners' tools, and all other mechanics' tools; edge tools of all kinds, including axes, scythes, files and saws of every description, and steel skates, be reduced to 20 per cent.

MR. LANDRY said that the hon. gentleman from St. John's, because he had no manufactures in his county, seemed to have no regard for those in other parts of the Dominion. If this motion was adopted, it would strike a fatal blow at our iron industries. The hon. gentleman had fallen into the error which was very common among supporters of the Liberal party—that of viewing every great question from a narrow and sectional point of view. In order to make a little political capital among their constituents, they were seeking to overturn this great National Policy, knowing very well, however, that their efforts in this direction would be entirely futile.

MR. CASGRAIN said the hon. member for St. John's was one of the oldest members in this House, and was one of the most popular men in the Province of Quebec, having been frequently returned by his constituents by acclamation. In moving this amendment, he (Mr. Bourassa) had done so in all seriousness

and he did not deserve the unjust criticisms of the hon. gentleman from Montmagny. He (Mr. Casgrain) supposed the amendment would not be carried by this Parliament, but it might be carried by another Parliament.

Question put and amendment (Mr. Bourassa) negatived on a division.

MR. CHARLTON said he wished to call the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to the fact that he was here imposing a very objectionable duty on raw material. Only one manufacturer was engaged in smelting pig iron, where at least thirty were engaged in using this iron as a raw material in other manufactures. He had no idea that the imposition of this duty of \$2 a ton, would lead to the production of anything like the amount of pig iron used in the Dominion. The experience of the United States in reference to the duty on pig iron might be of service to us. It appeared from the census return of 1870, that the production of pig iron in the United States was in round numbers 2,000,000 tons; the duty that year was \$9 per ton. The prices current showed that the price of pig iron in the United States was within a small fraction of \$9 per ton higher than it would have been had the pig iron been imported from England. There were employed that year, in the production of pig iron, 27,000 labourers, and there was invested in that production \$56,000,000. The United States paid \$17,000,000 more for that iron than if it had been imported. That \$17,000,000 would have paid the wages of every one of these 27,000 labourers engaged in that business; it would also have paid the interest, at 7 per cent., upon the capital invested, and, after doing this, the country would have been the gainer by \$700,000. In addition to this, the country would have had 4,000,000 tons of iron and \$18,000,000 worth of coke, charcoal and other materials. This fact showed the absurdity of placing a Protective duty on pig iron. The duty imposed by the hon. the Finance Minister on this item would have the same effect here as a similar duty had in the United States. He ventured to say that the loss to Canada by the imposition of this duty would be

greater than if the country were to pay every man that would be engaged in the production of pig iron his wages and allow him to remain idle.

MR. PLUMB said there was a time when the hon. member for North Norfolk did not hold exactly the same views in regard to pig iron that he held now, and he expressed those former views in this House with all the energy and strength of argument for which he was distinguished. He (Mr. Plumb) happened, by chance, to have in his possession a speech made by that hon. gentleman in this House in 1876, in which he used the following language respecting the duty on iron :—

“The price of iron was brought down, by a Protective duty, several dollars a ton, and it is now cheaper than the English iron was ever offered in the American market.”

The hon. gentleman then made one of the ablest Protection speeches ever heard on the floor of this House, but the difficulty was that, after he had made this speech, he voted to keep in a Free-trade Government. He had convinced the House that he could discuss either side of the question with equal ability, and, he (Mr. Plumb) would add, with equal sincerity.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said many papers in the United States were recently ringing the changes on the unpatriotic action of Mr. Vanderbilt, in importing 12,000 tons of British steel rails, although American steel rails were protected by an enormous duty, thereby showing that the attempt to bolster up by Protective duties the iron manufactures in the United States, had proved to be a conspicuous and total failure. And yet this industry had been one of the “infant industries” of the United States for scores of years. The experience in the United States, with reference to pig iron, showed the full force of the objections against imposing a duty on a material that must, of a necessity, pass through many hands, for every dollar of duty placed on such an article, must of necessity, disproportionately increase its cost to the consumer in the end. Whether this duty would bring in a heavy revenue in our own case, or whether it would promote the manufac-

ture of iron, he was not prepared to say. If he understood the hon. the Finance Minister aright, he expected it would promote the manufacture of pig iron.

MR. DOMVILLE said his hon. friend seemed to desire that nothing whatever should be made in the Dominion; he was opposed to any branch of industry being carried on amongst us. His hon. friend had told this House that the manufacturers here were a set of bankrupts. They were able to make iron in the Lower Provinces, and, if a duty were put on of \$2 per ton, if any people could find fault with it, it would be the people of New Brunswick, as they would be in favour of a higher duty being imposed, provided it gave employment to the people. What signified that duty in the price of a stove which weighed 200lb. or 300lb.? The extra cost, if any, would be a mere bagatelle. Under the Free-trade policy in the United States, iron was far dearer than under their Protective policy. He was surprised at the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance talking of steel. He thought the hon. member had had sufficient experience in that business, not to care to have anything further to say about steel rails. The duty on iron was not too high, and this, he believed, was the opinion of all the manufacturers of iron. They were afraid that duty would not keep out the foreign iron.

MR. TUPPER said that Canada possessed an immense amount of iron ore in close proximity to large coal deposits. The Londonderry iron mine produced ore capable of being manufactured into the highest class of iron that could be produced in any part of the world. It was situated some thirty or forty miles from the coal fields of Spring Hill, the coal from which, Sir Wm. Logan stated, was second only to the first-class Newcastle coal. If iron could be manufactured in any part of the world successfully, it was there. When it was known that iron ore could be carried to Pittsburg from Canada, manufactured there, and then sold in Canada, it was high time we should endeavour to manufacture for ourselves. After the iron mines at Londonderry were established, and when they were being devel-

oped, the ironmasters of the United States, becoming aware that they were losing their customers in Canada on that account, sent round circulars throughout Canada stating they were prepared to sell their iron at 10 per cent. below the prices of the iron from the Londonderry mine, thus crushing out this industry. Under these circumstances, we should endeavour to foster this industry, and enable it to compete with the similar industries of the United States.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What are the qualities of iron produced at these iron works?

MR. DOMVILLE: After running off the ore, they make Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, pig iron. Only a certain percentage of each of these can be run off from the furnaces at one time. Their chief manufacture is pig iron, but they have their rolling mills alongside, where they make bar iron, plates, etc. The increased duty on iron would not add anything to the cost of ships, which is one of our greatest industries, because the shipbuilder got a drawback on the iron used in the construction; consequently, the people of New Brunswick have nothing to complain of in the iron duties.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, all through Canada, the English iron offset the American iron, so that there was very little danger of the Americans putting up the prices. The greatest percentage of pig iron and bar iron was brought from Great Britain, so that the competition from which the Londonderry people had suffered was more the competition of the British than the American manufacturers. There were reasons which would render it difficult for any iron manufacturer who was obliged to transport his coal so short a distance as even thirty miles to compete on equal terms with manufacturers of Great Britain and the United States, who had the coal and iron close together. In certain parts of Scotland, both were found in the same mines, and the advantages of transport were so great, that the cost of freight to this country on all classes of goods like iron was reduced to a very small figure. He had heard it complained that it was absolutely cheaper to bring iron from Liverpool to

Montreal, than from Londonderry to Montreal.

MR. DOMVILLE: Because it comes out as ballast.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he spoke of these things simply in answer to the interrogation of the hon. gentleman. In his judgment it would be less objectionable to give a bounty than to tax the whole community for the support of this industry, because where they gave a bounty they knew the cost, but when they gave a tax like this, they did not know what it was ultimately going to lead to.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the hon. the Minister of Public Works was mistaken in the statement he had made upon this subject. It was well known that different mines produced different kinds of iron. It did not matter what duty was placed on certain kinds of iron; they must have those classes for special purposes.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said that he was sure every member in the House must rejoice to know that they had such a quality of iron in the country as that produced at Londonderry. In making a change in the tariff upon this kind of iron, great care should be taken, for, while they might benefit one industry, another might be injured.

MR. BROWN said that he used the Londonderry iron and found it equal to the Scotch iron, and it was laid down cheaper than the Scotch iron. The bar iron was quite as good as any he had seen from the old country. They made experiments with No. 1, 2 and 3 qualities and found that No. 1 was too soft to use for stoves, and that it would carry a large amount of scrap iron. No. 2 was better adapted for machinery, and Nos. 1 and 3 ought to be mixed together. They had used a good deal of iron from the United States, but it could not compete with the Nova Scotia iron or the old country iron. The American iron was laid down at \$24 a ton, and the Nova Scotia iron at \$18 a ton. They had tried the experiment of charcoal manufacture, and they had demonstrated that by this process iron could not be manufactured for less than \$24 a ton.

MR. ROBINSON read two letters to the House, which, he said, showed that the results of this duty would be very satisfactory. Take the United States, as far as blast furnaces and mills were concerned. In that country there were 700 furnaces, in a population of 40,000,000, and, proportionately, Canada should have 70 furnaces; whilst there was only one—the Londonderry Mills. It was gratifying to know that, under this tariff, at any rate, they were likely to have more.

Item agreed to.

On item—Tin plates, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. HADDOW asked if it was fair to the struggling fishing industries to increase the duty from 5 to 10 per cent. on tin plates; block tin, formerly free, now charged 10 per cent.; muriatic acid, formerly free, now charged 20 per cent., and rope increased to 20 per cent. They had heard to-night of the protection afforded to the furniture manufacturer, the iron producer, and the manufacturer of cottons and woollens; but, while the Americans are allowed to send in their canned goods duty free, they were obliged to pay at the rate of 1½c. per lb. or 18c. per doz. cans, for any goods sent in there.

MR. TILLEY said that the increase of duty would not make the least difference in the world.

MR. HADDOW said they had to sell their canned salmon in this country. They would want a drawback if they exported it.

MR. DOMVILLE: How much is sold in the country?

MR. HADDOW said all the salmon canned in the Lower Provinces was sold in the country.

MR. DOMVILLE: No. Canned salmon were shipped to England from Gloucester County last year.

MR. ANGLIN said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haddow) knew more about this particular trade than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) did altogether.

MR. DOMVILLE said there were other hon. gentlemen in the House that

MR. BROWN.

knew something about it too, and it was well known that all the salmon canned in Canada was not all consumed in this country. A large part of it was exported to Europe. The hon. gentleman should not try to raise sympathy by saying that the people of this country consumed all the canned salmon produced in it. The hon. gentleman was trying to gain cheap popularity in his county. He (Mr. Haddow) knew very well that nearly all the salmon canned in the Dominion was exported from New Brunswick.

MR. HADDOW said he would like to know if the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) could say if any canned salmon had been exported from the county of Gloucester within the last two or three years?

MR. DOMVILLE: Carried.

MR. ANGLIN said that the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Haddow) was himself interested in the business of canning, and knew what he was talking about, and should not be interrupted in that way by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville).

MR. DOMVILLE said the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) tried to impress the country at large that he (Mr. Domville) interrupted every hon. member for New Brunswick. But he was not afraid of his (Mr. Anglin's) statements. With regard to the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Haddow), that gentleman before he came into this House said he was not a John A. man, but he was a friend of Tilley's; now he was going against the Hon. Mr. Tilley. The hon. member (Mr. Haddow) took the course he did to-night, because he thought it would give him influence in the county of Restigouche, and get him a little cheap popularity.

MR. TILLEY said that, whether the salmon exported from the Lower Provinces paid a large or small per cent. tariff, it did not in any way interfere with that industry, for the simple reason that the parties canning salmon would not be placed in any worse or better position, because, under the old tariff, every cannery, both of British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces, when they

asked for a drawback upon the tin that went into the manufacture of the cans in which the salmon was exported, received a drawback. He could not see upon what grounds the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haddow) could argue that the imposition of a higher duty upon tin, or upon anything used in the making of tin cans would injure the trade.

MR. HADDOW said he found he had made a mistake with regard to the exportation of canned salmon from the Lower Provinces. He had reference to Great Britain. He thought it would be found that there was no canned salmon exported to that country from the Maritime Provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a little.

MR. HADDOW said it did not pay to send them to Britain, as they were driven out of that market by the salmon from British Columbia. In answer to what had been said by the hon. the Minister of Finance, he maintained he was in a worse position, for all the salmon he canned was sold in Canada. Last year he sold nearly 2,000 boxes of four dozen each, which had to be sold in Canada, and, if he had to pay a duty of ten per cent. where he had only paid five, he must be in a worse position.

MR. DOMVILLE: It is very hard on you.

MR. HADDOW said he could not understand the conduct of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) With regard to the statement of that gentleman, that he (Mr. Haddow) had once been a Tilley man, and now was opposed to the hon. the Finance Minister, he would say that he thought he had been a supporter a longer time than the hon. member for King's, for he had never in his life given him an adverse vote.

MR. DOMVILLE: I stood to him better.

MR. HADDOW said, if he (Mr. Domville) had always been a Conservative, as he professed to be, he could not always have supported the Finance Minister. He (Mr. Tilley) had not always practised the same as he did to-day. He had not always been a Conservative. The hon.

the Finance Minister was always a Liberal, and he (Mr. Haddow) was always a Liberal.

. Several HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. MACKENZIE said the interruptions to the hon. gentleman were most scandalous, and if hon. gentlemen opposite persisted in pursuing that course, they would make little progress.

MR. HADDOW said that in former days he had voted for the Finance Minister, and never against him. When they were fighting the battles of Confederation, he had stood by him and opposed those who predicted from Confederation the present result. Could it have been foreseen, that Province would never have entered the Union. He had given no reason for that hon. gentleman's attack on him. He had come here on both occasions pledged to his constituents to oppose Protection, and he was going to stand by his record. He told his constituents last nomination, if they wanted some one to support a Protective tariff, not to send him.

MR. KING said it appeared as if the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) had taken charge of New Brunswick. That hon. gentleman had thought proper to incriminate a gentleman holding a high social position, by charging him with having attempted to bribe him (Mr. Domville) to secure the settlement of an election protest. He (Mr. King) felt compelled to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER raised a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER said he did not suppose that the point of order was as to the hon. gentleman having spoken before; because the debate was proceeding as if the House were in Committee. The point was that the hon. gentleman did not confine his remarks to the point before the House. Well, hon. members on both sides were liable, to some extent, to the charge of the same irregularity.

MR. KING said that, at the risk of the interruption of the hon. member for King's, and the Finance Minister's applauding him, he would not have referred to that matter to-night, if it was as well understood in the county that

hon. gentleman represented as it was here, that his remarks on elections and other matters did not possess great weight. When he charged him with having sent Thos. R. Jones to him (Mr. Domville), with an offer of \$2,000 to retire—

MR. SPEAKER: These remarks are going a little too far.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved that the House do now adjourn.

MR. KING said, with regard to the charge of his having offered \$2,000 to the member for King's to compromise a protest against him in the Courts of New Brunswick, at the time he had taken the liberty of denying, most emphatically, the charge; and he had immediately telegraphed to Mr. Jones on the subject. He would read the telegram:

"April 17, 1879.

"To THOMAS R. JONES,

"St. John, N. B.

"Domville stated to-night that you told him you were authorised to arrange protest against me if it did not cost more than \$2,000. Answer by telegraph; also, fully by mail.

"G. G. KING."

To this Mr. Jones replied:

"Must be some misapprehension; will write fully by mail.

(Signed) "T. R. JONES."

He had also received the following letter:—

"ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK,

"April 18, 1879.

"G. G. KING, Esq., M. P.,

"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—Your telegram received, and answer forwarded: 'must be some misapprehension; will write fully by mail. (Signed), T. R. JONES' Any conversation or matter in connection with Mr. Domville and yourself, in which I was a party, arose in this way: You met me at my door after the election, and after some trivial conversation of no moment as regards the election, you stated that you thought it unfair, after the contest was over, that you should be subjected to persecution on the part of the now existing Government and their friends; that Wiggins had filed a protest against you; that he had no chance of succeeding, and could only put you to trouble and annoyance.

"I said, so far as I knew, that there was no disposition on the part of your political opponents to put you to any trouble in the city of St. John.

"You said that Wiggins had no money to carry on the protest, and that he had got small notes from his friends in Queen's

MR. KING.

County (that is, you had heard so), and that they were being negotiated at some of the banks here.

"I said that I had never heard so, and did not believe that any one, after the large majority the present Government had, would have any interest in the matter but Wiggins himself.

"You said that the notes could not be got through without some party here interesting themselves, and mentioned Mr. Domville's name as the party.

"I doubted it, as Mr. Domville was out of business, and had no connection with a bank, at that time, as President or Director; but I, as a friend, on your behalf, volunteered to see Mr. Domville, which I did. He stated that he had nothing to do with Wiggins in any way, as regards the protest. I then said that although you were elected against the present Government, I thought you would be prepared to give the Government fair play in their measures, and not factious opposition; this last were my own views of the case, and it was very little difference whether you or Wiggins held the seat, and asked him if he would see Wiggins, as a friend of mine, and advise him to withdraw his opposition. He (Domville) said he would see Wiggins.

"A few days after I saw Domville, and he stated to me he could do nothing with Wiggins (between you and him). I think I stated this to you a few days after.

"This is all I remember of the transaction. You can make what use of this letter you please.

"Yours very truly,

"THOS. R. JONES."

This letter being very full, ought to have satisfied the hon. gentlemen opposite, because it came from a supporter of the Finance Minister, and, he believed, of the hon member for King's. The writer was a gentleman for whom he (Mr. King) entertained the highest respect. Feeling that that might not be satisfactory, he had telegraphed again, to-day, to Mr. Jones, as follows:—

"April 22nd, 1879.

"THOMAS R. JONES,

"St. John:

"Domville says you stated you were authorized to pay two thousand dollars to have protest against me settled. Is it true.

"G. G. KING."

He thought it useless to comment on these facts, or to take up the time of the House longer on these subjects.

MR. DOMVILLE said, as this was a personal matter, he only wished to say a few words on the subject at this late hour. He had made the assertion in the House that Mr. T. R. Jones authorised him to meet S. Wiggins, and go so far

as \$2,000 to haul him off. He (Mr. Domville) regretted the hon. member should have brought the matter up at that late hour, in the manner observed. He had no objection to giving his papers to the House, if allowed, and, to-morrow, would produce Mr. Wiggins' letter, in which he stated the overtures made, and that Mr. Ferris, the late member, said that perhaps it would cost \$4,000 to take him off. The hon. gentleman's letter to-night corroborated his (Mr. Domville's) letter. Mr. Jones was telegraphed to, and while the hon. member for King's was getting his letter, he (Mr. Domville) had received a telegram from Mr. Jones, saying: "I have sent King an evasive answer." At the same time that this letter said, in terms of evasion, that he was not authorised to make the offer, it admitted that overtures were made which proved his (Mr. Domville's) story. He insisted that the letter should be laid on the table of the House for reference.

MR. ANGLIN: I know Mr. T. R. Jones, who is a blunt, outspoken man, and not likely to give an evasive answer to anybody.

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

Item *agreed to*.

MR. TILLEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion *agreed to*, and debate *adjourned*.

House adjourned at
Thirty minutes after
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 23rd April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OTTAWA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE
COMPANY BILL.—[BILL 48.]

(Mr. Rochester.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

MR. ROCHESTER moved that the Bill be withdrawn, and the fees paid

thereon refunded, less the cost of printing and translation.

Motion *agreed to*, and Bill *withdrawn*.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Rykert.)

FIRST READING.

MR. RYKERT introduced a Bill (No. 86) To amend the Act further securing the independence of Parliament. He said the object of the Bill was to prevent persons occupying seats in this House and, at the same time, offices of emolument under the Ontario Government. There should be no connection between the Ontario Government and this one.

Bill *read the first time*.

IRREGULAR MEMORIALS.

SPEAKER'S RULING.

MR. ORTON said he desired to call the attention of the House, before the Orders of the Day were called, to a very extraordinary memorial, which had been sent in yesterday, and which was, he believed, irregularly laid on the table of the House. His reason for calling attention to it was that it bore very remarkably upon the policy inaugurated by the present Government. It purported to come from the Reciprocity Free-trade Association of England.

MR. SPEAKER: In reference to the paper laid informally on the table yesterday, I have to say, on further consideration of the matter, that no documents can be regularly presented to the House, unless sent down by Message from the Governor-General, or in answer to an Order or Address of the House, or in pursuance of a Statute requiring their production. Individuals outside of Parliament must approach either House by petition, and it has been frequently decided that no letter or declaration, nor address, nor remonstrance without a proper form of prayer, can be received. In the case of a petition, it must be presented by a member in his place. He is responsible that it does not contain any flagrant violation of the rules of the House. It has never been the practice

for the Speaker to present even a petition regularly framed. When a petition was sent to Mr. Speaker Addington, that he might present it, as a member, he declined doing so, on the ground that it was clearly irregular. The paper in question is not a petition, but a communication containing a declaration with respect to the Canadian tariff, now before the House of Commons; in fact, a document which could not be regularly presented by a member in his place, for it bears on the face of it all the evidences of its irregularity. In 1841, Mr. Milner Gibson wished to present a declaration of a similar character, from the people of Manchester, stating their feelings with respect to the corn laws; but the Speaker would not allow him to proceed. This paper, then, not coming before the House as a petition in a regular way, and not having been brought down in response to an order of the House, cannot be taken notice of.

THE QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION PROTEST.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

MR. KING called on the hon. member for Kings, N.B., (Mr. Domville) to produce the telegram he stated he had received from Mr. Jones, in which that gentleman stated he had sent him (Mr. King) an evasive answer.

MR. DOMVILLE said he would have done so, and taken any step he could to substantiate his statement, but the hon. gentleman had precluded him from knowing what this letter was which he had received from St. John. He (Mr. Domville) had written the hon. gentleman for it this morning, but the hon. gentleman had refused to give him this letter until he (Mr. Domville) produced the telegram from Mr. Thomas R. Jones. He (Mr. Domville) must insist on obtaining that letter, after which he would give the hon. member any information he required.

MR. KING said he had no objection that it should be laid before the House. He simply claimed in justice to the gentleman from the city of St. John, that the hon. member should produce the telegram he referred to. When he did so, he would lay the correspondence on the table.

MR. SPEAKER.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) had already read his letter to the House, it was in the possession of the House, and should be produced.

MR. HOLTON stated the letter was in the official reports of the House, and in reply to it the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) stated he had received a telegram of a certain purport. The telegram should therefore be produced. He (Mr. Domville) furthermore made the statement that he was aware of the tactics of the hon. gentleman, and that he had received a telegram saying that the Hon. Thos. R. Jones had sent him (Mr. King) an evasive answer. He would leave this to the *Hansard* for substantiation. He had only to ask the hon. gentleman to lay before him (Mr. Domville) the letter he had received in regard to the assertions made by himself in the House.

MR. KING said that the hon. member for King's having failed to produce the telegram, he now, on behalf of Mr. Jones, would take the liberty of reading a telegram he received from him that morning.

"April 22, 1879.

"By telegraph from St. John, N.B.,

"To G. G. KING:

"Domville must be in error. You never authorised me to offer \$2,000 for withdrawal of protest, and, if you had, I would not have been a party to it. My letter explains all that took place.

"T. R. JONES."

He did not propose to say anything further in regard to this matter, beyond expressing his utter abhorrence of the manner in which this controversy had been conducted by the hon. gentleman.

MR. DOMVILLE said the criticisms of the hon. gentleman fell very harmless upon him. As the hon. gentleman would not produce his letter, he (Mr. Domville) had a letter from a gentleman who would corroborate his (Mr. Domville's) statement. It was as follows:—

"MY DEAR SIR,—

"I see Mr. King, M.P. for Queen's, denies the fact that any overtures were made to me after last election, and, therefore, I beg to inform you that John Ferris, Esq., ex-M. P., informed a friend of mine, in January last, and who informed me—that they had offered me

the sum of \$2,000 if I would have the protest against Mr. King withdrawn, but that I had refused, and that he feared they would be obliged to increase that sum to \$4,000. You are at liberty to use this in any way you deem proper, as there can be no doubt that you stated to me—and to which I am ready to testify on oath—that the sum of \$2,000 would be paid me if I would give no further opposition in the matter, I may further add that when you informed me that Mr. Jones had authorised you to ascertain what I would accept for my trouble and drop further opposition, you will remember I promptly spurned the offer, with the remark that I would never sell my friends.

"Yours truly,

"E. STONE WIGGINS."

This was his statement, and Mr. Wiggins was in Ottawa, prepared to justify his (Mr. Domville's) statement on oath.

MR. KING : I call——

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I think we ought to have Mr. Jones's letter. The hon. gentleman is precluded from speaking until he lays that letter upon the table.

MR. KING : I have no objection to lay the letter upon the table, and I now call upon the hon. member for King's for the telegram from Mr. Jones.

MR. DOMVILLE said that that letter which the hon. gentleman had laid upon the table, and which he had in his hands, formed a part of his (Mr. Domville's) answer. Mr. Jones had been applied to by his hon. friend for a denial of certain allegations made by him (Mr. Domville) and he sent in reply the letter which had been read last night. That proved his case. He stated that he had made overtures to Mr. Wiggins, on behalf of Mr. King, through Mr. Jones. Here was Mr. Jones's letter, and also Mr. Wiggins's, who said he was prepared to testify on oath that the amount was offered to him, and he refused to take it. He (Mr. Domville) made no assertion in the House that he received a telegram from the Hon. Thos. R. Jones. He noticed, at the time, some hon. gentlemen smile, and he (Mr. Domville) smiled to think they had taken a view that might please them. But it was incorrect, as far as he was concerned. He stated that he had received a telegram saying Mr. Jones had sent him (Mr. King) an evasive answer. He would

read the telegram which, however, was not from Mr. Jones; he did not say that it was.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : I distinctly heard him make the statement last night.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) : I was present when Mr. Domville made the statement, and I distinctly understood him to use these words: "I received a telegram from St. John, saying Mr. Jones had returned an evasive answer to Mr. King."

Several HON. GENTLEMEN : No, no.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) : I do not know who says "no, no;" nor do I care. I am quite satisfied he used those words.

MR. ANGLIN said he understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had received a telegram from Mr. Jones saying he had sent an evasive answer to Mr. King.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said he listened attentively to the remarks of the hon. gentleman on the night previously, and he understood him to say that he had received a telegram from St. John, saying the Hon. Thomas R. Jones had sent an evasive answer to Mr. King.

MR. DOMVILLE said the telegram he received was as follows:—

"Forewarned, forearmed. King has asked Jones for a denial of your statement, and Jones has written him what he calls an evasive manner. Jones says you are mistaken. He did not talk of a money compromise.

"S. J. KING."

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the charge made by the hon. gentleman was that his hon. friend behind him had sent a gentleman to him authorised to pay to Mr. Wiggins \$2,000 if he would withdraw the protest.

MR. DOMVILLE said he had made that charge. He did not deny it, and he had Mr. Wiggins here to prove it on oath.

MR. ANGLIN said the hon. gentleman had not read the telegrams which were laid on the table with the letters of Mr. Jones.

MR. DOMVILLE: I did not see them. Send them here, and I will read them.

MR. BOWELL said that, with reference to the remarks of his hon. friend, on the night previously, his recollection was decidedly the same as that of the hon. the Minister of Justice, and the hon. member for Cardwell. What impressed it more particularly on his mind was the circumstance, that immediately after the statement was made by the hon. member for King's, he turned round to the hon. gentleman and said: "Domville, they understood you to say that you received this telegram from Mr. Jones." "Well," said he, "I do not care whether they do or do not think so." He (Mr. Bowell) was quite satisfied that the hon. gentleman was correct as to what he said.

MR. COCKBURN (Muskoka) said he thought he could throw a little light upon the subject. When the hon. gentleman said he had received a telegram from the Hon. T.R. Jones, stating that he had sent an evasive reply to Mr. King, the hon. member for Gloucester said Mr. Jones was not the man to send an evasive reply.

MR. DOMVILLE: Yes, we heard him say so.

MR. KING read the report in the *Montreal Gazette* of what took place. He would next read the telegrams which he claimed the hon. member for King's would not read. He (Mr. King), upon hearing that the hon. member for King's had a communication from Mr. Jones, telegraphed as follows to the latter gentleman:

"April 22, 1879.

"To THOMAS R. JONES,
St. John, N. B.

"Domville says you telegraphed him to-day that you had sent me an evasive answer. Is it so?"

"G. G. KING."

In reply, Mr. Jones said:

"April 23, 1879.

"By telegraph from St. John. N. B.,

"To G. G. KING,
Ottawa,

"Domville has no telegram or letter from me on the subject matter whatever; if he has, let him produce it. Get Insolvency Amend-

MR. ANGLIN.

ment postponed for a few days. Somebody will be up to explain. Will work bad here as it is.

"T. R. JONES."

Now he called upon the hon. member for King's to produce the telegram.

MR. DOMVILLE: What is the use of the hon. gentleman calling on me for a telegram I never had, or claimed to have had?

THE CONFEDERATION CAMPAIGN IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. TILLEY said he rose to a question of privilege. He desired to call the attention of the House to a statement he made, and which was positively contradicted by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin). When he (Mr. Tilley), speaking with reference to the feeling that existed in the Province of New Brunswick during the first Confederation election, for the purpose of showing how public feeling changed, said that the feeling was so strong that he could not obtain a hearing until the hon. member stepped forward and obtained a hearing for him. He had said he never would forget the humiliation to which he was subjected at that time—that he was dependent on that hon. member (Mr. Anglin) for a hearing in his own constituency. Every hon. member would recollect how emphatically, and distinctly, he denied that statement, saying that he had never interfered, because he (Mr. Tilley) was never refused a hearing except on one occasion, in the Mechanics' Institute. He was authorised to make this statement:

"The undersigned were present on nomination day, February 27th, 1865, for the first Confederation election, when Mr. Tilley was prevented from receiving a hearing until Mr. Anglin pushed his way to the front of the hustling, and asked the crowd to give Mr. Tilley a hearing, which was then done. Signed: C. H. Fairweather, George Robertson, C. M. Boswick, J. H. Allan, William Fleming, Luke Stewart, John A. Chesley, Wm A. Turnbull, Geo. S. DeForest, John Bell, E. E. Kenney, J. D. Turner, J. E. Paddington, S. J. King."

He had received several telegrams to the same effect since. But, if anything more was necessary to establish a statement, he had extracts from the editorials

of the *St. John News*, of March 1st, and the *Morning Telegraph*, February 28th, 1865, as follows:—

“Mr. Anglin undertook to speak against time yesterday, consuming nearly one-half of the whole time at the disposal of the candidates. His efforts were seconded by the lungs and rowdiness of a lot of ‘plug-uglies,’ who kept interrupting each of the Union Speakers, obliging them to shorten their addresses, and finally closing the performance by creating such a disturbance as prevented Mr. Tilley from replying to Mr. Anglin’s sophistries and misstatements. That the gang was organised, but by whom, or by whom paid, or under whose leadership, is yet unknown, although shrewd suspicions are entertained. That Mr. Anglin was at least their patron is undoubted.

“Matters have come to a pretty pass in this city, when public speakers can address public assemblages in this loyal city, only by Mr. Anglin’s permission; Mr. Anglin, whose past career is yet redolent of treason. Let all friends of Confederation treasure up the disgraceful sights of yesterday. Let them be ever before their eyes until this important contest is over. Let them spare neither time, nor care, nor physical labour until, by the election of the Confederate candidates, they assure New Brunswick that St. John is *not* to be ruled by Mr. Anglin and his gang of rowdies. The enemy has at last unmasked their batteries. Intellect is no longer of any service to them; passion, prejudice, falsehoods and mob law are now their weapons.”—(*St. John Telegraph*, Feb. 28th, 1865.)

“The course pursued by the Anti-Confederates in front of the Court House on Monday last, has defeated the object intended by the promoters and abettors of the disturbance. Many men who were halting between two opinions, and who had deferred making up their minds until they heard the friends and opponents of Confederation face to face on the hustings, have decided to throw, not only their votes, but all their influence in opposition to the party that sought to stifle the right of free speech, which is the proud boast of every Briton; and many others, who were luke-warm friends of Confederation, have been prompted to give the good cause their warm and hearty support. All reasonable and fair men looked forward to nomination day as the one on which intelligence and truth would triumph. The result of the day’s proceedings has, however, been provocative of nothing but dissatisfaction. They expected that when the opponents of the scheme were heard for hours without interruption, a short time would have been allowed its friends to combat the arguments advanced, and establish the correctness of their own position. This privilege was denied them. Indeed, it was with difficulty that any of the friends of Confederation obtained even a partial hearing. Why was this so? Simply because the men who declined to face the friends of the scheme, whenever and wherever challenged, feared to have their specious sophistry and their flimsy argu-

ments exposed and refuted. Had a different course been pursued, Mr. Anglin’s fine spun theories, Mr. Cudlip’s fallacious declarations, and Mr. Witmore’s windy declamation would have been as completely annihilated as Mr. Wilmot’s untenable position was thoroughly exposed in the few minutes afforded for review. But this could not be. At the behest of Anglin alone would the noisy crowd, who occupied the centre of the vast throng, become quiet. The battle was, therefore, not one of reason, but a test between the lung power of the speaker, and the turbulence of a band of ruthless, ignorant and deluded men; and in such a scene of strife, it is no wonder that the latter gained a temporary triumph. Among the whole band of reckless men there were probably not more than half a dozen votes. Matters have come to a pretty pass when conduct so disgraceful is suffered to prevail in a city of the size and importance of St. John. It is high time that the people should know whether their public men are to be brow-beaten in this manner, and whether they are to be permitted to declare their views only under the patronage of a man who has endeavoured, on every occasion, to clog the wheels of progress in this ‘fine and favoured’ Province. It must be apparent to every right-thinking man, that the cause which requires mob violence in its aid is bad, and we trust that votes recorded on Friday and Saturday next will show that this is properly understood and appreciated.”—(*St. John News*, March 1st, 1865.)

Now, he thought, with that testimony, he was justified in stating that, on that occasion, he obtained a hearing only at the solicitation of the hon. gentleman opposite.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought that, as the House had listened to those extracts read by the Finance Minister, they would be able to form a very correct estimate of the value of the statements of those newspapers. Anything more violently partisan than those articles could scarcely be written. At that particular time there was a determination on the part of the hon. the Finance Minister to create the impression against the anti-Confederates, that they were endeavouring to resist Confederation by just such means as were described in those articles, and the knowledge of that intention rendered the anti-Confederates particularly scrupulous and careful to restrain the slightest show of improper interference with any speakers on the opposite side. He recollected what took place on that particular day. They stood on the stoop of the Court-house in St. John, the vast as-

sembly before them remaining in the snow from a little before twelve o'clock in the day, till long after the lamps were lit in the evening; the fact of their remaining so long would be of itself evidence that there was none of that violence and rowdyism described in those articles, and no attempt to interrupt the speakers on the Confederate side. Notwithstanding the show of evidence produced by the hon. gentleman, he (Mr. Anglin) repeated, positively and emphatically, that there was no interruption beyond possibly two or three or half-a-dozen voices sometimes contradicting some of his statements. He (Mr. Anglin) did not interfere at any time to procure him a hearing, nor was there any occasion for his doing so. He did not say that the writers of those articles deliberately misstated the facts, nor that the Finance Minister knowingly misrepresented them; but owing to the lapse of time, their memory had deceived them. Though the newspaper articles said there were interruptions, they did not say the Finance Minister was interrupted. What did occur was this: Mr. Charles Skinner was, he thought, a candidate on that occasion. While he was addressing the meeting, some person interrupted or contradicted him, when a controversy arose, in which five or six persons engaged. Some noise ensued, and he (Mr. Anglin) was foolish or good-natured enough to say: If any of his friends were making a noise, he hoped they would submit to anything rather than to interrupt Mr. Skinner. That gentleman immediately took most unfair and improper advantage of his interference, exclaiming that things had come to a pretty pass if he, in the capital of his native Province, was to be indebted to him (Mr. Anglin) for a hearing. Everybody present felt how very unfair that remark was, and a great many of his (Mr. Anglin's) friends reproved him for being foolish enough to interfere. Nothing would have been more pleasing to the Finance Minister and his friends, than a serious attempt to prevent his being heard at that time, for nothing would have helped them more. There was no turmoil, excitement, or interruption, beyond the little episode he had mentioned, which was not worth noticing or mentioning; but it was

MR. ANGLIN.

seized upon and exaggerated by the writers of those newspaper articles, to turn against them the public opinion then running in their favour. Those papers were at that time most violent partisans of the hon. the Finance Minister, and very violent and unscrupulous advocates of Confederation.

MR. TILLEY said the circumstances of that day would not soon be forgotten by himself, and the thousands then present. There were twelve candidates, eight for the county and four for the city of St. John, and as a late member for the city, and of the Cabinet, it was decided that he (Mr. Tilley) should speak first. The member for Gloucester had occupied nearly half of the time devoted to the twelve speakers, and after the county candidates had spoken, he (Mr. Tilley) stepped to the front, but could not get a hearing. He recollected it well, for he never felt so humiliated before in his own constituency, which had elected him six or seven times. Mr. Anglin, who stood beside him, pressed forward, and asked the crowd to give him an opportunity of making his statements; and, though the interruption lasted some time, he afterwards obtained a hearing, but not one altogether satisfactory. The hon. gentleman said that those writers, and others, did not recollect the matter correctly; but those statements of the *Telegraph* and *News* appeared the very next morning from the editors describing as tersely and clearly as possible all that happened—that he had obtained a hearing only by the intervention of the member for Gloucester. He was surprised that the hon. gentleman should be at fault in this matter, knowing well that his memory generally was remarkably good. He (Mr. Tilley) had felt it due to himself to make these explanations, thinking it best to set this matter at rest.

MR. ANGLIN said that the hon. gentleman was not named in those articles as having been interrupted in any way.

MR. TILLEY: I think so.

MR. TUPPER said that, if he correctly understood the hon. member for Gloucester, he had asserted that the two leading papers of St. John, supporting

hon. gentlemen opposite, were such violent and unscrupulous partisans that one could not believe a word they said.

MR. ANGLIN said he did not quite say that. In those days they were violently partisan in character, and greatly exaggerated the little episode mentioned for the partisan purpose of creating ill-will and ill-feeling against the anti-Confederate party—of creating the impression that they were playing the part of bullies and rowdies, although they had been particularly scrupulous to treat the Finance Minister with the greatest possible respect. He defied the hon. gentleman to say that, during that excited time, he (Mr. Anglin) had ever uttered the slightest word in reference to him, his purposes or motives, that he or any reasonable man could take exception to.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, of course the *St. John News* and *Telegraph* lied when supporting the Finance Minister, but both supported the member for Gloucester now, and had atoned for all sins, and whitewashed all those falsehoods against hon. gentlemen opposite; they had recovered their honesty, and were now to be believed, though they were not then.

MR. WELDON said he had a file of the *St. John News* containing an account of the proceedings of that meeting, the same paper from which the Finance Minister had read. The report stated that, while Mr. Skinner had been interrupted, when Mr. Tilley came forward he was received with loud applause. Then followed two columns of his speech, and then, when Mr. Wilmot, now Speaker of the Senate, but then one of the candidates opposed to Confederation and to the Finance Minister, attempted to reply, he was met by such a storm of yells that he retired with the observation: "Well, if you do not want to hear the explanation, I am sure I do not want to give it."

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Resolution 11, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (April 9th).

On item—Iron and steel screws, commonly called "wood screws," 35 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. ANGLIN asked why this duty had been increased.

MR. TILLEY said that the machinery for making the screws was very expensive, there was a large outlay for skilled machinists, and a considerable portion of the iron used was, to a certain extent, used in the manufacture of screws. Under these circumstances, builders' hardware, and everything of that kind was entitled to further consideration.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would be satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would inform the House of the expense of that machinery and the capital involved. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was under the impression there was very little expense compared with other manufactures. There was another matter that seemed very extraordinary. In one of the items passed he found this: "On rolled, round wire rods, in coils under half an inch in diameter, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*." This sort of iron, used in screws, was allowed in at 10 per cent, but if the same sizes of iron were brought in by a blacksmith, he would have to pay 17½ per cent., simply because it was straight rods in bundles. He knew that blacksmiths, particularly for carriage purposes, used a very large quantity of quarter-inch five-sixteenths, three-eighths and half-inch, which came, generally, in straight bundles of 100lb. each. If brought in in coils, it only paid 10 per cent. This amounted to a protection of 42½ per cent., which would render the making of screws a monopoly, while it was alleged that the best screws were those brought in from England and the United States, especially those from England. He thought there was only one manufactory of screws in the country. The percentage of 35 per cent. was really a prohibitory duty, without counting the difference of 7½ per cent. on iron in their favour, and prohibitory in a wrong direction, as those English and American screws were universally used to a greater or less extent.

MR. TILLEY said the proposition had been amended since it was first introduced, because, at the time he made the

proposition, he supposed, from information he had, that the wire was all manufactured in the country, but, on further consideration, it was found desirable to allow this description of iron to come in at 10 per cent. Of this description of iron, which was used in the manufacture of nuts, etc., a considerable portion was lost in the manufacturing of these articles. It was thought worthy of consideration to give as much protection as possible to the one establishment which had been manufacturing screws in the Dominion. It was quite true that the competition had been very sharp, and he believed that establishment had been closed for some time.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. the Minister of Finance was mistaken about the factory referred to having been closed for want of a market for their articles. He (Mr. Mackenzie) knew that men in the trade had sent orders to that establishment which they were unwilling to fill, but the company were, in fact, in a position to take advantage of the markets, so soon as it would be regulated by the Minister of Finance, who, no doubt, had communicated with them, as he (Mr. Tilley) said he had with all industries, and arranged the tariff to suit that particular trade. They were given a protection of 35 per cent., and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the iron they used, which made really, as he had said, a protection of $42\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. The articles manufactured by that company were said to be inferior to the English article, or were made in a different way.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said that he was in a position to state, notwithstanding the insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for Lambton, as to the quality of the screws manufactured by the Canada Screw Company, at Dundas, that they were of the most unexceptionable quality. They were, in every respect, equal to those manufactured in England and the United States—and he (Mr. Robertson) must protest against the extraordinary statements made by the ex-Premier in his place in this House, in reference to the quality of the manufactures of this country. The hon. gentleman, judging from the course he had pursued, since the debate had been proceeding, was animated by a

MR. TILLEY.

desire to destroy in some way or other the effects of the National Policy. Being powerless to prevent the adoption of the patriotic measure now under discussion, and no doubt being conscious that the result would be antagonistic to the prognostications of himself and his party, he sought, by a means most unfair and unworthy of a statesman, to detract from the quality of the goods produced in the country. And, when this was being done day after day by a member of this House, who occupied the prominent position of leader of the Opposition, there could be no doubt that an incalculable injury would be done to those industries which he had chosen to single out as the object of his attack. A short time ago the hon. member thought proper to make a most unwarrantable statement in reference to the clocks manufactured by the Hamilton Clock Company. That statement, no doubt, had done its work, and he (Mr. Robertson) was aware that it was just as devoid of merit as the unjust remarks made to-night in reference to the quality of the wood screws. The clocks made by the Hamilton Company were in every respect equal to any of the same class made in the United States. And he (Mr. Robertson) considered it unworthy of any man, much less of a member of Parliament, who had lately been the Premier of Canada, to condemn the industries referred to, for political reasons, and in the interests of persons who were importers, and whose great object always was and always would be, to keep down native manufactures. The hon. gentleman, he (Mr. Robertson) believed, really knew nothing about the quality of the goods he had been decrying, and he thought it was high time for some one to protest against such unwarrantable statements.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. member for Hamilton might as well reserve his lectures, for he should pay no attention to them. He should do what he conceived to be his duty altogether irrespective of the hon. gentleman's opinion. He did not object to the hon. gentleman giving his opinion, and, when a manufacturer came here asking the taxpayers of the country, through this House, to impose a Protective duty of 35 per cent., he would fail in his duty if

he did not discuss everything relative to such manufacturer. He should do so, and he cared nothing about the hon. gentleman's opinion of his conduct; he was not responsible to him; he was not to be frightened by the hon. gentleman or any of his constituents. He stated nothing against the character of any party. He stated what he had been informed, that this manufactory to which he had alluded was receiving 35 per cent. protection, and had been issuing an inferior article. He had letters from gentlemen informing him that that was true, and the hon. gentleman had just now admitted it, although he claimed they were making a good article now. He was glad to hear it, but he had many letters in his possession throwing doubt on the quality of the article. With respect to the item under discussion, it was well known that, in the United States and England, a great deal of opposition was engendered to the manufactories existing there. When the duty was placed even at the low rate of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., a company in the United States deemed it proper to establish a branch in Canada. It was not a Canadian industry, it was only transplanted from Rhode Island to this country. It was one that they thought they could make profitable, and did make profitable at $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and, because it was profitable at $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the hon. the Finance Minister put on $17\frac{1}{2}$ more, and gave them material at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than the other industries. They were unduly protected, and it was most unjust to the consumers. He doubted exceedingly if the hon. member for Hamilton was so good a judge of screws as he represented.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he had no desire to take up the time of the House a second time on this question; but, since the hon. member had chosen to characterise his (Mr. Robertson's) remarks, as a "lecture," all he (Mr. Robertson) had to say in reply was that he did not wish it to be understood that he presumed to lecture any person, and he wished it, at the same time, to be known, that he did not propose to be lectured by the hon. member for Lambton. It was true that he (Mr. Robertson) was but a young member, but he wished the hon. member

to understand that he (Mr. Robertson) quite understood his position in the House; he was an independent member of Parliament, representing a constituency of infinitely greater importance in this Dominion than that represented by the hon. member for Lambton, and as often as that hon. member chose to make statements derogatory to the honour and wellbeing of his (Mr. Robertson's) constituency, he would not fail to resent it. As to the clocks referred to, he (Mr. Robertson) could speak as one who had authority, for the simple reason that he knew all about it. There was no doubt that some of the cases of a lot of clocks made at Hamilton two or three years ago had been improperly finished, and they consequently did not take the eye of the commercial world, and a great loss was sustained by the company; but these clocks had all been recalled, and the company was now, as it always had been, able to turn out clocks equal in every respect to those of the same class made in the United States. He (Mr. Robertson) was aware of these facts, in consequence of having had a brief at the trial of a case in which the quality of these clocks came up; and, as to the screws, he was quite sure he knew more about them than the hon. member for Lambton, as he (Mr. Robertson) had repeatedly watched the process of manufacture at the factory at Dundas.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said, without entering on this ticklish controversy as to the merits of the screws, it did appear tolerably clear that it was an absolutely prohibitive duty. No revenue could come from it because it was certain none of these articles were now going to be imported. The result of that was that the people of Canada, whether they consumed \$10,000 worth or \$50,000 worth of these screws, would have to pay 35 per cent. higher for them. Now it was perfectly well known that there was a sharp competition between the iron manufacturers of England and those of the United States, which would effectually dispose of that part of the hon. gentleman's argument that there was risk of an increase in price. The certain result would be that we would get less from this article than before, and all for the benefit of a manufac-

ture of which he believed there was only one in the country, and from what had been stated there was not much likelihood of having many more of them established. Therefore, they would simply be creating an absolute monopoly, and this 35 per cent. would go largely into the pockets of the manufacturers instead of into the revenue.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said he would like to call attention to the item of horse-shoe nails, which paid a duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more than the iron entering into them. These were much used and of great consumption; there was a factory now in St. John making these nails. They were compelled to pay $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the iron, and they were getting 5 per cent. less Protection than wood screws. One article was consumed in the country as largely as the other, and iron entered more largely into this industry than wooden screws.

MR. TILLEY said he would like to know from the hon. gentlemen whether the late Government had, by Order in Council, ever taken the duty off iron that was made in the horse-shoe nails, and also, whether they did not take the duty off wire that was used in the manufacture of screws.

MR. BURPEE: Yes.

MR. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman now, because there was a horse-shoe nail factory in St. John, endeavoured to draw a contrast between the action of the late Government and the protection now given to screws.

MR. BURPEE: The duty on iron was 5 per cent.; the drawback was only on those exported.

MR. TILLEY said he understood it was on all the iron used in that manufacture, and he believed that was the case. Now, when they imposed 10 per cent. on the raw material and gave them protection, there was a howl from the other side, as if they were building up a monopoly.

MR. BURPEE said what he desired to point out was the difference in those two industries. Why should one not be protected as well as the other?

MR. TILLEY: Then I just ask the hon. member why he allowed one in-

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

dustry to be free, while on the other industry in St. John he imposed a duty? We have a little electioneering capital being made here, and we may just as well settle it as we go along.

MR. MACKENZIE: Supposing that to be the case, does the hon. gentleman allege that it was wrong?

MR. TILLEY: No.

MR. MACKENZIE: Has the horse-shoe nail maker not to pay the same rate of duty as the screw maker?

MR. TILLEY said he had not, on the ground that, in the first place, he did not require the same expensive machinery.

MR. MACKENZIE: What is the cost of the machinery? What is the amount of capital invested in it?

MR. TILLEY: I do not know exactly.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman states, as a reason, that they have large capital invested, and that the machinery is expensive; of course, he must have had some information.

MR. BOWELL: In the factory at Dundas there are over 300 machines, costing on the average \$500 each.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Can the hon. gentleman tell us what is the value of the raw material in the finished product, because this whole legislation largely depends upon that? Has he any idea of the proportion between the value of the raw material and the value of the finished product?

MR. JONES said that, in the manufacture of horse-shoe nails, the loss was nothing whatever, and the machinery required was not so expensive as that required in the manufacture of screws, which was the most expensive machinery that was imported into this country.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Can the hon. the Minister of Finance answer that question?

MR. TILLEY: If the hon. gentleman should ask me how many grains of wheat there were in a bushel, I could not answer him.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said this was an admirable illustration of the value of the information the hon. gentleman had got, and the care bestowed in framing this tariff. The whole question depended on what proportion that tax of 10 per cent. on the raw material bore to the value of the product. If the manufactured screw was worth two or three times as much as the iron cost that entered into its manufacture, then the tax of 10 per cent. was a trifling matter. If, on the other hand, the raw iron was a large constituent in the value of the screw, then there was something in the hon. gentleman's argument.

MR. TILLEY said he thought he might appeal to this House whether, since the commencement of the discussion on the details of the tariff, he had not endeavoured, and been able, to give all the information on these questions that it was possible to submit. The hon. gentleman had, on many occasions, proposed questions to him which it was quite clear to this House were for the purpose of embarrassment, and such questions as would not be put under ordinary circumstances. He had patiently endeavoured to answer these questions, but, when the hon. gentleman asked such a question as that, as to the relative values in this case, it was impossible to estimate the percentage exactly. A screw was not like a piece of machinery that had a small quantity of iron in it, and that iron might have an increased duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which would not materially affect the price. But in this case the whole product was iron, it was like a cooking stove, it was composed entirely of an article which paid a duty.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had not exhibited what he called great patience in answering questions. It would have been very easy for him, instead of sending an insulting answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright), to say that he was not able to answer the question, or did not possess the precise information. It would not have been a difficult matter to obtain the relative values of the raw material and the finished product in the matter of screws. If the hon. gentleman could not answer the questions put to

him, it might be expected that at all events he could explain his reasons for not being able to give the information asked.

MR. HAY said that the firm to which he belonged made use of more wood screws than any house in the Dominion. The difficulty they had with the Screw Company, at the commencement, was that they could not make all the numbers that they required in their business, but at present they could supply all demands. This establishment was not an American institution at first, but a Canadian institution; recently it became partly an American one. When the Dundas concern was started, the manufacturers of England and the United States lowered their prices 25 to 30 per cent., which was a strong argument in favour of encouraging our industries. There was no danger of monopolies, because other manufacturers in the same line would shortly be started, if the business was profitable.

MR. HESSON said hon. gentlemen opposite were trifling with the time of the House. The hon. member for Lambton had spoken four or five times on this one item. The ex-Finance Minister was also very anxious to elicit from the Finance Minister his view as to the exact amount likely to be raised from each item; he wanted to know the number of threads in a yard of cotton. It was not so long ago that the late Minister of Finance brought in estimates which were not realised, but which had resulted in large deficits. This trifling with the time of the House was not creditable. It was quite enough to expect from the Finance Minister that he should prepare an estimate of the amount to be realised on the whole policy, without entering into such minute particulars.

MR. COCKBURN said it was the duty of hon. members to examine carefully into all these propositions, and to call on the Finance Minister to explain his reasons for any particular duty imposed. The remarks of the hon. gentleman were utterly uncalled for and unwarranted by the facts of the case.

MR. MILLS said that the position taken by the hon. the leader of the Op-

position and the hon. member for Centre Huron was not an unreasonable one. This tariff was an entirely novel one, and this House had been promised that the principles upon which the Minister of Finance acted in each particular case would be explained when the tariff was discussed in detail. They were now discussing it in detail, and they asked for information with regard to the difference in the tax on nails and screws. The hon. Minister had given a reason that was simply a fallacy. He said there was a great waste in the manufacture of screws which did not occur in the manufacture of nails. In what way did that justify the imposition of a larger tax upon screws? There was no advantage in respect to waste possessed by foreign manufacturers of screws. There was the same diminution of material in both cases. The hon. the leader of the Government knew that certain parties had come from Providence, R. I., to establish a manufactory of screws in the Province of Ontario. They did this under a Protective tariff of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and must have regarded the undertaking as a profitable one, or they would never have invested their money in it. If that $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Protection were sufficient, and the duty was now raised to 35 per cent., every man who purchased \$65 worth of screws under Free-trade, would, under this tariff, have to pay \$100. If the object was to obtain a revenue from this article, the tax should have been a reasonable one, because there were few who would purchase goods for importation when the tax amounted to 35 per cent. in addition to freight, rate of exchange, etc. When these goods would be sold, there would be a profit charged upon the 35 per cent. as well as upon the original price; so that before these screws passed into the hands of the consumer, at least 40 per cent. addition would be made to the full price. This tax was imposed in the interest of parties who would practically enjoy a monopoly of the trade. True, other manufactories could be started, but that would require a large capital, which was not easily acquired for so small a market. What was the history of manufacturing industries started in this way and under such circumstances? In most cases, where there was a

large premium in the form of a Protective duty, workmen, with little or no means, undertook to start other establishments to compete with those already in operation which were run by men of capital, and, in a few months, the former would have to succumb; so that the parties who, in the first instance, started with considerable capital enjoyed in so limited a market a monopoly. Wherever a system of Protection was adopted, that protection was a premium in favour of continuing the manufacture with the sort of machinery that was originally employed. In England, until Huskisson proposed to remove the Protective duty on silk, they continued to manufacture that article with the same description of looms and appliances as had been used by Huguenots. There was no improvement until the system of Protection was done away with. In the United States, until the outbreak of the Civil War, when labour became scarce, they used the old style of agricultural implements, but had then to improve machinery so as to make up for the lack of labour, and agricultural machinery was improved during the five years of the Civil War more than during the fifty previous years. By affording exclusive Protection such as this, these manufacturers would go on with their existing appliances as long as possible, until, by means of superior appliances, outside manufacturers would be enabled to overcome this duty and compete with our manufacturers in our markets. Our manufacturers, for instance, had formerly no difficulty in selling any sort of stoves to our people, but since they were compelled to compete with the Americans they were obliged to make a better article. Under this system, instead of the industry being encouraged, an inferior article would be produced, and all motive for improvement, all necessity for making labour efficient, would be taken away.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he congratulated the House and the country on the appearance of the hon. member for Bothwell in the character of a thorough-paced Protectionist. His speech was an answer to all he had said during the campaign. He said that this establishment at Dundas, having the advantage of priority in its establishment,

and having invested capital, it had, under this duty, practically a monopoly, and that there was no use in younger manufacturers or workmen going in to establish similar enterprises, because of the practical monopoly which the previous employment of capital gave to this establishment at Dundas. What was the argument the Conservatives had used all through the country? It was that priority in the establishment of an enterprise gave a great advantage to it, and that in such cases protection was allowed. The hon. gentleman was afraid that this establishment was going to be such a monopoly that it would crush all the others, and, in the interest of labour, he would crush this monopoly. It was not likely that the employment of \$120,000 or \$240,000 in any industry would prevent other enterprises of the same kind being started. The fact of this institution being profitable would induce, in the natural course of competition, the establishment of others of a similar nature. The hon. gentleman would admit that, if we were to have manufactures, all other things being equal, it was as well to have them in our own country as to get them from foreign countries.

MR. MILLS: Without Protection, otherwise there is no real profit at all.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman stated that our manufactures could not get on because there were previous establishments in the United States, protected establishments, with large capital, which crushed down our infant manufactures. He referred to one establishment at Dundas, which killed, he stated, other enterprises of the same kind. The hon. gentleman was of the same opinion as the Government, that our infant industries were being crushed by the protected institutions in the United States. But the hon. gentleman, going back to his Free-trade theories, said that in consequence of a protective duty the old patterns would be kept up. How did it happen that the Americans were enabled to manufacture a superior description of goods, as the hon. gentleman had stated, in the manufacture of stoves? He had a high opinion of the hon. gentleman's opinions, and was glad to find that he entertained

the same opinions as did the Government on this subject. Then the hon. gentleman said that, in consequence of this duty, they would have to pay \$100, where they only paid \$50 before. They were not going to pay the \$100 because they were going to make the screws in Canada. The statement of the hon. member for Centre Toronto showed that the price had not been increased since the imposition of the present tariff.

MR. CURRIER said that the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell was not a very sound one. That hon. gentleman said that so much protection was given to the manufacture of screws that it would be throwing all into the hands of the one establishment now existing, and therefore they would continue to use the bungling machinery they now used, and would consequently make an inferior article. He (Mr. Currier) believed that, if they continued to make an inferior article, other manufacturers would come forward who would use the most improved machinery, and take the business from them.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. the First Minister had sheltered himself under the authority of John Stuart Mill. He thought, if the hon. gentleman refreshed his memory, he would find that Mr. Mill had said that, incidentally, Protection might be useful under certain rules which he laid down. Hon. gentlemen opposite had argued that manufacturers had no sort of advantage under the late tariff. He (Mr. Cartwright) asserted that that tariff, which was an average tariff of 17½ per cent., gave an enormous incidental protection to all kinds of manufactures in the country. This tax upon screws, instead of benefiting the revenue, would benefit the capitalist engaged in the business. By-and-by there would, probably, be three or four manufacturers, and then they would divide the plunder. He maintained that nothing but the absurd fiscal policy of the United States had kept it from being the most formidable competitor of England in the commerce of the world. If hon. gentlemen wanted an illustration as to the working of the Protection system, they might find it in this, that, in spite of the high tax levied on steel rails, the chief manager of one of the principal railroads

in the United States had sent to England for 12,000 tons of steel rails, in the face of a duty which he was informed was now nearly 100 per cent. They had had twenty years of the highest prohibitory tariff in the world, and they were not able to manufacture steel rails to be compared with the steel rails of England.

MR. JONES said that the hon. member for Centre Huron only spoke theoretically; he (Mr. Jones) after 20 years' experience could speak practically. With regard to steel, and almost all classes of iron, they had been able to import a very large portion of their supply from the United States, that highly protected country. In his own business, he had been able to import bar steel cheaper from the United States than from England. He denied that there were the great advantages which the hon. member for Bothwell had attached to the priority of manufacture. He admitted that there was a certain advantage in being first in starting a manufacture in a country, but the manufacturer would have to undersell those who had command of the market in order to obtain a market. Then the American and the English manufacturers would reduce their prices in order to crush out the new manufacturer. He maintained that the result of this tariff was that the people of Canada were getting those goods cheaper than ever. A malleable iron firm in Troy, N. Y., had written to parties in the village where he had lived, stating that the market price of malleable iron castings was 7c., or 7½c., and offering to send them in at 6¾c., laid down at their own doors, freight and duty paid. While the tariff before the House gave incidental protection, he did not regard it as a Protective tariff, but as a revenue tariff. He hoped it would be a lasting tariff, and he was satisfied it would result in the protection of Canadian labour. If it were found that the revenue derived from it was larger than anticipated, the duty on the necessaries of life might be removed.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said he agreed that enough, or more than enough, competition in the home market would reduce the price of an article, and there were certain industries in Canada

in which there was so much competition that the prices could not be raised greatly to the disadvantage of the purchaser, except by a combination, which could not, perhaps, be permanently maintained. In regard to screws, there was only one factory in the Dominion. The total importation of screws last year amounted to \$18,633, which was not sufficient to call another manufactory into existence. The inevitable result, therefore, of one man having control of the market, with the advantage of a tariff of from 25 to 40 per cent., would be to send up the price of screws. It was human nature to take advantage of an opportunity like this, and, when the manufacturer could increase the price legitimately, and when that increase was legalised by the tariff, it would undoubtedly be done.

MR. PLUMB said it would not be surprising if his hon. friend the Finance Minister did occasionally manifest a little restiveness in the position in which he was placed by hon. gentlemen opposite. He must say, with all parliamentary deference, that the late Finance Minister exceeded all others who occupied the Opposition benches, in the insolence with which he propounded his questions. It was not surprising that hon. gentleman should feel sore in respect to the tariff which had been brought forward. It was not surprising, after he had been washed overboard by the wave that swept over the country, that he should be struggling amidst the breakers, and anything that came from him must be received with a grain of allowance on account of the desperate position that he was in. But there was dissension in the Opposition camp, most unfortunate dissension, which still further weakened and embarrassed them, their tactics were not in harmony. They did not present an unbroken front to the enemy, there were grave differences among them. For instance, the position taken by the Minister of the Interior, when he rose, was one of utter antagonism to the leader of his party in the Dominion, the grand old Reformist himself, the gentleman who went, cap in hand, with bended knee, to the United States Government, and offered all we had for the purpose of getting reciprocity in the exchange of farm

products. Did he want only to get farm products into Canada, to compete with ours? They were already admitted duty free. The late Minister of the Interior said the consumer paid the duty. Therefore, everything the leader of his party did was in the direction of an absolute sacrifice, a sacrifice which would have amounted to \$2,300,000 of duties upon American goods, which he offered to put on the free list, taking the imports of 1874 as a basis of calculation. He also offered to expend a large sum in enlarging and constructing canals, at a time when the revenue was declining, and would have also given up the Fishery Award, and conceded the free navigation of our rivers, lakes, and canals—and all for what? For the purpose of inducing the American people to receive our produce, upon which, according to the late Minister of the Interior, they paid the duty, and we lost nothing by their heavy tariff. Well, that was one of the inconsistencies of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Another was uttered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who stated in this House that the tariff in the United States reduced the price of pig iron so far, that, under a heavy Protective duty, it was sold cheaper than ever before, either in that country or in England. He was not at one with the late Finance Minister, who had stated that a Protective duty increased prices by that duty, and, perhaps, created a monopoly which enhanced them still more. The hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), now a Free-trade Boanerges, in the most patriotic tones, in 1873, prayed that the hon. the Premier would give Protection. He said he had hoped that the Finance Minister would have brought in a Protective tariff. It was an urgent need of the country. That was the hon. gentleman's supplication in 1873, and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver), who had just addressed the House, had also petitioned for the adoption of a Protective tariff and a National Policy, but now he had no language with which he could sufficiently denounce it. The late Premier and Minister of the Interior had never introduced the Free-trade principle so far as petroleum was concerned. They always kept a heavy duty on that

article. It was a product of their respective constituencies, and they knew, to use a figurative expression, the origin of where the milk in that cocoanut came from. It would be impossible for any man, even if he were gifted with the proverbial patience of the old patriarch, to sit here, hour after hour, with perfect equanimity, constantly answering the most inconsequential and trivial questions put forth on the Opposite side; to hear, hour after hour, on every item, the renewal of the whole Protection and Free-trade discussions without manifesting some impatience. The late Minister of the Interior had argued and quoted John Stuart Mill, to prove that Protective duties were ruinous, that all tariff charges were a direct tax, to their full amount, and much more, upon the consumer. How did the holders of those views account for the fact that, in one of the most highly protected countries in Europe—Belgium,—when the iron and coal trades were stagnant in England, when every manufacturing industry in England was paralysed, the British Secretary of Legation in Belgium could report a very different state of things there? If that report had been made with regard to the United States, they would have been told that those results were owing to the enormous Protection. They had been told last night by the member for North Brant (Mr. Fleming) that the people of the United States were fools for keeping up a Protective system. Well, he (Mr. Pumb) thought that we might as well mind our own business, and leave the Americans to befooled themselves if they liked. They had befooled themselves to some purpose. They learned from the speech of the member for North Norfolk—which contained his first opinions: they did not know what the last were—that the internal commerce of the United States amounted to twelve thousand millions a year; that, although they might have lost foreign commerce, their internal trade had sprung up to such an enormous extent as to compensate them for it. That was exactly what they asked for Canada, through the system which the hon. the Finance Minister had proposed, and which was fought with such determination, such abusive bitterness on the floor of this House, as well as in the late con-

test, the result of which had been an overwhelming declaration of public opinion in its favour. There was nothing truer than the rough cartoon displayed in a comic paper of last Saturday, which represented the Government party in the House in unbroken front, and all the leading gentlemen on the other side astride their hobbies—every man nearly coming to grief, or, if not, tilting violently against his neighbour. They on his side could afford to let them quarrel amongst themselves; but he did protest against the opening of the whole Free-trade question upon every petty item in this schedule. They were anxious to go on with the business of the Session, but had not been disposed to prevent free discussion. On the other side, the discussion had been carried on with such a lack of courtesy, and with such bitterness, as had rarely been witnessed. The member for Centre Huron, last night, quoted the example of Bright and Cobden to justify him in language which was far beyond parliamentary rule, and, if it were not unparliamentary to say so, was such as he (Mr. Plumb) could style utterly disgraceful. The Finance Minister had shown a desire to give the House full information; but he could not be expected to furnish d tails with respect to every item in such an enormously cumbersome list as that of a full tariff. Nobody knew this better than the late Finance Minister, who had displayed his utter ignorance of his duties when he brought down the tariff for 1874, with its 16½ per cent. rate, a tariff which attacked and bungled and muddled and disturbed every business interest in Canada. He had to withdraw that tariff and content himself with making a horizontal tariff of 17½ per cent., a rate which he now considered so sacred that he thought no man should touch. That was the sacred number, and 2½ per cent. more appeared to be thought robbery, sacrilege, pillage, that would destroy their industries and ruin the country. Away with such trash and nonsense—let their opponents bring a little practical common sense to the discussion, and they would be able to dispose of it and pass to other business which must be done before the Session closed. If it was delayed, the Opposition must bear the responsibility of keeping them here, and he

MR. PLUMB.

(Mr. Plumb) would do his part towards having it understood by the members of both Houses, who were kept from their homes and their business interests, and the people who paid for their attendance, where the responsibility belonged.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that, if the hon. the Finance Minister was desirous of getting on with that discussion, and conducting it in a reasonable and proper tone, he would advise him not to set up the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) to use the scandalous language he had just employed. He had never heard anything more utterly disgraceful than that hon. gentleman's language in speaking of hon. members on the Opposition side of the House. He seemed to think that he was licensed to say anything, however coarse and severe. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was not aware of any bitterness or impropriety having been shown on his side of the House as that hon. member asserted. It was their duty as an Opposition to scan the Government's propositions for taxation zealously, and they would not be deterred from doing it by any ill language the hon. member for Niagara might be put up to use. There was no intention to show any factious opposition to the Government, who had based their existence on this tariff, and who had a large majority. The Opposition had expressed their opinion of it in a general way, and must do so also in regard to the details. They had criticised very few of the details indeed, and at least half of the time of the discussion had been occupied by the Ministerial side; they would endeavour in every fair and right way to aid the Government to get their measures through Parliament; but, on the other hand, they must discharge their duty of criticising freely and independently the Government's policy. The hon. member for Centre Huron, who was the late Finance Minister, had a right to attend to the details of this measure, and it was necessary that he should speak frequently and pointedly on matters connected with the subject under discussion. The hon. the Finance Minister would do much better for himself and the Government by preventing such interruptions of such a calm, temperate and fair discussion as had been carried on from the Opposi-

tion side of the House, as had just been witnessed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had listened with a great deal of care to the speech of the hon. member for Niagara, and had failed to hear one single unparliamentary remark.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman spoke of the insolence of the member for Centre Huron.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman only said that, if it had been parliamentary, he would have gone far enough to use that word.

MR. MACKENZIE: No; it was the word disgraceful he used in that connection.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the hon. member for Niagara was quoting the language used by the member for Centre Huron last night, when he spoke about the robbery, pillage, iniquity, etc., perpetrated in connection with this tariff, employing every epithet from Billingsgate vocabulary that could be heaped upon it, and all who supported it. If this measure was robbery, the members who countenanced it were robbers. He had heard the member for Niagara but quote the language of the member for Centre Huron, and he was sure that, if he had used unparliamentary expressions, Mr. Speaker would have called him to order. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was sure that, to use a phrase of the member for Lambton, he was not the man to administer a lecture on parliamentary propriety. He thought he had heard that hon. gentleman using such language towards the member for Niagara as that he had made an idiotic tirade of about two hours' length.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had told the member for Niagara, the following day, that he was not aware that he used that expression; that he regretted it, and had asked the official reporter not to leave it in his speech.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was sure the hon. member for Niagara was not aware, either, that he had used any such word as insolent, and would ask the reporter not to put it in the *Hansard*. With regard to the last Parliament, he

(Sir John A. Macdonald) did not think the hon. gentleman was exceedingly careful in his language; and, to-day, he had used a very improper expression, reflecting upon the independence of members of Parliament, in observing that he would advise the Finance Minister not to put up the member for Niagara, as they had just heard. What right had the member for Lambton to say that his hon. friend had put up any independent member to make a speech, or that any would allow himself to be put up for such a purpose? The hon. member for Niagara had the very same privilege and right as the member for Lambton to express his opinions, and his remarks were of a general character, but not more general than the member for Bothwell on the general principles of political economy. The member for Lambton observed that half the useless speeches that were made on this subject came from the Ministerial side. Considering their numbers, they should be surprised that his hon. friends only took up half the time. He ventured to say that, if they took up the *Hansard*, and counted every line and word uttered in this debate, that it would be found the active, energetic, able minority had taken up more than half the time.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he might observe for himself that it was a matter of profound indifference to him what the member for Niagara thought or said as to himself. Consequently he did not care a single straw whether the hon. member's words were parliamentary or unparliamentary. He had never called him to order, and never should, let him say what he liked. As for his own (Mr. Cartwright's language last night, if unparliamentary, he would withdraw it, or put it into parliamentary form. But he would repeat that his position with regard to the whole tariff system was that the people of Canada were being robbed. That was the opinion and belief of the Opposition. It did not necessarily follow, however, as the First Minister had said, that they thereby accused hon. gentlemen opposite of being robbers. That would not be parliamentary, and they did not say so. But they did declare that, from first to last, the whole tariff was a scheme of spoliation, to

which the consent of a very small numerical majority of the people had been obtained under false pretences; and he asserted that, in stating that here or elsewhere, they were using no unparliamentary language. As they honestly believed that, they had a perfect right to use that language in describing what they believed to be a gross outrage and crime upon the people of this country. They did not apply that language to persons, at any rate in that House; for what they said outside they would be prepared to answer. Here they were prepared to recognise the rules of debate. Should the Speaker think that he (Mr. Cartwright) had, in the heat of debate, exceeded the legitimate limit of Parliament, by language which had a pretty wide range, he should not only withdraw that language, but take care as far as he could to guard against its repetition. But he denied *in toto* that the language used in describing this tariff was unparliamentary. There were abundant examples in the Parliamentary debates of the Mother Country, of language to the full as strong, and stronger, than any he had ever used in his place.

Item agreed to.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 26) To authorise the Trustees of the Toronto Savings Bank to sell and convey to the Home Savings and Loan Company, Limited.—(Mr. Cameron, North Victoria.)

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed consideration of Resolution 11, reported from Committee of Ways and Means.

On item—Oil cloth, stamped, painted or printed, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked what amount of revenue it was expected would be collected on this article; it looked to him like a prohibitive duty.

Mr. TILLEY said they did not expect it would be a prohibitive duty. The imports last year amounted to \$131,722, yielding a revenue of \$23,000. It was expected that the duty imposed would increase the quantity manufactured in the country, but that the quantity that would still be imported would yield \$3,000 or \$4,000 revenue more than that of last year.

Item agreed to.

On item—Opium, prepared for smoking, \$5 per lb.,

Mr. ANGLIN said he thought for many reasons this was an objectionable proposition. Temperance men generally contended that the licensing of the sale of wines and strong liquors was the legalisation of that traffic, and how hon. gentlemen who held that opinion could in silence permit an item like this to pass was beyond his comprehension. It was an admission that opium might be used with propriety in this country for smoking purposes. He supposed it was intended to bear upon the Chinese in our western country, many of whom were stated to be addicted to this habit. But whether it would not be well to meet that case in some other way than by imposing a duty on opium for smoking he thought might fairly be taken into consideration. When he saw the item first, it startled him, but it occurred to him afterwards that it was introduced thoughtlessly. Whether the duty on opium for all purposes might not be largely increased, or whether we might not have one duty imposed in the original packages, and another duty on opium in any other shape, might well receive consideration. He felt a strong objection to seeing an item of this kind in our tariff.

Mr. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman had suggested that this should be dealt with in some other way, but he had not suggested any other way. They could only deal with it in two ways: one was to admit it and charge as high a duty as possible, in order to discourage its use:

and the other was to prohibit it, which, he concluded, was the other way the hon. member wished to deal with it. Now, he recollected the speeches made by that hon. gentleman in New Brunswick, on the subject of prohibition, and he recollected reading a speech made by him in this House last Session, when he felt it his bounden duty, though Speaker, to get up and declaim against the principle of prohibition as being outrageous. He (Mr. Tilley) was rejoiced and delighted to find that the hon. gentleman was a convert in favour of prohibition against the introduction of opium for the Chinese.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: But it all ends in smoke, you see.

MR. TILLEY said there had been a great advance in public opinion, in certain directions, in the last eight or ten years, and he must say that, of all the conversions he had heard of in favour of prohibition in the Dominion of Canada, within the last ten years, none was more satisfactory than that of the hon. member for Gloucester.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Or so sudden.

MR. TILLEY said that in British Columbia last year the duty paid on 14,470 lb., at $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., was \$11,642. He agreed with the hon. gentleman that the use of that drug, as the Chinese used it, was a misfortune. There were only two ways of dealing with it—either prohibit it, or make the duty so high as that it would diminish the quantity consumed. Therefore, it was proposed that, upon this article, which cost \$11 or \$12 per pound, \$5 per pound should be imposed as a duty. If they consumed even two-thirds of what they consumed last year, the duty would give an additional revenue of \$25,000. They would pay about the same percentage as the people in this country paid on wine, about 50 per cent of the value.

MR. ANGLIN said the hon. the Finance Minister had made a good point against himself individually, although it did not amount to a great deal. Though he was opposed to drunkenness, he did not believe that any set of men ought to prescribe to another set of men whether they should or should not use alcoholic

beverages. Those beverages were often beneficial, as was also opium, and he would not have it prohibited if used in a proper way. Opium smoking was one of the most destructive and ruinous vices to which any people could be addicted. So bad was it that even in China an attempt had been made to prohibit the introduction of opium. Evidently the hon. the Finance Minister contemplated the introduction of opium in different shapes. He proposed to tax the smoking preparation heavily; why not, then, as it generally came in the form of cakes, tax it in cake or in the crude state, at one rate, and in all other preparations whatever, at another rate? He, however, would be happy to see its improper use prohibited, whatever charge of inconsistency it might expose him to.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said hon. gentlemen opposite had frequently attacked this tariff as being opposed to England and the Imperial policy, and they had raised the cry of disloyalty because it was proposed to tax certain things without reference to the Imperial policy. The Imperial policy of England was now to encourage opium smoking. A considerable portion of the revenue in India was derived from the opium raised there and sold in China. As the hon. gentleman knew, they attempted to put it down in China, but it was in this way: The Chinese Government became Protectionists, and said they could raise as good opium in China as was raised in India, and therefore they put an additional duty on the foreign article, in order to raise opium in those provinces of China where the poppy would grow. The hon. gentleman must remember that one of the ablest State papers on that subject was drawn by the Duke of Argyll, when he was Secretary of State for India. That paper had ever since been an authority, and it was stated that the smoking of opium by the Chinese was not injurious, that it was a mere opiate to soothe the irritation produced by the stimulating property of tea. That paper was a complete vindication of the British Government.

MR. ANGLIN said the right hon. gentleman was mistaken in one or two particulars. In the first place, a great many years ago an effort was made to

exclude opium altogether from China, and that led to the first Chinese war. The importation was then prohibited, not with any view of encouraging the growth of the poppy in China, but it was an honest attempt on the part of the Chinese Government to put an end to the practice which they found to be so injurious. They knew that England went to war with China to compel them to receive the opium, and that they succeeded. In later years the Chinese Government, finding it impossible to keep opium out of the country, had adopted the Protective system, and allowed the growth of opium in the country.

Item agreed to.

On item—Organs, cabinet, viz:—On reed organs having not more than two sets of reeds, a specific duty of ten dollars; having over two and not over four sets of reeds, fifteen dollars; having over four and not over six sets of reeds, twenty dollars; having over six sets of reeds, thirty dollars; and in addition thereto, ten per cent. *ad valorem* on the fair market value thereof,

Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked if the hon. gentleman would tell what this item represented in the way of an *ad valorem* duty, and what the value of this class of organ was.

Mr. TILLEY said on reed organs, a duty of \$10 and 10 per cent. was imposed, and they had the following prices varying from \$46 to \$149. He had prepared the following table:—

2 Sets Reeds, \$10, and 10 p.c.	2 to 4 Sets, \$15, and 10 p.c.	4 to 6 Sets \$20, and 10 p.c.
p.c.	p.c.	p.c.
\$ 46 .. 31½ ..	\$125 .. 22 ..	\$112 .. 27-85.
63 .. 26 ..	100 .. 25 ..	265 .. 17-8.
100 .. 20 ..	127	139
112	139	123
105	149	149
75 .. 23½ ..	87	133
134	112	159
59	109	123
79	119	149
97	129	137
65	159
93
95
115
83
87
149 .. 17

Average 21 p.c. Average 22 p.c. Average 23½ p.c.

Item agreed to.

Mr. ANGLIN.

On item—Paintings, drawings, engravings, and prints, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*,

Mr. McLENNAN said he could not allow this item to pass, without drawing the attention of the House to the prohibitory rate of duty that we appeared to be putting upon every description of art. He had no doubt that, upon further consideration, and before the tariff came to be dealt with at another Session, this question of duty upon art would be re-considered. This subject might have been overlooked heretofore, but it was one of the greatest importance for the future. In the United States, where high tariffs had prevailed, the rate of duty on works of art was 10 per cent., whilst those for associations for the promotion of art, and works of native artists resident abroad, were admitted free. In our own tariff, printing, drawings, engravings, and prints were put down at 20 per cent.; manufactured and finished marble was put down at 25 per cent., and he supposed this included statuary. The great improvement that had been made of late in England, in the production of illustrated works created another element in the art education of the country. He found that the progress that had been made in that respect had brought into public service in England a very high class of art. There was no home production of these works of art to be protected, and the revenue derived from them would be very small, because the importation was very small, and he trusted the Finance Minister would consider this matter during recess, and be prepared to place them on the free list, or the 5 per cent. list.

Mr. MACKENZIE said there was an item in the free list, of paintings by artists of well known merit, and copies of the old masters. No doubt the Custom-house clerks and deputies would be able, quite as well as the Minister of Finance, to distinguish those works of art from others.

Mr. TILLEY said that models for the use of schools of design, as well as paintings in oil by artists of well known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists, were admitted free. Paintings, drawings, engravings and prints, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. These were to

be found only in the houses of the wealthy, who could afford to pay the duty. Had they been put on the 5 per cent. list, hon. gentlemen opposite would have exclaimed against the Government for imposing such a light duty, when tea and sugar were charged heavy duties.

MR. MILLS said it was a mistake to tax heavily works of sculpture and paintings. Whatever might be the general standard of intelligence in a new country, it must, with respect to æsthetical culture, be behind an old country, and not only was it necessary to provide the necessary appliances for the advantage of artists, but, in order that the product of their art should find a market, it was necessary that a taste for art should be cultivated in the country, and a powerful means of doing this was by encouraging the diffusion of works of art as much as possible. He knew of some instances where parties had countermanded orders for paintings from Europe since this tariff was introduced. It seemed to him that these articles should have been put on the free list or on the 5 per cent. list.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there would be no difficulty in discriminating between the works of eminent artists and those of inferior artists. The real works of art which would educate the people were allowed in free. This duty would apply to an immense mass of rubbish which came into this country and degraded art.

MR. McLENNAN said in Europe there were a host of copyists of the paintings of the old masters, and the best copies were never sold for any price worthy the dignity of the art, while the humblest painter producing an original picture got a better price than he could have got for any copy of a picture in the art galleries. Some limit should be placed on the valuation for the duty, as it was extremely difficult to fix the commercial value of those works. In the matter of engravings, there was the widest possible range in the value, from the humblest that appeared in our magazines to the finest steel engravings.

MR. STRANGE said, from the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell

(Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), the public would be led to infer that there were no native artists of any merit in Canada. In justice to the Ontario Society of Arts, he protested against this assumption. That society held an annual exhibition, in which several paintings of great merit were exhibited. In justice to them, this tax should be levied, and thus protect the native product of art.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What revenue will be derived from the increased duty on paper-hanging?

MR. TILLEY said the importation last year was \$189,142, on which \$33,102 revenue was collected. Under this tariff it was estimated \$69,000 additional revenue would be produced, after making allowance for the increase in the article manufactured in this Dominion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: It is proposed simply for revenue?

MR. TILLEY: For both revenue and Protection.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he was afraid the increase would largely diminish the importation, and would have the effect of producing an inferior article, as it was not likely an article equal to the imported one could be made here. There was no object in taxing an article like this except for revenue purposes.

MR. TILLEY said he did not think the tariff would diminish the importation of the better class of wall papers. The manufacture of the common description of wall paper which was used in the Dominion would, no doubt, be increased, but not sufficiently to diminish the revenue.

Item agreed to.

On item—Paper calendered, 22½ per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked what was calendered paper.

MR. TILLEY said it was a distinction recommended by the trade between the paper used for printing purposes and glazed paper, such as writing paper. They did not expect to derive any

increase of revenue from the change made in the duty upon paper.

MR. ANGLIN enquired whether, under this duty, it was calculated that, within a reasonably short time, factories would be established in which writing paper would be manufactured for general use in this country.

MR. TILLEY said, after giving the matter the fullest enquiry, and obtaining information from all quarters, the Government had decided that an addition of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on calendered paper would lead to the manufacture, within a few years, of a large portion of this description of paper. It was manufactured at present, but not extensively.

Item agreed to.

On item—Plants, viz: Fruit, shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CHARLTON said that he was informed by those engaged in this trade, that orders for fruit trees were generally given a long time in advance of the time for delivery, and that a large number of orders were given before there was any talk of the imposition of a duty upon plants. He would enquire whether, in such a case, any remission of duty would be allowed upon the fulfilment of the orders.

MR. CASEY said he had one or two applications from his neighbourhood, asking for a remission of duties in these cases. Such a remission of duties, he believed, was not altogether without a precedent, since he understood that, in the case of the Credit Valley Railroad, which had ordered some steel rails before the tariff came into force, an arrangement had been made for the remission of the duty on those articles.

MR. TILLEY said an application had been made for a remission of duty on the road in question, but the answer that had been given was that the case could not be taken into consideration, because all that would be necessary in cases where parties desired to take advantage of the increased duties would be to submit a written agreement showing that the goods were ordered before the im-

MR. TILLEY.

position. He thought it would be quite apparent to hon. gentlemen that no such agreement could be recognised.

Item agreed to.

On item—Plaster of Paris, calcined or manufactured, 15c. per 100lb., or 45c. per barrel of not over 300lb.,

MR. CHARLTON said that plaster of Paris was considered a fertiliser, and he asked whether the hon gentleman could, with propriety, impose a duty upon it.

MR. TILLEY said that this article was a fertiliser, but the fact that they had an abundance of raw material in the country and the men and mills to grind it had induced them to impose the duty. They did not see why they should send the raw material to the United States to be ground and brought back again.

MR. MACKENZIE: Where was that done?

MR. TILLEY: It was done in New Brunswick.

MR. MILLS: It must have been advantageous, or it would not have been done.

MR. CHARLTON said this tariff would act injuriously to the agricultural interest, and on that ground he regarded it as objectionable.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought that many years must have elapsed since any of their plaster was sent to the United States to be manufactured. For many years past they had manufactured it in their own country.

Item agreed to.

On item—Printing presses of all kinds, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. ANGLIN said he had received letters with regard to printing presses from persons who understood the matter, and who regarded this as a grievous burden, and one that should not be imposed. There was a great variety of printing presses, and it was simply impossible that this duty could serve any purpose of Protection, because no factory could exist in Canada that made them. The printers felt they were hardly dealt with.

They were given little or no Protection under the tariff, while their burdens were greatly increased.

MR. TILLEY said that there might be some objection taken to this duty, because it was only 15 per cent., whilst other manufacturers were paying 20 and 25 per cent. He maintained that printers had a great advantage under this tariff, especially book and job printers, and that the job printing which used to be brought into the country by travelling companies was now being done in Canada. An instance of this had occurred lately in Ottawa. He found that the value of the portable hand-presses which paid duty was \$1,859, while those that were admitted free were valued at \$99,298. The proposed duty of 15 per cent. would perhaps result in a revenue of from \$10,000 to \$15,000. He could not see, if the necessaries of life were taxed at from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent., why this class of machinery should be exempted.

MR. CARWRIGHT said he did not see what earthly right the cotton or worsted manufacturer had to get his machinery in free, because it could not be made in the country, while the printer and manufacturer of paper was obliged to pay duty on his machinery, which was not made in this country. That was distinctly an injustice to this particular class of manufacturers, and in favour of others much more largely protected.

MR. TILLEY said that up to 1873 the tariff was so arranged that, by Order in Council, machinery not made in this country was admitted free. Subsequently, by Order in Council, a duty of 10 per cent. was imposed. It was found, and he was satisfied, that hon. gentlemen opposite would bear testimony to the accuracy of his statement, that previously to and after 1873, machinery represented not to be manufactured in the country, was manufactured in the country. It was utterly or practically impossible for the Treasury Board or the Government to definitely settle the matter, though they might have a certificate from particular sections of the country, that that article was not produced in it. It might be found

that the machinery was afterwards made with great dissatisfaction as to the result. In some cases, prices were taken and had not been collected. It was then decided that, if any machinery was to be admitted free, it should not be by Order in Council, but under the tariff itself. With the exception of cotton machinery, it was found that there was very little that would be required on our industries that could not be made here. Machinery for the cotton or worsted industries, when established here, must be imported. The machinery from the United States manufactories was of the most perfect character at present, giving manufacturers in those trades advantage over every other part of the world. It was considered better to come to the House and ask that an arrangement of this kind should be made by it, leaving nothing to be done by the Governor in Council.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there was not the faintest likelihood that printing presses of the best kind would be made in this country for many a day; so the hon. gentleman's whole argument tended to show that the best description of those presses should be put on the free list.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said that a great many petitions protesting against taxing printing presses had come from printers in all parts of the country. Valuable printing presses were not made here. The Finance Minister said this duty was collected to encourage the book publishing business; but the presses required for all the finer kinds of book work were not made in Canada, but only the ordinary presses. The large presses, such as the *Globe* and *Mail* were printed on, would come to \$2,000 or \$3,000. This was an important item, and must interfere with the printing business. It would throw a serious obstacle in the way of the book publishing business. Any newspaper man or book publisher that wished to furnish an office with the finer kinds of book-work, would be utterly unable to do so with the Canadian kind of type, which was an inferior article. For ordinary newspaper work, the Montreal type material had been found to be of very in-

ferior quality. A good article had to be imported. He thought that the Finance Minister should not have imposed those duties on printers' material.

MR. ANGLIN said that the argument for advantages to machinery used in the making of cotton and woollen goods applied to the better kinds of printing presses with greater force, as they could not be made in this country. As presses for the large newspapers, and the finer kinds of work, must be imported, a protective duty was uncalled for, and would be unavailing, as there was no probability that manufactories of that kind could be established and maintained in Canada.

MR. BOWELL said it was unfortunate that, in case of almost every item affecting our industries, they should find some hon. gentleman depreciating the value of the articles manufactured in this country. The member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) stated that the type manufactured in Montreal was of an inferior quality, and unfit for book-work, while the fact was, it would do for both it and newspaper work. He had no doubt that our type-founders would produce an article suited for all kinds of work done in this country. The Scotch metal, brought here at a small duty, would enable Montreal men, with skilled mechanics, to close the Canadian market against United States type. He knew the sources of the petitions against these duties, including an importer of Scotch type in Toronto. It was quite true that the larger presses were not manufactured in Canada; but it was equally true that, a very few years ago, there were no power presses, either treadle or steam, made here. But, for some years past, an Oshawa company had turned out a very good class of press, called jobbers, which were of the very best kind used; and they also produced an excellent power press, known as the Taylor. When they could do this, he had no doubt that, with this protection, such firms would be able to enter largely into the manufacture of the presses used for all kinds of work. Though the eight-cylinder press might not be made here at present, it was no reason why they should not pay their proportion of the revenue as well as

MR. ROSS.

other articles. The ordinary platen or hand-press used to do all the book work of the country, but now, with the power presses, having proper registering apparatus, books could be well printed here. He was assured by practical men that, under this tariff, ninety-nine hundredths of the class of work heretofore done in the United States for Canada would now be done by Canadian printers.

MR. ANGLIN said that, from his knowledge of the business, though it was somewhat theoretical, there was no compensatory advantage given to the great mass of those engaged in the newspaper business, under this tariff, for the many burdens imposed upon them.

Item agreed to.

On item—Quinine, sulphate of, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to the desirability of making this article duty free. Quinine was universally used, and it was one of those things which it was desirable to have in the Free list, especially as the amount of duty derived from it could not be considerable. It was hardly an article from which revenue should be obtained.

MR. TILLEY asked on what grounds it should be free.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Medicines ought to be free.

MR. TILLEY said he could not understand why this particular article should be admitted free.

Item agreed to.

On item—Salt (except salt imported from the United Kingdom, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries, which shall be free of duty) in bulk, 8c. per 100lb.; in bags, barrels, or other packages, 12c. per 100lb.,

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said perhaps the hon. the Finance Minister would allow that item to stand over, as he (Mr. Cameron) knew that the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) intended to speak on the subject. As

the hon. the Minister of Finance was aware, that gentleman took a lively interest in the matter, but, through illness, he was unable to attend the House.

MR. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman could move an amendment on the second reading.

MR. CAMERON said he regretted the hon. the Finance Minister had not dealt with this industry in the same generous spirit with which he had dealt with the other industries of the country. He would like to know why this important industry had been left out in the cold. There was no industry in the country, from the little clock factory in the city of Hamilton, to the largest and most important industry in the Dominion, that the hon. gentleman had not undertaken to protect. Our salt interest alone had received no encouragement, no assistance, and no consideration at the hands of the Finance Minister, and he would like the hon. gentleman to explain to the House and the country why this important industry, one of the most important in the country, had not been considered by him in the same spirit in which he had dealt with other industries. The only protection the salt manufacturers of the western section of the country received under this tariff, was from salt coming into the Province of Ontario from the United States. By referring to the trade returns, it would be found that there were only some 33,000 bushels of salt imported from the United States last year.

Some Hon. MEMBERS : 183,000 bushels.

MR. CAMERON said that was the total quantity brought into the whole Dominion from the United States. The hon. the Minister of Finance knew that, owing to the high freights, the salt manufacturers of the western section never could send their salt to the Lower Provinces, especially to the Provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. The only sections of the Dominion to which they could at all hope to send this product of the Canadian mines was the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec. This duty would only have the effect of excluding 33,000 bushels of salt from the markets

of Ontario. That quantity was a mere bagatelle, and could be produced in the smaller wells engaged in the manufacture of salt in Ontario in ten days. And, yet, the hon. gentleman had undertaken to impose this duty upon salt, to try to make the people of the western section believe that the Government was conferring a boon upon them. This duty would do no good whatever to the salt industry of Canada. He (Mr. Cameron) would have been better satisfied if the Government had left salt alone. There were seven millions of dollars invested in this industry in the counties of Huron and Bruce alone, and, as a matter of fact, since the establishment of salt factories in Ontario, there had been a saving to the people of the country of between \$5,000,000 and \$7,500,000, owing to the very large reduction in the price of salt, after salt was discovered in Canada. While the hon. the Finance Minister was dealing with every Canadian industry, and undertaking to protect it, the salt manufacturers of the West fully expected to be treated in the same spirit as other Canadian industries. And the Finance Minister might rest satisfied that the salt manufacturers would not thank him for the ungenerous and illiberal spirit in which they had been treated. The tariff was said to be a tariff of encouragement and Protection—to the salt manufactures it was a tariff of paralysis and death. They received no Protection. The price of every article used in the manufacture was largely increased. If the hon. gentleman would take the trouble of looking minutely into what he had done for the salt industry by his tariff, he would find that the effect of the tariff would be to very seriously cripple, if not utterly destroy, the whole industry. The duty on everything that was used in the business had been very largely increased. The duty on boilers and engines had been increased from 17½ to 25 per cent. ; on tools used in boring, from 17½ to 30 per cent. ; on tubing, which everybody engaged in the trade knew was necessary for the purpose of getting the brine from the bowels of the earth, the duty had been increased from 17½ to 25 per cent. A large quantity of this tubing was used—one well alone requiring from \$500 to \$1,000 worth. This tubing was not manufactured in

Canada, and could not be obtained here. Canadian tubing had been tried over and over again, but it had been proved a total failure. Boiler plates used in constructing evaporating pans had been increased from 5 to 12½ per cent. Rivets had been increased from 5 to 30 per cent., and nails and spikes from 17 to 35 per cent., over one hundred per cent. Bricks, used in the construction of furnaces and smoke stacks, had to pay a duty of 20 per cent. Cotton, for packages, had been increased from 17½ to 50 per cent. To cap the climax of the hon. gentleman's so-called liberal treatment of the salt manufacturer, a duty of 50c. a ton was put on coal. His hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) must have known very well, from representations made to him by deputations from Goderich, that the imposition of 50c. a ton on coal, and the increases on the cost of the articles used in the manufacture of salt, would increase the cost of manufacturing the article enormously. Now, if the hon. gentleman would take the trouble, or get one of his employés to figure up what the extra expense under this tariff was going to be in manufacturing a barrel of salt in Ontario, he would find it to amount to 12c. a barrel. As an equivalent for this additional taxation, the hon. gentleman gave these manufacturers in the West the privilege of excluding from the Canadian market about 6,000 barrels of salt a year. Why he should deal with this particular industry in the way he had done passed his comprehension. Every argument used in favour of putting a duty on coal or on any manufactured article, could be used in favour of a duty on all salt imported into Canada, and coming in competition with the Canadian manufactured article. And yet the hon. gentleman left this one article at the mercy of the foreign importers, while protecting every other industry in the West. The hon. gentleman knew that a large amount of coal was used in the manufacture of salt. He desired to ask the hon. gentleman if it was intended that there should be a drawback on that coal, when used in the manufacture of salt. The hon. gentleman knew that all the salt manufactured in Goderich and Kincardine was manufactured, not for the local market, but for the foreign market. In the manufacture

MR. CAMERON.

of that salt they used a ton of coal for four or six barrels of salt. Did the hon. gentleman intend that there should be a drawback on coal used in the manufacture of salt for export to a foreign country? If not, the damage done to the salt manufacturer would be greater than he (Mr. Cameron) estimated it at.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. the Finance Minister had not answered the question of his hon. friend from South Huron—was he going to give any drawback on the export of salt?

MR. CAMERON said the Finance Minister shook his head when he asked him the question. No doubt the hon. gentleman intimated from that that the Government would allow no drawback in such a case.

MR. TILLEY: That we will consider.

Item agreed to.

On item—Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, including ginger, orange, lemon, strawberry, raspberry, elder and currant wines, containing 26 per cent. or less of spirits of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer, imported in wood or bottles (six quart and twelve pint bottles to be held to contain a Imperial gallon), 25c. per Imperial gallon, and for each degree of strength in excess of 26 per cent. of spirits, as aforesaid, an additional duty of 3c. per Imperial gallon, until the strength reaches 40 per cent. of proof spirits, and, in addition thereto, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. ANGLIN said the Government had reduced the duty upon malt, and the reason assigned by the hon. the Finance Minister—though that gentleman did not himself quite express his concurrence in it—was that, if people would drink alcoholic beverages, it was desirable to encourage them to drink ale and porter instead of the stronger liquors. It was to be regretted that light ale and porters were not sold more generally in this country, and at a lower price, and it was for the same reason desirable that the use of light wines should be encouraged. That had been the policy of this country for some time. They were now about to entirely depart from that policy. They were about to put a duty on champagne.

which would be almost prohibitory, and it would encourage the manufacture of spurious liquors under that name. He would like to know whether any progress had been made in those negotiations with the French Government, of which they had heard so much. Since the hon. the Finance Minister had felt at liberty to tell them something about those negotiations, several weeks had elapsed, and he thought it was of some interest to the country to know whether any progress had since been made towards entering into that arrangement with France, which would enable us to send our ships there for sale at a low rate of duty while we should receive in return the light wines of that country.

MR. TILLEY said he had intended to lay on the table of the House some correspondence with the French Government, but an address was passed in another branch of Parliament asking for similar returns, including various despatches not embraced in that correspondence, but the papers would very soon be laid before this House also. The hon. member had referred to the reduction of the duty on malt, and the desirability of encouraging the consumption of malt liquor instead of spirits. He (Mr. Tilley) entirely concurred in that view. The proposition of the Government was now that it was desirable to increase the duty on spirits and to reduce it on malt. He knew it was urged by certain hon. gentlemen that it was not consistent, and they had been charged with diminishing the cost of the poor man's beer and increasing the cost of the poor man's flour. But they would argue this question out upon its merits at another time. He was satisfied, however, that the feeling of this country, whether among practical teetotallers or not, was that it was very desirable, if stimulants were to be used, that they should be in the shape of malt liquor rather than in the shape of spirits, and it was in accordance with that sentiment that the Government asked for a reduction of the duty on malt and its increase on spirits. The hon. gentleman said they were increasing by their proposition the duty on light wines. Now this was not the case. This particular proposition supposed no arrangement made with France what-

ever. This proposition supposed they should make no arrangement with France by which the 30 per cent. *ad valorem* duty would be taken off cheap French wines that had an alcoholic strength of 26 degrees proof. If imported to-morrow, the cheapest description of French wine would be 36c. per gallon, with 30 per cent. added. The duty now levied on wine was 36c. per gallon, no matter what its strength. If it cost under 48c. per gallon, the duty now was 36c.; if it cost 50c., the duty was 72c. The result was that there were cases before the Customs Department showing that the whole effort of the importers was to bring wine, no matter what its strength might be, but worth under 48c. a gallon. Under the proposition before the House at the present time, after they passed the 26 degree proof spirit, then for every degree of strength it was 3c. more. Under this proposition the duty that would be collected on wine would be in proportion to its value. Under these circumstances it would be fair and equitable, and the arrangement could also apply to Spain, in case anything was done in a similar direction before the next meeting of Parliament. If they disregarded the strength of alcohol, then they might have it imported in the shape of wine, and paying a less duty than if imported in brandy, gin, or any other liquor. Under the original arrangement, it was 15c. for every five degrees of strength, and it was thought it might simplify the matter, because the Department would be able to tell, after the process of distillation, what the strength was as between 5 degrees. Then it was a jump of 15 per cent. One degree of strength would carry up 15c. per gallon, and it was thought better to make it 3c. for every degree. In answer to a question of the hon. gentleman, he would state that no further progress had been made in negotiations with the French Government.

MR. ANGLIN said the impression left on his mind by the hon. gentleman's Budget speech with regard to the imposition of duty on wines was, that the Government was about to increase the charges on French wines, and we would have something more to give in exchange for the right of entering our vessels in the

French market than under the old tariff. That was the reason he assumed that these duties on the cheaper wines were now higher than formerly. He hoped progress would be made very soon in the negotiations with the French Government so that the expectations of the shipbuilders, especially those of Quebec, might not be grievously disappointed, as they had been on a former occasion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he recollected statements made by parties concerning the wine trade, to the effect that this tariff would be certain to exclude large quantities of wines of Spain and Portugal, at present brought into this country. If he understood the hon. gentleman correctly, the maximum duty that could be attained under this tariff on the strong wines of Spain and Portugal would run as high as 65c. per Imperial gallon, plus 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. That would be an absolutely prohibitory tariff on those, although it would, undoubtedly, admit the wines of France, as contradistinguished from those of Spain and Portugal, at one time, at any rate, largely imported.

MR. TILLEY said the duty would depend altogether on the cost and the alcoholic strength. On French wine, under 26 degrees, say, which cost 25c. to 30c. a gallon, the average duty would be 34c. a gallon, whereas now it was 36c.; on wine costing 60c., 31 degrees, the duty would be 59c. per gallon; on wine costing \$1.20, of which about 120,000 gallons were imported last year, at that average price, of 33 degrees proof, the duty would be 82c. per gallon.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that from Spain about 71,000 gallons were imported, roughly valued at about 40c. per gallon; all that would be excluded, under this tariff, because it was strong wine, ranging considerably above 26 degrees. He thought that the rates there would range as 34c. or 35c. All that class and the trade in it would probably be destroyed, because it was not likely that a wine, of an average value of 40c., could afford to pay 75c. or 80c. per gallon. There was a good deal to be said for the taking of the alcoholic standard. All he wanted to know was

MR. ANGLIN.

whether the hon. gentleman had representations made to him as to the prices and effect of these duties. The wines of France would have a very considerable advantage, but we imported nearly 120,000 gallons from Spain and Italy, which, being of tolerably considerable alcoholic strength, would cease to be imported.

MR. TILLEY said that was exactly the view taken by the Government. He could not see why a certain degree of alcohol, in any shape, if it entered any wine, should pay a lower duty, as it did under the old tariff, than if it went into gin, whiskey or brandy.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had pointed out that French wines, up to 26 degrees, were only charged 34c., or, roughly, 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ c. for each degree of alcoholic strength. The moment they went beyond the imaginary limit of 26 degrees, the duty was very much higher. There might be good reasons for introducing cheap French wines, but there was no proportion between the tax placed up to 26 degrees, and the tax from 26 degrees to 36 degrees. It would be difficult to get our people to take much of the light French wines, and, therefore, the revenue might be considerably less than was expected. Another consideration was the difficulty of getting wines free from adulteration, which difficulty would be greatly increased under this tariff. In the case of champagne and sparkling wines, the duty would average \$10 to \$12 per dozen. That would not be paid. Either the wine would not be imported, or a cheap wine might be imported and doctored in this country into the semblance of champagne.

MR. VALIN said there was no reason why we should not place a heavy duty on French wines, as the French Government imposed taxes on our ships, our lumber, and everything that we sold them. This tax would also enable us to claim from them the free admission of our ships in return for its abolition.

MR. TILLEY said the rate proposed on champagne was a little over the rate collected on sugar and tea last year, and he did not see why those who could afford to drink champagne should not pay as

heavy a duty as those imposed upon the necessities of life.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he did not object to the tax, but questioned whether any revenue could be derived from it. We only used about 9,000 dozen of sparkling wines. That was imported at an average price of \$10 per dozen, so the duty now proposed would be equivalent to 60 per cent., and in the case of the better grades it would be higher. His point was that the chances were decidedly against our getting much revenue from this tax.

Item agreed to.

On item—Shovels, spades, hoes; hay, manure and potato forks; rakes and rake teeth; carpenters', coopers', cabinet makers', and all other mechanics' tools; edge tools of every description, including axes, scythes, files and saws of all kinds, and on steel skates, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. CHARLTON said that was another burden on the lumbering industry. This scheme could not be called a Protectionist measure, because it was ruinous to the most important manufacturing interest in the Dominion. The lumber interest was sufficiently depressed without having these burdens laid upon it. The exports of lumber to the United States, in the year 1873, were \$12,507,535, and they had fallen off to such an extent, that in 1878 the amount was only \$4,481,000, or barely one-third more than the amount in 1873. This great interest was entitled to consideration at the hands of the Finance Minister, and he held that the feature of the tariff, if it possessed no other objectionable feature, was sufficient to warrant them in condemning it as a measure calculated to prove detrimental to the interests of this Dominion.

MR. ROCHESTER said he would like the hon. gentleman to explain in what way the lumber interest was injuriously affected; if it was by the tax on axes, it was something strange. The other night, the 10c. per barrel on pork was the great bugbear, now it was the tax on axes. He knew from practical experience that better axes were made in Canada than in the United States. Axes

better suited to the climate, which would stand the pine lumber during the hard frost in the winter. Those axes we could not get from the United States. We could manufacture our own axes and saws cheaper, and of a better quality than could be obtained in the United States. He had got them from the different factories in the States, and from all the factories in Canada, and he had got as good saws out of the factory in Canada as out of any factory in the States. He would ask again what portion of this tariff militated against the lumber interest.

MR. CHARLTON said there was scarcely an article that entered into the production of lumber that was not taxed. The climate of Northern Michigan, and the pineries of Wisconsin and Minnesota, was almost the same as our climate, and the axes made for the lumber trade of the United States were better and cheaper than those made in Canada. It was unnecessary to recount a list of the articles that were taxed by this tariff, and which entered into the production of lumber. Woollens, blankets, oats and corn, would cost more than they had done heretofore. This tariff would act in a hundred ways against the lumber interest, and he was astonished that party lines could be drawn so closely that the hon. gentleman would get up and advocate a measure that gave his interest a slap in the face, and affected it so injuriously.

MR. ROCHESTER said the hon. gentleman had named axes, but he had not said a word about saws or files, which could be manufactured as well in this country as in the United States. As regarded woollen goods, the tariff would be a decided benefit. Under the late tariff, the Cornwall factory had been compelled to close, and the market had been supplied by English shoddy. Now he understood this mill was starting up again, and they would have the same kind of blankets as before. He thought the hon. gentleman should not make such broad assertions, but particularise more.

MR. SNOWBALL said that, if he could get Canadian axes for nothing, he would not send them into the woods. He could say the same with regard to

Canadian-made saws and files, which came in the same category. They also had to send to the United States for their emery grinders. On pork they had to pay more than 10c. additional, and they expected an increase on flour and cornmeal. In fact, under this tariff, for everything the lumbermen eat, drank or wore, they expected to have to pay extra. According to the statement of his hon. friend, they would have to pay more wages, more for their materials, while they did not expect to get any additional price for their lumber.

MR. WALLACE (South Norfolk) said that hon. gentlemen interested in the lumber trade thrust themselves forward and asked for Protection for a great manufacturing industry. He maintained that they were not manufacturers, but merely converters of the wealth of the country into another form of wealth. The labour they employed was paid the least wages of any class of men in the country. They called this a great industry, while they were almost robbing the country of its wealth and enriching themselves. They were converting the tree, as it stood, into saw-logs, square timber, deals, etc. How much of a manufacturing industry was there in that? The gentlemen had been enriching themselves at almost the expense of the country—diverting the wealth of the country into their own pockets, as it were. And they were now employing labour at such a rate that it did not afford the labourers a living. These men, if they had not been employed in lumbering, would, perhaps, have been cultivating the soil, and thereby have been fulfilling a duty much more useful and beneficial to the country. The best protection they could give to lumbermen would be a protection that would prevent them from manufacturing lumber, because they were taking away the wealth of the country that centuries had produced, and which would be produced for centuries more.

MR. ROCHESTER said it was very true that they were taking away the wealth of the country, and they were receiving very little for it. What had been stated with regard to the men's wages was true, at the present time, and as regarded the past year or two. Form-

erly there was no labouring work that was more remunerative. The machinists, mill-wrights, and engineers used to receive \$3.50, \$4, and \$4.50 a day, all the year round, and common men used to receive from \$8 to \$10 and \$12 a week. The lumber interest was the second interest in the country, and he believed that, if lumbermen were to cease operations for a year or two, it would be a benefit to the country. The distress in the whole Ottawa Valley, consequent upon the depressed condition of the lumber trade, showed that it was an important interest, employing thousands of men.

MR. BOURBEAU said he desired to reply to the hon. member for North Norfolk, who had declared that the saws manufactured in Canada were of no value. In his own county there were large manufacturers of lumber, and the saws used in the mills were all of Canadian manufacture, and gave very great satisfaction. As to the axes, he could also say they were used in his own county, exclusively of Canadian manufacture, and they could be purchased at \$1 a dozen cheaper than they could have been bought a year ago; and such was the case, also, with respect to other instruments and tools manufactured in this country. This he stated in order to do justice to the carriage manufacturers, having, himself, a perfect knowledge of the quality of the articles manufactured by them.

MR. COCKBURN (Muskoka) said that, as regarded the effect of the tariff on the lumber trade, it was a matter in which he was not personally interested, but he desired to direct the attention of the House to one article, namely, bacon, which was largely used by lumbermen, and the duties on which, under the new tariff, would cost double. Some of the western lumbermen used nothing else in the way of meat, and when the settlers' stock of oats along the Georgian Bay were exhausted, they had, frequently, to import oats from the United States, upon which a duty of 10c. was charged, without benefitting farmers. The lumber interest was one of the greatest manufacturing interests they had in the country. The hon. member for Carleton had said that the price of

blankets had not risen under the new tariff. He (Mr. Cockburn) desired to ask if this was a likely season for an advance to take place on heavy woollen goods. Next year, however, they would have an opportunity of seeing how the tariff had affected the price of blankets, etc. He thought it should be patent to every gentleman in the House that this tariff imposed great burdens on the lumbermen, and attacked them from every quarter.

Item agreed to.

On item—Rough freestone, sandstone, and all other building stone, except marble, \$1 per ton of 13 cubic feet,

MR. MACKENZIE asked if this duty was intended to operate as a prohibitory tariff also.

MR. TILLEY said he did not know. The tariff on stone, as a whole, would very likely be prohibitory, but there might be some brought in rough.

MR. MACKENZIE said he referred to ordinary building stone.

MR. TILLEY said he thought that, if they took it from Windsor over to Detroit they paid \$1.50.

MR. MACKENZIE said if they charged \$2.00 a ton, we wanted to do our best for our own people. This duty would be prohibitory of the purchase of stone on the other side. Stone could not be carried a long distance in Canada; so the Finance Minister was only inflicting a hardship on those wishing United States stone for building.

MR. TILLEY said, if the hon. gentleman would state where they would be under the necessity of importing that stone from the United States, and show that there could not be found as good in the Dominion, he might help them. At present they knew of no such case; practically the duty of \$1 per ton would shut out the ordinary stone imported. They had plenty as good in the country, and there was no necessity for importing it.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no freestone to be had anywhere here.

MR. TILLEY said that he held a sample of Ontario freestone which had taken

the prize at the Paris Exhibition. The certificate stated that it was superior to the Ohio or any other found in the United States. It was found in Ontario.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was freestone up the Ottawa, in the neighbourhood of Pembroke, but the hon. gentleman could not expect it could be profitably carried to Western Ontario. It would be cheaper for the people in the West to pay \$10 a ton for stone from Ohio than to take this stone West. There was no stone in Ontario fit for fine dressings; so they had to take Ohio. They had common limestones in the Western Peninsula, but nowhere a good freestone.

MR. TILLEY said he heard there was, north of Toronto.

MR. BOWELL said they got from the Grand River a freestone.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not a freestone.

MR. OLIVER: That stone from the Grand River is obtained some thirty or forty miles from Ottawa. †

MR. SPROULE: There is a freestone quarry in my constituency, specimens of which have been sent to Toronto, and pronounced as good as any got. Another in the North Riding of Simcoe has been worked for years.

MR. MACKENZIE said that no stone had been taken to Toronto for fine buildings, or dressings, except the Ohio; the sort of bastard sandstone found in Ontario served a very good purpose in ordinary dressings, but was not fit for fine work like the Ohio. He knew of no single place in the western peninsula where there was a kind of rock that could at all approach the Cleveland stone, and it would have to be got, or the people must stop using such materials. This item would put a heavy tax on everyone using this stone in building, and it was shaking the business all over the country. In these matters the Finance Minister showed an obstinacy perfectly incredible. Any one interested in the building interests would bear out his statements.

MR. MACMILLAN said that competent judges of stone had told him that

this Ontario was infinitely superior to the Ohio stone. It was a little harder, but very much better, and did not rot like the Ohio stone. It was got at Dundas, and was considered so desirable that the whole cathedral in Hamilton was being built with it, and a higher price paid for it than the Ohio. All along the Great Western Railway it was being used for window-sills, and it was made a condition by the contractors that it should be used in the Molson's Bank building in London, and not the Ohio stone. They believed there were 3,000,000 feet of that stone at the quarry, and it could be found all along the section from Dundas to Hamilton.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had admitted his point in saying the Ohio stone was easier in working. Ease in working was absolutely necessary for fine work, or fine fronts of important buildings. The Dundas stone was excellent for ordinary straight walling, but not fit for the purposes for which Ohio had been preferred, in all parts of the country. There was a rough freestone behind Kingston, and elsewhere; but the Canadian Government were compelled to go to Ohio for stone for the Parliament Buildings. This duty would make it impossible to import it hereafter, except at a great additional charge.

MR. MACMILLAN said that a large portion of the Ohio stone in the London Post-office had rotted where the water came in; but the Dundas stone, under water, had not rotted. He had been told by competent workmen that it withstood the water better than the Ohio.

MR. McCALLUM said that there was a quarry of freestone on the Grand River, in Haldimand, which was soft, and could be worked easily, but became hard when exposed to water. Millions of tons of this stone could be got easily within three miles of the river, and would answer the purposes of the Ohio.

MR. HESSON said that he had, and others had, been obliged to select Georgetown sandstone in preference to Ohio, for corbels, window-tops, and window-sills, in a school building that was to cost \$20,000, and for similar work in a church at Stratford, costing over \$20,000.

MR. MACMILLAN.

That stone was suitable, and there was plenty of it of a most desirable quality. It was their duty to develop the interests of this country in the matter of their quarries, as well as in other respects.

MR. TUPPER said he congratulated the Finance Minister on having accomplished this, if no other good, by the imposition of this duty—excited a discussion that had led to the discovery of a large amount of freestone in Ontario. The dissemination of this information, with respect to this product of the country, would be of great value to the people. An hour ago it appeared from hon. gentleman opposite that there was no freestone in Ontario, and now it was discovered that freestone was found in the neighbourhood of Ottawa, that had been able to carry off the second prize at the Paris Exhibition, and had been pronounced unsurpassed on this continent. It was not a small tribute to the value of the tariff that it had led to the bringing out of this fact that the hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to be entirely ignorant of when the discussion commenced. It was humiliating that they had been obliged to import so much ornamental stone from the United States, when they had in the neighbourhood of Ottawa such excellent freestone. Then the excellent qualities of the limestone of the country were demonstrated by the magnificent public and private buildings of Montreal, that had delighted and astonished every foreign visitor.

MR. MACKENZIE said the finest buildings in Montreal were of freestone, brought from the United States.

MR. TUPPER said that the limestone buildings in Montreal might be a source of pride to any city. He was glad the time had come when the Finance Minister had said to our American neighbours that if they shut out the products of our country, we would shut out theirs in the same way. We had had a large and valuable trade with the United States in freestone, till it was killed by their tariff; and, if there was no other reason why we should adopt this proposition, that exclusive policy of the Americans would be sufficient. He believed that the result of this duty would be to sweep away the American tariff against

our industries, which had had the effect of paralysing them, and to produce a free interchange of commodities as between both countries.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no stone in all eastern or western Ontario to at all compare with the Ohio stone for certain purposes. It was a great inconvenience to the people to have this tax imposed upon building material. They should be at liberty to obtain such material wherever it could be obtained cheapest. As the hon. the Finance Minister was determined to adhere to the tariff as it was, he (Mr. Mackenzie) must content himself with entering his protest against this absurd part of the tariff.

MR. DESJARDINS wished to inform the hon. the leader of the Opposition that in the county of Hochelaga were to be found the best limestone quarries in the Dominion. Many of the owners of these quarries were supporters of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), and he (Mr. Desjardins) had received letters from them complaining that the tariff was not high enough to protect them from the competition with stone brought into Montreal. He denied the accuracy of the statement of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that the best and finest buildings in Montreal were constructed of Ohio stone. For instance, the post-office, the city hall, and most of the fine buildings erected lately were constructed of limestone. The friends of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) in his (Mr. Desjardins') constituency, would be dis- trary views to them.

MR. MACKENZIE said his hon. friend was mistaken. There was no doubt that the Montreal banks, and other public edifices built of the native limestone were wonderfully beautiful, but, for all that, it cost a great deal more to build a very fine limestone front than a freestone front. He quite agreed in the remarks in reference to the fine appearance of Montreal. It was seen to marvellous advantage. The Kingston limestone, and limestone obtained in the vicinity of the Welland Canal, were good building materials. What he

wanted to point out was that it was impossible to do with the Canadian stone the class of work that could be done with the Ohio freestone, which would be shut out of the market by this tariff.

MR. SNOWBALL said that, in the county of Northumberland, N.B., they had as fine freestone as could be produced. It was particularly adapted for grindstones, and, in face of the duty of \$1.50, the Americans, for many years, had purchased largely of these goods. They had different grades, suitable for any kind of grinding, and manufactured them from five to ten feet in diameter. They were shipped as far west as Oshawa. It had become a valuable industry, and, no doubt, would continue to prosper.

Item agreed to.

On item—Sugars, syrups and molasses,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there had been a great deal of discussion about the precise loss which would result from the taxation imposed on the people of Canada by the proposed alteration of the sugar duties. There was no possibility of deciding accurately the exact value of the sugar that might be purchased from time to time. But, by applying this taxation to the quantities and qualities of sugar which was imported last year, and then by comparing it with what was received last year, the House could ascertain at any rate what would be the effect, supposing that was the fair average value of the quantities and qualities of sugar consumed by the people of this country. The sugar imported last year was chiefly of two grades, those above and those below No. 13, Dutch standard. Of the former, there was imported 93,490,879 lb., of a total value of \$5,419,715, for which was received \$2,289,840. Under this proposed tariff the specific duty on this would be \$934,908, while the 35 per cent. *ad valorem* would amount to \$1,896,880. In other words, under this tariff, supposing the same quantity and quality of sugar imported into the country last year were consumed this year, the revenue would be \$2,831,788, whilst, under the old tariff, the duty was only \$2,289,840. Consequently, in that grade alone—the

grade above, No. 13, their would be an additional duty under this tariff of \$541,948. Then, of the grade below No. 13, there was 10,624,336lb. imported last year, which was valued at a little over \$517,000, upon which \$209,066 in duties was received. Applying this tariff, the duty to be collected this year would be \$235,041. Therefore, it followed that, if the country continued to import the same quantity and quality of sugar, the duty, under this tariff, for the next year, would be \$3,066,829. The hon. the Finance Minister stated that it required 120,000,000lb. of sugar to produce the 105,000,000lb. which were consumed in the Dominion last year. He (Mr. Cartwright) did not believe that statement was literally correct. He was inclined to think that quantity was largely in excess of what would be required. But he would assume, for argument's sake, that it was correct. Suppose there were 120,000,000lb. introduced, less charges on packages brought from the country of growth or production, and less the charges and expenses prior to shipment. Under these circumstances, he was informed by gentlemen of high standing, that the duty would have to be collected on the average value of three cents per pound, or three dollars per cwt. Of course, that might be a matter of opinion, although these gentlemen were speaking from actual experience. If that were correct, he thought, bearing in mind the very large percentage the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley) had allowed, that it would follow that, if they manufactured in this country, as they probably would, under this prohibitory tariff, during the next year, all the sugar consumed in the Dominion during that period, they would receive in all the sum of \$1,980,000, as against a revenue which ought to be collected under this tariff of \$3,066,829. In other words, the people of Canada would lose, for the purpose of promoting the refining interest, some \$1,086,829 per annum. That was the position of the case applying the existing tariff to the late importations. Even on the showing of the hon. the Minister of Finance, who only expected to get \$2,250,000 revenue, there would be a loss of \$800,000 to the people of

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

Canada for the benefit of the refiners. He (Mr. Cartwright) was not going to reopen the discussion further than to point out in all probability what was the actual cost to the people of Canada. What he wanted to call attention to was the fact—as clearly established as any fact could be—that, if the present tariff were applied to the importations of last year, a revenue of \$3,066,829 would be collected. According to the hon. gentleman's own statement, he did not expect to receive more than \$2,250,000 in round numbers. So there would be, according to the Minister of Finance's own showing, an annual loss of \$800,000. According to the best information he (Mr. Cartwright) was able to receive, there would, however, be an annual loss of \$1,086,829. Therefore, he was not able to understand the resolution submitted to the House. He did not intend to delay the House further than to call attention to the fact that the people of Canada would be compelled to pay very considerably more for their sugar for the express purpose of benefitting the refiners.

MR. TILLEY said he did not know upon what basis the hon. gentleman calculated there should be a revenue of over three million dollars derived from sugar; but he could say that his (Mr. Tilley's) calculations were based upon the proposition that sugar imported direct from the West Indies would pay no more duty on the packages which brought it than before, and that the 35 per cent. *ad valorem* would not have to be imposed, because we would refine our own sugar. His calculations were based upon the importation of raw sugar, and refining it in Canada. If half of it were brought in refined the Government would lose \$250,000, unless they lost more by the reduction in the price of sugar, as the *ad valorem* duty would not produce so much if a much lower price prevailed. As to the reduction in the price of sugar, he could state as a fact that the price of sugar had gone down half a cent a pound in Montreal since these resolutions were submitted to the House.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said about two weeks ago he had bought from a firm in Montreal, with whom he had been in the

habit of dealing, some refined sugar, and he found that the price had increased $\frac{3}{4}$ c. per lb. He had asked the firm when the increase had taken place, and was informed it had occurred since the 15th March last.

MR. TILLEY said he had his information from undoubted authority.

MR. CAMERON said he would tell the hon. gentleman the name of the firm if he wished.

MR. DESJARDINS said the Redpath refinery was now selling refined sugar at $8\frac{1}{4}$ c. per lb., whilst, before this tariff was proposed, they sold the same sugar at $8\frac{3}{4}$ c. per lb.

MR. ANGLIN said the impression the Finance Minister sought to produce was that the increase in the duty did not add to the cost of sugar. It was not to be supposed that the hon. gentleman would go so far as to allege directly and plainly that the imposition of a duty caused a decrease in the price of sugars. He was not surprised to hear statements of that kind made with regard to sugar and other articles by some hon. members. on the other side of the House, but he was surprised to hear the hon. the Finance Minister, who had a reputation at stake, make such a statement in the way he had made it, for he created the impression that the imposition of a higher duty did not necessarily increase the cost of the article to the consumer. It was obvious, however, that the additional duty must increase the cost of the article. It was a simple question in addition. Fifty causes might lead to a temporary reduction in the price of the article, but it would be absurd for that reason to allege that such a reduction could possibly be caused by the imposition of a higher duty. He believed that he had seen it stated in the Montreal papers that Redpath's sugar was selling at one-half or one-quarter of a cent per pound less than the American sugar. No doubt they would hereafter offer it at a shade lower than the price of American sugar, with no higher duty added, because if they did not, they would not have the market exclusively to themselves. But to say that hereafter sugars would be any cheaper because of the imposition of the duty, was to assert what no one who looked carefully

into the question could believe possible. He had heard it stated that the importation of sugar for some weeks before this tariff went into effect was so enormous that a number of persons holding sugars to-day were compelled to effect a sale. But, as soon as these temporary causes ceased to produce their temporary effects, there could be no doubt whatever in the mind of any one competent to understand a sum in addition that the price of sugar would be enhanced by the imposition of higher duties.

MR. TILLEY said that within the last eight hours a gentleman from Montreal, whose testimony could not be doubted, had informed him that sugar was selling to-day, in Montreal, at a half cent per pound less than in the middle of last year. This was due to the refinery being established and manufacturing sugar out of the raw article. The hon. gentleman from Gloucester asked if it was possible that the Finance Minister should stand up here and say the imposition of duty could possibly cheapen the article to the consumer. Why, they knew it was argued here, last night, that the imposition of a 50c. duty on coal if it led to the output of 300,000 tons of coal more in Nova Scotia, would result in coal being supplied cheaper to the people of the other Provinces than it was to-day. If they looked at the experience of the United States they would find, beyond a question, that the imposition of high duties had decreased the price of the article to the consumer in that country. He believed that, when he was privileged to meet Parliament again, he would be able to tell a similar story in regard to numerous articles. He had statements before him now showing that, in reference to cotton, the imposition of an additional duty had not increased the price of the article, but that it was selling to-day at the same price as before the imposition of the duty. There might be some cases where, if a duty was imposed on a raw material, and parties manufactured from the raw material, the price would necessarily, to some extent, be increased. But in the case of certain articles, of which all the materials existed, in this country, the price was reduced by 20 or 30 per cent. to the consumer.

MR. MACKENZIE: Which are they?

MR. TILLEY said there were several of them. Take the duty on wood screws for instance—close up that industry to-morrow, and the price of them would rise to a great deal more than it was at present, because when that industry was established the price was immediately reduced 20 or 30 per cent. They alleged that this was a correct principle; it would not apply to every industry, but to a large portion.

MR. MILLS: Apply the principle to the salt of the fishermen.

MR. TILLEY: Yes, and what is the position with reference to the fishermen? They are on the sea coast.

MR. MILLS: So is the coal.

MR. TILLEY said the circumstances were entirely different. With reference to the salt there were certain circumstances under which it would increase the price, but he was not without faith that we could make arrangements by which we could carry by water our coal from Nova Scotia to the West, and take back salt and put it down as cheaply as we could get it from England. A gentleman from St. John had telegraphed him that salt was forty cents a bag there. The salt of Ontario was a very suitable salt for curing fish, and he held the day was not far distant when that salt could be put down in the Maritime Provinces as cheap as the English salt. But to assert that the imposition of a duty necessarily increased the cost of the article to the consumer, when it could be abundantly made in the country, was a proposition that was not tenable, and he asserted that a Protective duty might be imposed on an article manufactured in the country and not increase the cost of it to the consumer.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that might be true, in case the Protective duty was utterly useless and unnecessary. If the hon. gentleman believed the statement he had just made, let him take off his duty on wood screws; and if, after a year or two, it turned out as he had stated, they would be willing to put dependence on his other statements. The hon. gentle-

MR. TILLEY

man stated that, in the matter of cotton, the price had not gone up. He (Mr. Cartwright) was informed, by gentlemen acquainted with the trade, that the last move of the manufacturers of cotton goods was to issue a circular to say that the prices of several leading lines must go up, and they had gone up.

MR. VALIN said he believed no member in this House had dealt more largely in sugar than himself. He had imported in his ships from the West Indies, about 70,000,000lb., and he had just telegraphed for two other cargoes. Since the introduction of the tariff he found that sugar could be bought to-day for about \$76 per ton. Including the freight and the duty, he found it would cost him about 6c. per pound. The duty in the States was 4c. He believed the present duty would not have the effect of raising the price, and that it would keep as low as it was in the States.

MR. ANGLIN said the Messrs. Redpath, to-day, had no other permanent competition in this Dominion, except that which came from the introduction of the sugars called raw groceries from the West Indies, and such competition as they would have to encounter from British and foreign refineries. They could easily calculate the price of refined sugar from the United States or England, and add to that the amount of duty to be imposed under this tariff, and so ascertain exactly the price at which that sugar could be landed in Montreal, or in any other city of this Dominion. If it should happen, in the course of time, that refineries should spring up in various parts of this Dominion, and competition should arise between them, instead of their working together in rings, as they probably would, then they could understand that the prices would be kept down to a figure that would afford a reasonable profit, and, perhaps, in some cases, to a figure that would afford no profit. But, when there was only one refinery in the Dominion, and that refinery capable of producing only two-thirds of the sugar required for use in this country, then there was no competition, and it was absurd to argue that they were to have cheaper sugar because of this tariff. The contrary would be the inevitable result. Some hon. gentlemen ex-

pected some advantage from the greater use of raw groceries. The taste for sugar of that kind did not exist in this country. The people chose to use refined sugar, and it was much to be doubted whether the admission of these raw groceries from the West Indies would interfere materially with the monopoly now possessed by the refiners of Montreal.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he wanted to ask the hon. the Finance Minister what construction was to be placed on this important clause with respect to the *ad valorem* duty levied on goods imported from the place of production. Suppose a merchant purchased a cargo of sugar in Cuba, or any other port, and that it was brought from New York to a Canadian city, would that man be allowed the benefit of this clause?

MR. TILLEY said they had been discussing the objections to the former state of things, which interfered with the direct trade between the Dominion and the West Indies. The propositions of the hon. member opposite had really driven the direct trade from the Dominion of Canada to the American ports, to the great loss and disadvantage of the shippers of lumber and fish.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Would the hon. gentleman inform the House what change I ever made in the sugar duties?

MR. TILLEY said the change he made was that he had not done as the present Government had done. They had made little change except to provide that the American refiners were not to send any sugar here with the drawback over and above what they obtained, and that had changed the whole aspect of the trade. Inasmuch as the Government purposed to restore the direct trade to Canada, and to use the St. Lawrence for the conveyance of products from the West Indies here, sugar coming from Cuba to New York, and being discharged there, would have to pay a duty on packages.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, if a man established a refinery in Toronto or any other point in Ontario, he would have to compete at an enormous disadvantage with refiners in Montreal, St. John, or Halifax, who got the advantage of this

important clause. It was equal, at least, to a reduction of 5 per cent., according to the statement of the hon. gentleman. If, on the other hand, men in Ontario desired to establish a sugar refinery, they must do it at enormous disadvantage, seeing that they would have to import from New York. That was a matter of extraordinary importance, which a good many of his friends in Ontario would understand and appreciate. He had one other question to put. What did the hon. gentleman think was the value, for duty purposes, of the 120,000,000lb. which he calculated would have to be imported to produce 105,000,000 refined sugar?

MR. TILLEY said that would depend entirely upon the prices of sugar, as they ranged during the year. To show how difficult it was for the hon. gentleman to make a calculation, he valued the sugar below No. 9 Dutch standard, for duty purposes, at three cents, instead of four cents. It was very difficult, taking the different grades under No. 7, and between 7 and 9, and 7, 14, and 9, the prices these various grades of sugar would cost, and the rate of duty, to estimate the amount, but under the operation of the tariff \$2,250,000 would be collected. He had stated distinctly in the memorandum he submitted the other day the proportion of the sugar, and the average cost of each grade, from No. 14 below to No. 9, and from No. 9 to No. 7, and from No. 7 below that.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that might be because this large deduction had to be made from it. In any case, the value was very nearly 4c., on which the hon. gentleman based his calculation. His hon. friend who sat next him had just handed him a telegram from Barbadoes, stating that refining sugar was offered there at \$2.90, so that the calculation he had made would have been well within the mark, as far as regarded the products that might have been expected from it.

MR. BAIN said his reason for addressing the House on this question was that it happened to be the only item upon which the hon. gentleman who represented the National Policy in his Riding and himself were at variance, and which caused danger of a rupture in their

otherwise pleasant personal relations. That gentleman took the ground that the National Policy would include a removal of duties from all these articles that were not the natural production of Canada, and the placing of duties on articles we could produce or manufacture. He (Mr. Bain) used to quote from the Finance Minister's speech delivered at St. John, with respect to the efforts he would make, if placed in power, to build up the refining industry as well as the West India trade. He (Mr. Bain) considered it then in order to enquire how gentlemen proposed to reconcile the Finance Minister's statement with his exposition as the supporter of the policy of the Premier as laid down to workingmen at Toronto? He (Mr. Bain) had been told that he had backbone enough to stand up and defend the principles he advocated, that he would be the exponent of the principle that we should have sugar free of any duty whatever. This was a fair sample of the way in which that verdict of the 17th September was carried, and on this specific matter it seemed to him that with the competition we should always have between the English and American refiners, there was no danger that either one party or the other would have the monopoly of our market. The only change the late Government made in the sugar duties was to relax them on refining grades in favour of the refiners. When hon. gentlemen opposite administered affairs, previous to the time of the late Government, they displayed no interest whatever in the welfare of this specific industry of sugar refining. The statement made by the Finance Minister himself in his Budget speech convinced him (Mr. Bain) that the new arrangement of the sugar duties was not in the interest of the Dominion at large. It was directly adverse to the interests of Ontario and for the benefit of a few parties in Montreal and Halifax. If the National Policy, as expounded in the West, meant anything, it meant that articles such as sugar, which could never become an article of Canadian production, would not be taxed, but that the duties were to be removed from such articles, and placed on those we could produce, for the purpose of stimulating those industries. When the hon.

MR. BAIN.

the Finance Minister stated that, notwithstanding the increased duties on refined sugar, he expected to suffer a loss of revenue, he emphatically proved that this tax was not in the interest of this country. No increased employment given to our population would compensate for the amount of money deliberately taken out of the pockets of the people, for the benefit of two or three refiners, by this tax on an article of universal consumption. It was to be regretted that, for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of a few wealthy corporations, the whole country was to suffer, and he therefore felt it to be his duty to protest against this tax.

MR. GUNN said that these sugars, which the refiners in Canada professed to sell at 8½c., could be obtained now, if the old tariff were in force, at 7½ to 7¼c., as the market price had fallen in New York since this tariff was introduced. There was a heavy tax on the people which they would appreciate.

MR. TUPPER said the late Finance Minister, who took such great exception to this proposed effort to establish refineries, must have changed his views very much since he introduced his tariff in 1874, when he deliberately formulated to this House a means by which that great industry could be established in Canada. Before the hon. gentleman got through with his tariff, he changed that, as he did many others of the propositions which he had then submitted, through outside pressure or some other cause. A year or two after he again brought forward a proposition to aid this industry, which was that the tax on the raw sugar to be used for refining purposes be reduced. Thus, on two occasions, he propounded measures to enable the raw sugar to be refined in Canada. It was difficult, therefore, to account for the hon. gentleman's denunciation of this effort of the Finance Minister to carry out, in an effective manner, the policy which the hon. gentleman had himself declared on two occasions to be a wise one. It was an entire fallacy for the hon. gentleman to state that the tariff which he was then dealing with was the tariff of the previous Government. It was entirely modified in its character by the action of the Legislature of the United States. In

dealing with a question of this kind, one must regard the legislation which took place outside the country, and, since that legislation had changed the tariff, as he found it was no longer the same in its character and effect as the same tariff under the previous Government, before the legislation in the States had been altered, the result of the hon. gentleman's policy was that the only refinery in the country had to close, and the moment it shut down the price of sugar became higher. The result was the addition of a cent per pound to the cost of every pound consumed in Canada, or a tax of a million dollars a year paid by the Canadian consumers into the coffers of other countries—into the coffers of men who had the policy of so fostering their own industry as to enable them to undersell our refiners. The market had fallen just as they said it would fall. As soon as it was found that the Finance Minister was determined to protect the industry of the Canadian sugar refiner, the market, as a consequence, declined. He was satisfied that under this tariff they would be considering Canadian interests, and the interests of the vast body of consumers, who would, themselves, gain by it directly as well as indirectly.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, when the hon. gentleman recalled what passed in 1874, he might as well have recalled to the recollection of the House that, when it was proposed by himself (Mr. Cartwright) to make an addition to the duty, not all along the line, but on certain grades of sugar, the man who most loudly denounced him for proposing it was the present Minister of Public Works; and so powerful were his arguments, so well were they put, such was the eloquence of the hon. gentleman, that he made such a great impression on his (Mr. Cartwright's) mind, that he reconsidered the question, and he found that there was weight in what the hon. gentleman said. Having got all the information on the subject, and seeing that there was danger to the revenue, he did, after full consideration and examination, withdraw the propositions, although they did not affect all grades of sugar, but only special grades. Afterwards, in their anxiety to please the hon.

gentleman, finding that the American Government had added considerably to their bounty, they reduced certain grades of sugar in a small degree, as the hon. gentleman had suggested. This was subsequently justified by the discovery that the American drawback then, although not now, was really a bounty in disguise. At the present moment he did not believe the drawback was a bounty in disguise. He did not think the American refiner got any unjust advantage at all. The hon. gentleman stated that the price of sugar rose upon that occasion. He (Mr. Cartwright) examined the matter at the time, and he must take issue with the hon. gentleman in a most positive manner. The prices of sugars for several grades, ranged as follows:—1875, 7½c., against 6½c. in 1876; 6½c. in 1877; and 5½c. in 1878, and so on all through. There was one argument brought forward by the hon. gentleman which did credit to his audacity. He had the highest opinion of the hon. gentleman's courage, and he did require the highest moral courage to rise in his place and declare that the price of sugar in New York, one of the largest sugar markets in the whole world, was affected by the imposition of a duty in Canada. About 3,000,000 tons of sugar were usually consumed by Great Britain and the United States, and one or two of the European countries, and the price in New York was regulated by the cost of this crop of 3,000,000 tons. Canada consumed 50,000 or 60,000 tons, yet the Minister of Public Works told them that the price of the 3,000,000 was regulated by the Canadian Minister of Finance's impositions on one-sixteenth part of the sugar used in the world.

MR. TUPPER said that the policy which, in 1874 and in 1875, he urged upon the then Finance Minister was a policy which would enable sugar to be refined in Canada. He, personally, pressed on the hon. gentleman the means subsequently adopted in relation to the matter. His hon. friend the Minister of Finance hoped, by these duties, to bring back the West Indian trade, which, under the administration of the hon. gentleman, was destroyed, which would not only contribute to the revenue, but the prosperity of the country. If there

was any feature of his hon. friend's policy that ought to commend it, regardless of any sectional point of view to the favourable consideration of every member of the House, it was that not only did it secure for Canada the refining of the sugar consumed in the country instead of driving that labour into a foreign country, but it secured a renewal of the West Indian trade, which was so important a factor in the commercial prosperity of the country.

MR. CASGRAIN said that nothing was more stubborn than facts, and the experience of the last eleven years went to show that sugar refining was no advantage to us. We had had sugar at a much cheaper rate than we could have under the system of Protection which was to be imposed on the country. It was all very well to talk about Protection, but the common sense view of the question was, should we have sugar at a cheaper rate than before, or were we to pay more for it? He had a statement in his hand of the price of sugar in the most important cities in the Dominion for the last past eleven years, which showed that during the three years, from 1872 to 1874, inclusive, the price of sugar fell 2½c., and from 1875 to 1878, it had fallen another half cent. So that, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, that we consumed in Canada 120,000,000lb. of sugar, we would save, by not washing our sugar ourselves, the sum of six hundred thousand and some odd dollars. He (Mr. Casgrain) would rather this sum was not paid to Mr. Redpath or any gentleman in the same line of business in the city of Halifax. Notwithstanding the eloquence of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the country would be the loser to the extent of \$600,000 by this tariff, on the article of sugar alone.

MR. BUNTING said he would have addressed the House at an earlier hour this evening had it not been that he desired first to hear what gentlemen on the Opposition benches had to say regarding the sugar duties. He had been engaged for about fifteen years in the business of importing sugar from the West Indies and Great Britain, and during that time, he had, on more than one occasion,

MR. TUPPER.

visited this city with a view to making representations to the Government on the subject of the duties. In 1868 he was here as one of a deputation from the Toronto Board of Trade, and he had the pleasure of meeting the present Finance Minister, making representations to him to adopt the tariff of one cent specific and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. That tariff had remained in operation until within the last few weeks, with some trifling alterations. Under that tariff, our refiners continued to prosecute their business profitably until the introduction of the American drawback system, when they were obliged to close their establishments. He had expected to hear another address from the hon. member for Bothwell on this subject, but, when that gentleman, in discussing the drawback system, deliberately stated that sugars were refined in bond in the United States—thus showing that he did not know even the alphabet of the business—he (Mr. Bunting) gave up all hope of getting any information on the subject from the Opposition side of the House.

MR. MILLS: I did not say sugars were refined in bond. I said they could be refined in bond.

MR. BUNTING said he certainly understood the hon. gentleman to say that sugars were refined in bond in the United States, and he corrected him; and when he corrected him he did not deny that he said it. Now, the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) had said that the new scale of duties would result in a loss to the revenue of \$800,000 a year. All he (Mr. Bunting) could say about that was that, if the present tariff would result in a loss of \$800,000 a year to the revenue, the tariff which the hon. gentleman sought to put on the Statute-book in 1874, would have led to the loss of \$1,600,000 to the revenue, because it was nearly three times more protective to the refiners than the present tariff. He (Mr. Bunting) held in his hand the Budget speech of the hon. gentleman, delivered that year, got up in pamphlet form, and it had, no doubt, been revised by the hon. gentleman himself. Having spoken for some considerable time, and having announced some changes he contemplated in the tariff, he (Mr. Cartwright) came

to the subject of sugar. He said: "There is one duty which I must apologise to the House for not having mentioned. We do not expect to obtain any considerable revenue from that source, and I am perfectly aware that it is one of the most difficult subjects in the whole sphere of taxation. Mr. Lowe and Mr. Gladstone, in the British Parliament, have both of them admitted the same thing. The Committee will observe that, up to the present time, we treat all sugars above No. 9 as being of the same value." For the information of the House, he (Mr. Bunting) might say that all sugars below No. 12 were refining grades, grades that must undergo the process of refining before the sugar was fit for the consumer. "We now propose to create two additional classes." The House would remember that there was only one additional class established under the new tariff up to No. 14, and the greater the number of classes established, with a higher rate of duty as they proceeded upwards, the more protective the tariff became, because a high rate of duty was thereby levied on the high grades of sugar, thus preventing importers from bringing in refined sugar from abroad. The Ex-Finance Minister then proceeded: "We now propose to create two additional classes, one class equal to No. 13, and not over No. 16, upon which we propose to impose a duty of 1½c. in addition to the *ad valorem* duty. The other class we propose to create is all above No. 16, upon which we propose to impose an additional specific duty of 1½c., being an increase of ¼ and ½ per cent. per pound, respectively, over present rates." He (Mr. Bunting) would explain to the House the measure of protection which the hon. gentleman sought then to impose. Under the present tariff, the difference between refining grades and grocery grades was simply 5 per cent. Now the hon. gentleman stated this evening that the cost of raw sugar was 3c. per pound, and 5 per cent. on this was 15c. per hundred. The hon. gentleman proposed to levy 25c. additional on all sugars between Nos. 13 and 16, and to levy an additional duty of 50c. on all over 16. So that if the measure of protection under the present tariff was 15c. a hundred, the

average measure of protection, under the tariff proposed by the hon. gentleman opposite, would be about 37½c. per hundred. The House would, therefore, see that the protection which the hon. member for Centre Huron then sought to impose was very much greater than that which the hon. the Finance Minister intended to grant to the refiners under this tariff. The late Finance Minister further said:—"According to the best opinions I could obtain, and according, also, to the opinions of the Customs authorities, the present duty is unfair in this respect, that the raw material is at present taxed at 50 per cent. *ad valorem*, while there is on refined sugars only a duty of 40 to 47 per cent." The hon. gentleman certainly could not have made the calculation correctly, for it could easily have been ascertained at that time—and could be ascertained now from the Trade and Navigation Returns—that the refiners, as a matter of fact, introduced the raw material at 2½ per cent. less than the grocers. So he was astray 10 or 12 per cent. in his calculation. He recollected, when this speech was published, and the propositions came to the knowledge of importers throughout the country, that meetings of merchants were held in Toronto, Hamilton and Montreal to protest against the proposed changes, and twenty or thirty merchants engaged in the West India trade came to Ottawa, interviewed the Finance Minister, and asked him to abandon his ill-considered tariff, the effect of which must have been to place the whole sugar trade of this country in the hands of a sugar-refining monopoly in Montreal to the exclusion of everything in the way of grocery sugars of foreign countries. The Canadian people would thus have been obliged to use Canadian refined sugar only, and would have been prevented from introducing the wholesome raw grocery sugars of the West Indies—indeed, all classes except the low grades for refining purposes. The deputation urged the hon. gentleman to abandon his tariff, which he reluctantly did. In a speech delivered by the hon. member for Centre Huron, on the 1st of May following, he referred to the abandonment of his propositions, and said that the position of the duties was by no means satisfactory, and he would, during the re-

cess, consider the whole matter in question, and arrive at a better decision. The hon. gentleman had had several recesses since that time, but had he arrived at a better decision? He had not, notwithstanding that the American drawback had been increased, that the Canadian refineries had consequently been put in a worse position than before, and that the trade with the West Indies had become less and less, until now it was almost extinct. He was sorry to detain the House at so late an hour, but it might be well for him to give hon. members some idea of the kind of sugar the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had obliged the people to consume. He had here a letter which was addressed to the *Chicago Tribune* by a gentleman named Rossiter, who was the proprietor of an extensive refinery which had been in operation a good many years. He was an honest, capable and conscientious man, and he abandoned the sugar enterprise, rather than resort to the expedients to which American refiners resorted in order to render the commodity cheap, and make the business profitable. With a view of apprising the public of the nature of the commodity they were consuming, and giving them a little insight into the manner in which American refiners had been carrying on adulteration, he made the following statement regarding refined sugar:—

“There is another evil almost as pernicious as the poisoned syrups, to which the attention of the community has not as yet been directed. Almost all the refined sugars sold in this country are poisoned in refining with chemicals to a greater or less extent. Most of them do not contain sufficient drugs to produce an immediate sensible effect on those who are in ordinary health. Nevertheless, enough are used to gradually undermine the health of very many who do not class themselves as invalids, and constantly aggravate the sufferings of those who have already become such. Many are daily suffering with headaches, pain in the stomach, and bleeding piles, who have not the least suspicion that sugar may be the principal cause. They are constantly using remedies which fail of producing the desired result, because the chemicals in the sugar are constantly feeding the disease. It is not contended that sugars are the only cause of the complaints, but that they are one cause, and so fruitful a one that it becomes everyone suffering in that way to look into the matter. The case of a man connected with merchandising in Chicago is similar to that of many others. He was a constant sufferer with head-

aches and bleeding piles, so that he feared he would be compelled to relinquish business. For months he used remedies highly recommended, but without any permanent benefit, never imagining that he was feeding the disease at the family board. A friend said to him: ‘Give up sugar.’ He did so, and in one month he was well. Other cases might be given of a similar character. Multitudes throughout the country are suffering with these and similar complaints who have no suspicion that sugar is one, and perhaps the only, cause of their sufferings, and that which defies the skill of our physicians. The trouble is not caused by the sugar itself, but by the chemicals with which it is refined.”

Previous to the year 1870, the sugar of the Canadian refiners was as good as that refined anywhere in the world. It was refined according to the old system, and chemicals were not used in the preparation of sugar. But subsequently, when, under the drawback system, American sugars were introduced, Montreal refiners were obliged to compete with their neighbours, and accordingly they enlarged their establishments and introduced machinery specially to manufacture sugars of a poorer class. He had those sugars analysed, but neither chemicals nor deleterious matters were found in them, and they were proved to be wholesome. So the House would understand that, under the system which had been allowed to exist during the last four or five years, the Canadian people had been induced, in their ignorance of the quality of the sugar, to take the adulterated, miserable article brought in from the United States by thousands of barrels, believing it was wholesome. When he interrupted the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the other night, and said a few words with regard to drawbacks, he stated there was a factory in Buffalo engaged in the manufacture of starch, glucose and syrup from Indian corn. In that establishment they used from four to five thousand bushels of Indian corn daily. He was informed by a gentleman who had superintended that establishment for some years, and was brought from England to enable the firm to extract as much saccharine matters as possible from the corn, that large quantities of the glucose and syrup produced in that factory were sent to sugar refineries, and mixed with the sugar sent out from the United States, on which a drawback was received. Thus

the commodity by courtesy called refined sugar, which contained a large percentage of glucose, carried with it a large drawback. It would be readily understood by the House, that it was utterly out of the question for the Canadian refiner, who enjoyed no special privileges, to compete with such a system as this. There was another little expedient to which American refiners resorted, with a view of defeating the revenue, and breaking down foreign competition. The product of molasses, that was sugar made in the refineries of the United States from imported molasses, carried with it a drawback of 1½c. per pound. In a certain city in the Union there was a refinery, and the two firms controlling these establishments were almost identical. He would show how they got over the drawback. They brought in molasses from the West Indies, paid the duty, passed the molasses through the machinery, and it came out crystallised sugar of a low grade. It was then taken to the sugar refinery, passed through another process, made into yellow refined sugar, and exported into Canada, and it carried with it the drawback properly applicable, according to the American laws, to exported sugar made from sugar and not molasses, so that the refineries obtained from the revenue of the United States a sum of money which was much greater than the duty paid on the raw material. By that expedient they got from the American treasury money they never paid into it. From an experience of about fifteen years, during which he had purchased considerable quantities of refined sugar in the United States, as well as very large quantities of raw sugar in the West Indies, he was enabled to say that these facts were almost short of the truth, for he could tell the House of chemicals of various kinds which were used in sugar refining. The argument might be used by hon. gentlemen opposite that, if refiners in the United States resorted to adulteration and the application of chemicals in refining sugar, there was no reason why the Canadian refiner should not do likewise. But this House had the remedy in its own hands. There was an Adulteration Act on the Statute-book, and it was quite within the power of Parliament to defend the

people against any imposition by the Canadian refiners, or any other manufacturers—and there was, undoubtedly, room for the intervention of Parliament in the matter of the adulteration of food. The only difference between this tariff and the tariff we had had in operation was the addition of 5 per cent. on the *ad valorem* rate. On all sugars from 9 to 14 Dutch standard the duty had been three-fourths of one cent. per lb., and 25 per cent. Under the new tariff it was three-quarters of a cent. per lb. and 30 per cent.; and above 14 it was one cent. per lb. and 35 per cent. So the difference made with a view of protecting the refiner was simply 5 per cent. *ad valorem*. That 5 per cent. was not a great deal to contend against. There was nothing now to prevent importers from going to the Clyde, Liverpool, or to the West Indies, as heretofore, and bringing in sugar which would enter into competition with the products of the Canadian refiner. He received a letter from a friend in Toronto a few days ago, who said he was making arrangements to import grocery raw sugars for the trade from the West Indies. When in Toronto during Easter week he saw that gentleman, who told him that he had seriously considered the matter in view of the new tariff, and saw nothing in it to prevent him bringing in wholesome raw sugars from the West Indies to go into competition with the Canadian refined. Some hon. gentlemen might labour under the delusion that there was not any really high coloured sugar to be had in the West Indies. He had imported sugar as white as paper from the West Indies, a sugar that commanded a higher price from the confectioners of the United States than the white sugars of the refiners, because the confectioners knew well that it was purer than the white sugar of the refiners. There was nothing to prevent importations from the West Indies going on under this tariff, nor, if there was sufficient competition between the importers of grocery sugars and the manufacturers in Canada, to cause any increased prices here. He would now show the probable effect of the new tariff on the West India trade. The aggregate quantity of sugar consumed in this country annually was from 105,000,000 lb.

to 110,000,000lb. and the consumption would doubtless be considerably increased, because, under the operation of the National Policy, many commodities for which sugar was required, and which had hitherto been imported, would be manufactured in the Dominion. This 105,000,000lb. or 110,000,000lb. would amount to about 75,000 or 80,000 hogsheads. As many hon. gentlemen knew, the vessels engaged in this trade had each a carrying capacity of less than 250 or 300 hogsheads, so that the aggregate of the sugar consumed by the people of Canada, in twelve months, would be equal to about 300 ordinary cargoes. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) in speaking of this trade, said it engaged forty vessels of 1,000 tons each. The hon. member, coming as he did from the Maritime Provinces, should have been candid in discussing this question, and should have stated to the House that the vessels engaged in the trade had not a carrying capacity of 1,000 tons, but of about 250 hogsheads. At the present time very little sugar was brought to the lower ports, because the people had been able to buy the commodity, which, by courtesy, was called sugar, cheaper from the United States. But, under the present tariff, they hoped to obtain a purer article. As he stated before, our West India sugar trade had been almost wiped out of existence by the drawback system of the United States. Under the proposed tariff, he had no doubt that it would be revived and restored; that before twelve months had elapsed it would be very active, and that 75 or 80 per cent. of the sugar used in this country would come direct from the West Indies. Suppose we imported 250 cargoes, it was safe to assume that the vessels bringing those cargoes to Canadian ports would take back Canadian products: fish, lumber, breadstuffs, coal—such products being now sent chiefly from American ports to the West Indies. With refineries established at Halifax, St. John and Montreal, and with 200 or 300 cargoes of raw sugars imported direct, a profitable trade with the West Indies would, no doubt, be established. This had not been the case for many years past, because the great bulk of our sugar had come in by American railways,

MR. BUNTING.

under which system we obtained no interchange of trade and little or no profit. The sugar refining question was one of special importance to the people of Nova Scotia, for the refining of 50,000 tons of sugar involved the consumption of a like number of tons of coal, and this would develop the coal trade of that Province. With respect to sugar refining in Ontario, if hon. gentlemen opposite would name any part of the world where a sugar refinery was established at a point as far distant from the seaboard as Toronto was, then he would admit that the industry could be profitably carried on in that city. But it was well known that no sugar refinery was established so far away from salt water. Consequently, Toronto laboured under a disadvantage in consequence of its geographical position. It was useless to argue that injustice was done to Toronto, for sugar could not be profitably refined in Ontario, under this or any tariff, as such a refinery could not successfully compete with the refineries at Montreal, Halifax and St. John. If sugar was brought from New York over the Suspension Bridge to Toronto, for refining purposes, and the privilege of admitting packages free of duty were granted, even then the industry could not be profitably carried on in his judgment.

MR. MILLS: How about Montreal?

MR. BUNTING: That is a different question.

MR. MACKENZIE: The bulk of the sugar for the Montreal refinery comes by Portland.

MR. BUNTING said that during the winter months, when the import trade was active, and when the raw article could not be sent in by water, it came to Montreal by rail from Portland. But when the river was open vessels would bring raw sugar direct to the refinery. He was afraid hon. gentlemen opposite could not afford him any information on the question. While he did not desire to depreciate their judgment, he was bound to say that, if the information they had given to the House during the tariff debate was of the same character as that presented on the sugar question, it was, indeed, very wide of the mark.

The *Toronto Globe*, the organ of the gentlemen opposite, in an article published a short time ago on the question of drawbacks, said :

"The French Government, like the United States Government, puts into the refiner's pocket at home the profits he should get from his customers abroad, and thus enables him to undersell the foreign refiners. So systematically have the French refiners gone to work that they have, it is stated, directed the beet root sugar makers to produce an article apparently giving 80 per cent. of saccharine matter, but which really gives 90 per cent. The cunning fellows thereby manage to pay duty on an 80 per cent. assessment of value and receive a drawback on one of 90 per cent. The results to the British refiners have been consequently most disastrous. Several refineries have shut down altogether, and if the unfair competition is continued others will soon follow."

While the *Globe* made the discovery that the French refiners had an advantage over the English, it failed to ascertain that the American refiner possessed ten times as great an advantage over the Canadian refiner. It professed ignorance of the existence of the bounty given on sugar coming from the United States to Canada, while it was perfectly well informed in regard to the bounty given on French sugar going into England. A few years ago there were twenty-four refineries in the British metropolis, producing enormous quantities of sugar for home consumption and export. But, of these, twelve were closed in consequence of the operation of the bounty system of France and the unfair competition which they encountered from the French refiners. Canada had suffered from a like cause in a much greater degree, and the refiners of this country had had good ground for complaint by reason of the drawback allowed by the American Government on sugar exported to this Dominion and foreign countries. He (Mr. Bunting) had no hesitation in saying that the new tariff was a good one, well adapted to the requirements and circumstances of the country, one that would ere long foster our trade with the tropics and contribute largely to the furtherance of our commercial welfare.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the value of the hon. gentleman's testimony was very great. He recollected when the hon. gentleman came before him as Finance Minister, and his evidence then

was marvellously in contrast with his evidence now. When the hon. gentleman from Bothwell was presiding over the Depression Committee, a few years ago, the hon. gentleman from Welland appeared before the Committee, and testified that he did not think sugar refining was indigenous to Canada, and that sugars could be refined in the United States and on the Clyde for less money than in Canada. The hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that a great quantity of sugars had been bought from the United States. He (Mr. Cartwright) found that 45,118,000lb. were brought from England last year, and only 42,500,000lb. from the United States, and he was further informed by the Customs authorities last year that the great bulk of sugars brought from the United States were hard white sugars, of a high class, which sugars, he always understood, were not easily adulterated. The yellow sugars, which could be most easily adulterated, were brought from Great Britain. Finding that complaints were made that sugars were adulterated, the then Minister of Inland Revenue, at his (Mr. Cartwright's) instance, caused an eminent analyst to examine a number of samples of American sugar in Montreal and elsewhere. The result was completely to disprove the allegations that deleterious ingredients, or, indeed, ingredients to any extent, were admixed in the sugars from the United States. He did not dispute that adulterated sugar was made in the United States, but he was sure we would find Canadian rogues and Canadian sugar refiners just as ready to adulterate as were foreign rogues, and he was afraid that particular description of home manufacture flourished amongst us sufficiently and needed no protection, although it got some encouragement under this tariff.

MR. DALY said this subject had occupied the attention of the people of Nova Scotia more than any other. It was this very question of sugar, and the neglect of the late Government to deal with it, that had much to do with his presence in this House. The gentleman who lately represented the city of Halifax in this House had some idea of the importance of the sugar question, but, when he entered the late Government, the renewal

of the question of taxing sugar, the remission of duties on the unrefined sugar, and its admission on such terms as would allow the industry of sugar refining to be carried on successfully in this country, received no attention whatever from the Government. He attributed the defeat of Mr. Jones to this great question. He congratulated the hon. the Finance Minister on having grappled with this question—a question so intricate as to puzzle his predecessors—but for which a fair solution had now been found. It would give to this country an impetus in the development of its resources, and give a stimulus to our languishing West India trade. It had been stated that the importation of sugar could not be made direct. He could assure the hon. gentleman who made that statement that there were now six vessels loading in the West Indies to come back with sugar direct to Halifax. They would not now come back in ballast from the United States, but would bring the raw material, which would be sent by the Intercolonial to be refined at Montreal. One of these vessels was owned by the late member for Halifax, who would now be glad to avail himself of the advantages to be derived from the policy which this Government had proposed, and which his own colleagues had not the patriotism to carry into effect. Not only would it revive the sugar refining industry, but it would develop the coal resources of the country. The refining of every 100lb. of sugar would take one ton of coal. It would give increased occupation to our ships, and the shipment of fish to the West Indies would be more profitable. Freight on fish would be lower, as the return freight on the sugar would help to pay the expenses of the round voyage, while such vessels had lately been obliged to return from the United States in ballast.

MR. MILLS said the hon. member for Welland was mistaken in supposing that he (Mr. Mills) had stated that the United States refiners refined in bond. The discussion at that time was as to whether the duties on raw sugars from the United States should be charged not only on the price of the sugar, but also on the American duty as well, and the hon. the Finance Minister stated

that when the duty was paid it would be charged on that as well, but not otherwise. He (Mr. Mills) then called his attention to the fact that the rule he laid down, besides being inconsistent with the provision of his tariff would apply to all American sugars, if refined in bond, which obviously they would do in order to avoid the duty he proposed to impose upon them. His impression was that little glucose was used in the manufacture of American sugars, and that was necessarily confined to yellow sugars. Some time last summer Mr. McGibson, of Montreal, to whom the hon. the Minister of Public Works had referred as a high authority, made a statement that the American sugars imported into Canada were poisoned with chemicals, and that they did not contain more than 65 per cent. of pure cane sugar. In order to ascertain the facts, Dr. Baker Edwards, of Montreal, the Government analyst, was directed to investigate the subject, and analysed, if he was not mistaken, upwards of twenty specimens of American and Scotch sugars. There was not an American sugar analysed that gave less than 99 per cent. of pure cane sugar. There was the smallest trace of ash, and scarcely a trace of glucose. No foreign substance of any kind was found. That report was a complete answer to the statement of Mr. McGibson. It was also a conclusive answer to the statement made to-night by the hon. member for Welland. He called the hon. member's attention to this fact, that the average price of sugars imported from the United States last year, exclusive of melado and syrups, was \$6.26, and the price of sugars imported from Great Britain was \$5.20. It was perfectly obvious that the sugar the people paid \$6.26 for, to the refiner of New York, was not the same sugar, or the same class of sugar which they paid \$5.20 for, to people on the Clyde or at Portsmouth. In one case they purchased white sugars, hard or soft, and in the other case yellow refined sugars. It was obvious they would not pay \$1.06 in New York more for sugars than they would pay in Glasgow for sugars of the same quality. The hon. member had also stated that the refineries in Canada were closed in consequence of the draw-

MR. DALY.

back given in the United States. He thought the hon. gentleman was wholly wrong. If time permitted, he could show that this statement was misleading. But, if there was any force in it at all, the effect would have been to exclude Scotch refined sugars and English sugars as well. But these sugars continued to come into the Canadian market more largely than before. The fact was that Scotch refined sugars drove nearly all the American yellow refined sugars out of the Canadian market. The sugars imported from the United States during the past year or fifteen months, were superior to those imported the year or two previous. Why? Because the class of yellow refined sugars it was impossible for the Americans to sell in a Canadian market, and compete successfully with the yellow refined sugars from Scotland. Our Trade and Navigation Returns showed that. He had shown the House that the drawback given to the American refiners did not accomplish the object the hon. gentleman said it did, and it was perfectly obvious that it could not. The sugar refiners in the United States imported 1,500 million pounds a year, mostly from the West Indies, and exported but 80,000,000lb. If they obtained the whole price of the sugars exported as a drawback, it could have but little effect on the whole refining business of the country, as fifteen pounds out of every sixteen refined, and on which the tax was paid, and no drawback could be allowed, was consumed at home. The fact that they exported but 80,000,000lb. showed the utter fallacy of the hon. gentleman's argument. If the American refiner received such a bounty as these gentlemen pretended, it would be his interest to export his sugars in order to obtain the bounty; but he did not do so, which proved the statement of these gentlemen to be unfounded. He contended that he could not import into Canada from the West Indies the superior grades of sugar, and successfully compete with the refiners here. This tariff imposed a tax of $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem* on sugars under No. 9, and on sugars over No. 13 1c. per pound, and 35 per cent.; a difference between the two grades of $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound, and 5 per

cent. *ad valorem*, a real difference of 25 per cent., for that $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound meant 20 per cent on the value. This tariff would not help the West India trade. The centrifugal sugars—the higher grades of raw sugar—were manufactured by the planters, and this tariff discriminated against them. They were the only men who were able to enter into close commercial relations with us. That tariff was framed specially in the interests of refiners, and under it the people could receive only, for consumption, the inferior grades of sugar refined here, for which they would have to pay a very high price.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the hon. member for Welland was under a misapprehension with regard to a statement which he (Sir A. J. Smith) had made. The statement he had made was that the carrying trade in respect to this sugar was equal to 40 vessels of a thousand tons each. He did not say it had to be carried in vessels of 1,000 tons and no other vessels. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that sugar could be carried in none but British bottoms. Did he know that sugar was brought to Chicago by the River St. Lawrence. How many cargoes were brought from the West Indies while the sugar refinery was in Montreal? Our vessels now had a large amount of the carrying trade. They took cargoes from St. John and Halifax to the West Indies, and brought back sugar to the United States.

MR. HOOPER said he held a petition which had been presented to this House two or three years ago, at the time the Redpath refinery at Montreal was closed, from the operatives in that refinery, numbering 2,500 workmen, and owners of real estate, shopkeepers and others in the neighbourhood of the works, setting forth the great injury inflicted on them by the closing of this refinery, which had then been in operation twenty-one years. The next question was: What caused these works to be closed? The answer was contained in the extract from the Budget speech of the late Finance Minister, which was read by the hon. member for Welland:

"According to the best opinions I could obtain, and according, also, to the opinions of the Custom-house authorities the present

duty is unfair in this respect: that the raw material is at present taxed at 50 per cent. *ad valorem*, while there is on refined sugars only a duty of 40 to 47 per cent. We propose to rectify this unfairness."

The hon. the Finance Minister did alter the duty as he proposed, which would have enabled the refinery to go on, and others to open, but after it had been a few days in operation he repealed it. The duty of to-day was the same as existed since 1868, under which, although unfavourable, the Redpaths were able to compete until the United States bounty crushed them out. It would appear, from the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1878, that there were nearly 1,000,000,000 lb. of sugar imported into Canada. He would not go into details, as the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Bunting) had gone fully into them; but speaking of the price of sugar, he would merely make a comparison for argument sake. Supposing that sugar had been cheaper the last five years than previously—what would be the effect of that? Presuming the Americans sold their sugar a cent less per pound, in any grade, than what was charged by the Messrs. Redpath, there still remained the important question of glucose to be considered, and in order that this House might understand the extent to which glucose entered into the American sugar, he would read an extract from a Free-trade paper, the *New York Bulletin*:

"Special Treasury Agent Chamberlain, who has been making investigations for some time past, regarding the alleged frauds in sugar, has forwarded a report to Washington, which, it is said, fully bears out the charges that have been made. The chief of the Detective Service in the Treasury Department has notified Col. Chamberlain that he is coming to New York, and will probably arrive here to-day, to take such action as may be deemed necessary in the interest of the Government. The points of the report have not, of course, been made public, but it is said that high grade sugars, on which a drawback was allowed for exports, have been found to contain, in some instances, as high as 60 per cent. of glucose, and this will be proved by samples which were tested by the Government chemists."

It was well known that in the United States there were three or four large manufactories of glucose. It was only the other day that a factory in Rhode Island was moved into Ohio, so as to be

MR. HOOPER.

in the midst of a corn growing country, and avoid the expense of freight. The poor starving workmen, for whom hon. gentlemen opposite had such intense sympathy, were paying, under their policy, 10c. for every 4c. worth of sugar and 2c. worth of Indian corn. Millions had been taken out of the pockets of our people to put in the hands of those American refiners. And yet the Opposition call them legalised robbers and taxationists, and said they wanted to take the money from the poor workingman to give it to rich monopolists. And that in the face of the above facts. There was another consideration which entered into this question, and that was the decrease in value of real estate in Montreal, owing to the destruction of the refineries:

"The total value of property constantly employed by Redpaths, including wages, is as follows:—The vessels, cars, horses, hay, oats, coal and wages, \$1,400,000. This does not include the refinery or raw material. The number of individuals supported by the works is 3,437 souls. The destruction and loss to dwellings is more than can be estimated by hon. members. Again, men out of employment, horses, vessels, and cars idle, the loss cannot be computed. In short, apart from the works, a whole town of 3,437 souls blotted out of existence by this sugar duty, and this is Free-trade."

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated the drawback paid by the Americans, was simply a drawback on the amount exported. He had frequently heard the very opposite, that the American refiners received a drawback from their Government for every pound of sugar imported. If 100 lb. of sugar made 75 lb. refined, they got a drawback on the 100 lb. These facts were sufficient to prove that the measure introduced by the Finance Minister was one for which there was urgent need, and one which every true lover of his country would support.

Item agreed to.

MR. TILLEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Two o'clock

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 24th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES LAWS
AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Baby.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution respecting Weights and Measures.

(In the Committee.)

In answer to Mr. BÉCHARD,

MR. BABY said it was the object of the Government to facilitate, as much as possible, the inspection of Weights and Measures, and to conduct it in such a manner as to incommode as little as possible those who were obliged to submit to it. He trusted the Bill relating to this matter would meet with the approval of the House.

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times and agreed to.

MR. BABY introduced a Bill (No. 87) To amend and consolidate the laws relating to Weights and Measures.

Bill read the first time.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS
ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the tariff of tolls and dues to be levied in the Harbour of Montreal.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said this resolution was introduced at the request of the Harbour Commissioners under the Act 36 Vict. The tolls were fixed by

Statute, and it was not in the power of the Harbour Commissioners to lessen those dues. Montreal had become a very expensive port, so expensive, in fact, that ship-owners almost avoided it and procured cargoes elsewhere. The Harbour Commissioners desired, by lowering the tolls, to encourage ships to go to the harbour as much as possible. This resolution only empowered the Commissioners to reduce the tolls with the consent of the Governor in Council. It did not empower them to increase them.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the first clause, as it was worded, empowered the Harbour Commissioners also to increase the tolls with the consent of the Governor in Council.

MR. POPE said that was a wrong construction to place on the clause. It was only intended to give the power to reduce the tolls with the consent of the Governor in Council. The second resolution had for its object the authorising of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, to make arrangements with steamers and tug-boats with regard to the dues and charges for towage to be imposed. It also authorised the Commissioners to purchase and own such tug-steamers. It was intended to place within their power the means of reducing, by competition, the fees or dues of tug-boat owners when they became too large; the Commissioners might thereby regulate the tug-boat charges on the river.

MR. KILLAM said that it might be possible that the charges at Montreal might have been so excessive as to prevent many vessels from visiting that harbour; but, on the other hand, perhaps the smallness of the number of vessels might have prevented proper competition between the individual owners of the tug-boats. However, this resolution simply authorised the Harbour Commissioners to stop a monopoly by creating another that might be equally injurious to the port. Perhaps there was no fear of their doing that, as it was not in their interest; but the Harbour Commissioners, by an agreement with any tug-boat company, or owners, to do all the towage at stipulated charges, could thus establish a monopoly that might become very injurious. If the Commissioners pur-

chased or built boats better fitted for towing at cheaper rates than the present, it did not follow that other improvements might not be undertaken, and a monopoly established in connection with them. It would be better to leave this work open to the competition of private individuals. He thought it would be just as proper for the corporation of Montreal to purchase cabs and carriages, and contract to do all the cab driving in that city, as for the Harbour Commissioners to enter upon such an enterprise as towing. Unless some better reason was given for this interference with private undertakings, he must protest against it.

MR. TUPPER said the Harbour Commissioners were expending very large sums to improve the facilities of that port and increase its business. While it was suffering from competition with the St. Lawrence route and other causes, it was the opinion of those gentlemen that they might do a great deal to increase its trade and business, and also the revenue from shipping by reducing the charges on it. They believed that instead of decreasing the revenue they would increase it, by attracting more vessels through those greater commercial facilities. Besides dealing with those tolls and dues, the resolution dealt with another point, which they said had become a serious one, namely, the heavy exactions levied by parties for tug service, which had been found a heavy obstruction to the Commissioners and a discouragement to vessels, which dreaded coming to Montreal in consequence. The second resolution would enable the Commissioners to deal with both matters. They had no object but to facilitate and increase the trade and business of the port, which, if they received the power asked, they believed they could do, by relieving shipping from the onerous exactions it now suffered from. The object was laudable, and, as the competition with Montreal was keen, it was important that the House should do everything to promote trade and business through our commercial centre.

MR. McCUAIG said that he understood this resolution in an exactly opposite sense to that taken by the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam). Its object

MR. KILLAM.

was to prevent extortionate charges upon vessels by the competition of steamboat owners and tugs. He (Mr. McCuaig) knew that shipowners had refused to come from Quebec to Montreal, owing to the heavy rates for towage. The resolution was intended to give the Commissioners power to check exorbitant charges.

MR. KILLAM said that nobody appreciated more than himself the efforts of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to improve the trade and facilities for shipping of the port. With regard to this resolution doing away with injurious monopolies, it might encourage the creation of another, more injurious still. He thought they were going the wrong way to work.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) introduced a Bill (No. 88) To amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Bill read the first time.

NORTH SYDNEY HARBOUR BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution respecting the appointment of three Commissioners, to have the superintendence of the Harbour of the port of North Sydney in Nova Scotia.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said that this resolution was designed to place this port in a similar position to that of Pictou, where the arrangement had been found to work very well. It merely authorised the appointment of Commissioners to make regulations, and look after the harbour-master, etc.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he doubted very much the policy of this resolution, because this was a port of call, and, if it was intended to tax all vessels coming

from Europe, calling there for orders, it would affect it injuriously.

MR. POPE said he understood that vessels did not come inside the harbour when calling for orders, in which case they would not be called on to pay harbour dues. If they entered, however, and remained any length of time, they would naturally be expected to pay dues, one cent a ton, which was all that could be charged.

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolution *reported*, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) introduced a Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Harbour of North Sydney in Nova Scotia.

Bill read the first time

PICTOU HARBOUR ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)

FIRST READING.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution respecting the Harbour of Pictou in Nova Scotia.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he would alter the resolution so as to make it read three police constables, instead of five.

Resolution, as amended, *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolution *reported*, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) introduced a Bill (No. 90) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou in Nova Scotia.

Bill read the first time.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's P.E.I.*)

FIRST READING.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution respecting the Pilotage Act of 1873.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said this resolution intended that masters of vessels, except those registered in Canada, should not be allowed to obtain authority to act as pilots in their own ships. It contemplated, also, giving authority to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to engage second-class pilots for the subordinate class of pilotage duties.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he approved both objects of the resolution. Mr. Cramp had convinced him it was in the interests of Montreal to have second-class pilots.

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolution *reported*, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) introduced a Bill (No 91) To amend the Pilotage Act, 1873.

Bill read the first time.

SEAMEN'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)

FIRST READING.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution respecting the Seamen's Act, 1873.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said this resolution was intended to amend the 31st clause of the Act, about the interpretation of which there was, at present, a difference of opinion.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the intention of this resolution was to make every foreign vessel, notwithstanding its size, have a certified master and mate on board. That he understood to be the intention of the Act, but, as there was difference of opinion on it, this would make the Act perfectly clear.

MR. KILLAM said this compelled vessels of any size to have a certified master and mate before they could clear for a foreign port. If that were the case, there would be a great scarcity of masters and mates, unless means were taken to give certificates to all masters and mates

now employed, and who had not certificates; otherwise many vessels would be prevented from leaving port.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said the resolution would not interfere in this way. It simply made the Act more clear than it was at present.

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolution *reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.*

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) introduced a Bill (No. 92) To amend the Seamen's Act, 1873.

Bill *read the first time.*

TRURO AND PICTOU RAILWAY TRANSFER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 58.]

(*Mr. Tupper.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading *read.*

MR. TUPPER said he had looked over the suggestions made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and did not think they materially altered the substance of the Bill. As it was founded on an agreement, he did not like to introduce any verbal alterations unless they were absolutely necessary. He had, therefore, not altered the Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not intend to divide the House on the Bill, but he regretted exceedingly that the ninth section should be retained. He could see no use for it. The hon. gentleman admitted that there might be a claim, else why state that the claim should be admitted in any way?

MR. TUPPER said he agreed with the hon. gentleman that there was no claim, and the fact that they both held this opinion ought to be sufficient to set at rest any doubts.

MR. ANGLIN said this Bill made serious alterations in the arrangements with regard to this railway. He thought some of the alterations devolved upon the Government of the Dominion contingent responsibilities, to which they

MR. KILLAM.

were not subjected under the old arrangement. He wished to draw attention to the personal claims of the gentleman who was formerly contractor for the road. This Bill interfered with his private rights. Under the arrangement made at the time the contract was taken off his hands, it was understood he was to receive certain bonds in payment of his claims then admitted. These bonds he believed would be seriously affected in their value by the Bill, because the Bill provided for a possibility of the railroad passing into the possession of the Provincial Government, and subsequently of the Dominion Government, free from all liabilities. Therefore, he thought these liabilities, which he supposed were to be attached to the road, would be seriously affected. The value of the bonds he expected to receive would be greatly diminished, or, indeed, rendered altogether unsaleable. It was evident that, if, under this Bill, the road was to be relieved from all liability, if the bonds might, through any neglect of the company or of the Provincial Government, be practically cancelled, nobody would be much disposed to invest money in them, no matter how improbable the contingency might seem to be. The Bill had passed a second reading without his perceiving it. He could not imagine that the Government had any wish to interfere in any way with the rights of Mr. Gregory, or to injure in any way his claims, or to affect injuriously the character of any bonds or debentures which he held or was entitled to receive. Nevertheless, Mr. Gregory felt that the provisions of this Bill would have that effect, and he (Mr. Anglin) thought his statement was not unreasonable. It seemed to him that he had a right to complain of the Bill, and to ask that his interests should be protected.

MR. TUPPER said he had looked carefully into the question raised by Mr. Gregory in relation to these bonds, and was satisfied that, far from his having any legitimate grounds of complaint, no person was going to be more benefitted than he himself by the passage of this Bill. By his agreement with the company they were to give him a certain number of bonds, a comparatively small amount of old issue, and he (Mr. Tupper) be-

lieved that Mr. Gregory was not in a position to obtain any bonds at all, and that the Company were not in a position to issue bonds, and that without this Bill their bonds could not be put in the market, and Mr. Gregory could not obtain his quota, which, under his agreement with them, he was entitled to. If the company who were to issue these bonds were satisfied with this Bill, he could have no ground of apprehension. What would affect him in a small degree would affect the company to a large extent.

MR. ANGLIN said this matter was of great importance to Mr. Gregory, whose interests amounted to \$40,000. If he (Mr. Anglin) understood the case it was this: this Bill provided that, if this company failed to work the road after it was completed, it should then go into the hands of the Provincial Government; and, if they, in turn, failed to work it, it should go into the hands of the Dominion Government, but that in returning into the possession of the Dominion Government it should go free of all liabilities. The arrangement was that bonds should be issued covering the Pictou Branch as well as the new portion of the road, but, if it was provided that under any circumstances that liability should be extinguished, the value of the bonds must necessarily be diminished. If the company contemplated issuing a large number of bonds on which they expected to realise money, or which they expected to issue in exchange for rails or rolling stock, the company should be interested in this particular question. The contingencies, however remote they might be, would nevertheless affect the value of the bonds in the market, and, if Mr. Gregory wished to realise on these bonds, he might find them worthless for that purpose.

MR. BRECKEN said he would ask that this Bill be not read the third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with such instructions as would meet the views of the hon. gentleman from Gloucester. Mr. Gregory had a very vital interest in this matter. A few weeks ago he (Mr. Brecken) presented a petition to this House asking that his claim to the issue of preferential bonds to the extent of \$80,000 should be a

prior claim, and precede the measure sought to be enacted by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. Under a certain agreement that Mr. Gregory entered into with the Canada Improvement Company, and sanctioned by the Province of Nova Scotia, he claimed before this Bill was passed that these bonds should have priority. The history of this contract was briefly this:

"By contract dated October, 1876, Harry Abbott, of Brockville, contracted with the Government of Nova Scotia to build and operate a railway from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, called 'The Eastern Extension Railway,' and to establish a steam ferry across the said Strait, in aid of which he was to receive as a subsidy from the Government of Nova Scotia, \$7,945, per mile, 150,000 acres of land, and a transfer of the line of railway from Truro to Pictou, called 'The Pictou Branch,' owned by the Government of Canada; which Pictou Branch it had been previously arranged between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia, should be given by the Government of Canada to the contractor for the said Eastern Extension Railroad, whoever he might be. The said contract provided, that inasmuch as the said Pictou Branch would not be delivered to the contractor as soon as he had anticipated when proposing for the said contract, he should not be bound to proceed further with his contract after his work done amounted to \$400,000, estimated by a schedule of values annexed to the said contract, unless the said Pictou Branch should then be delivered to him, as it was then expressed in the said contract to be believed that it would be delivered, and in default of such delivery, the said contractor was to be paid the full value of all work by him done. Abbott transferred the contract, with the approval of the Government of Nova Scotia, to 'the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company,' established by Act of Nova Scotia Assembly, 39th Vict., cap. 4, and 39th Vict. cap. 74. The Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company contracted with the Canada Improvement Company (Incorporated by Parliament of Canada, 1872), for the construction of said line, agreeing to pay there for, partly in money, partly in first mortgage bonds of said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, and partly in paid up stock in said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company.

"The Canada Improvement Company, sometime in December, 1876, contracted with Charles C. Gregory, the petitioner, for the engineering, clearing, grading, fencing, bridging, sleepers and track laying of the whole of the Eastern Extension Railway, agreeing to pay petitioner therefor monthly, as the work progressed, \$4,800 per mile, in money, and \$3,750 in first mortgage bonds of the said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, and on the completion of the contract 50,000 acres of land, and one-third of the

whole stock of said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company as paid up stock. Gregory gave a bond to the Canada Improvement Company, with sureties in \$100,000, for the due performance of the contract. This contract was approved of by the Governor in Council of Nova Scotia, in February, 1877. Gregory, under his contract, proceeded with the construction of the railway, until on the 1st of November, A.D. 1877, he had done work to the admitted value of \$400,000, by the Government Engineer's return, entitling the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company to receive said Pictou Branch, and thence forward until April, 1878, when work to the value of \$530,000 (being three-fourths of the whole contract) was done, at which time there was \$128,000 due Mr. Gregory. When Gregory had performed the work above-mentioned, and there was so large a sum due to him in bonds, the Canada Improvement Company declared their inability to give Gregory the bonds to which he was entitled, alleging that the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company could not issue the bonds until they had one mile of said railway finished and in operation for every £3,000 sterling of bonds sought to be issued. Gregory, not receiving any bonds or equivalent therefor, discontinued work, and in May, 1878, commenced suits against Sir Hugh Allan and Hon. John Hamilton, they being Directors of said Canada Improvement Company, who had signed Gregory's contract, and who Gregory was advised were personally liable therefor. On the intervention and solicitation of the Government of Nova Scotia, and through the Hon. P. C. Hill, Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia, Gregory having no negotiation with either the said Canada Improvement Company, the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, or any of the officers of either of the said two Companies personally, a settlement of the suits was arranged and embodied in a tripartite deed of settlement between the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company of the first part, the Canada Improvement Company of the second part, and Mr. Gregory of the third part, executed in September, 1878. By the said deed of settlement, Gregory agreed to discontinue the suits brought by him against the said Sir Hugh Allan and the Hon. John Hamilton, surrender his contract and deliver up his works to the Canada Improvement Company; and the said Canada Improvement Company, in addition to the sum of \$30,000 paid or secured to Gregory at the time of signing the said deed, agreed to deliver to Gregory 'as soon as the same could be legally issued—to which end both the said Companies agreed to use every diligence—\$80,000 in good, sufficient, legal and available first mortgage bonds of said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, and which should, so far as the said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company and the Canada Improvement Company could make them do so, attach and be a first lien upon the Truro and Pictou Branch Railway,

which is to be handed over by the Government of the Dominion of Canada to said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company as a subsidy towards the construction of said Eastern Railway Extension (provided always that such branch railway should be so handed over), the said Eastern Railway Extension and also upon said Company and the property, rights and privileges set forth in section 32 of the Act incorporating said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, 39 *Vic.*, cap. 74. In the said deed of settlement it was understood that the Government of Nova Scotia should be at liberty, and was thereby permitted and required, to use all means within its power to enforce the delivery of said bonds to Petitioner by either of said Companies, their successors or assigns, or by any other Company or Companies which may be substituted for them or either of them, it being intended that said Government might withhold any consent or privilege, or omit or refuse to do any Act within its jurisdiction, required or necessary to enable said Company or Companies to draw any Government aid or receive any subsidy or subvention, or issue said bonds or otherwise until said Government was satisfied that the right of Gregory to receive said bonds was protected and assured.' The Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia was privy to all the details of the said agreement and deed of settlement, and strongly urged Mr. Gregory to agree thereto in, as he alleged, the public interest. In negotiating the said agreement Hon. P. C. Hill assured Gregory that the said Pictou Branch Railway would be handed over by the Dominion Government as a subsidy to the said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, as contemplated by said deed of settlement; that arrangements to that effect had been made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia, and that naught but Gregory's litigation stood in the way of the same being carried into effect. Mr. Hill, as Provincial Secretary, further assured Petitioner, Mr. Gregory, that the Government of Nova Scotia would pass a Minute of Council recognising the said deed of settlement, and that Gregory might rely upon the Government protecting his interests. That at the time of the signing of the said deed of settlement, Gregory pledged to the Government of Nova Scotia \$40,000 of bonds, deliverable to him under the said deed of settlement, to recoup the said Government for moneys paid out as relief to labourers who had been defrauded by absconding sub-contractors, which pledging was effected by Gregory giving the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia an order on the Canada Improvement Company, for the delivery to said Government of said bonds, which order was accepted by the said Canada Improvement Company, and is now held by the Government of Nova Scotia. Immediately after the settlement before mentioned, a change took place in the Government of Nova Scotia, the security bond not having been returned to Gregory, and no Minute of Council having been made for the protection of Gregory's rights."

It appeared that the remuneration promised Mr. Gregory was not given by the company, and he instituted proceedings against Mr. Hamilton, but withdrew the case, and compromised with them. By the agreement arrived at then, Mr. Gregory was to receive \$80,000, half of which was to go to the Government of Nova Scotia, which that Government had supplied to Mr. Gregory to relieve the men employed under him. The petitioner had left the matter in his (Mr. Brecken's) hands to lay before the House. Mr. Gregory contended that the terms and the contract ought to be observed as far as he was concerned. He (Mr. Brecken) would, therefore, move the following amendment to the motion of the hon. the Minister of Public Works:—

"That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with an instruction that they have power to make the following amendments, by inserting in line 10, of page 2, after the word 'therein,' the following words: 'Save and except an issue of first mortgage bonds by the said Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, to the extent of eighty thousand dollars, forty thousand of which shall be issued to Charles C. Gregory, and forty thousand to the Government of Nova Scotia, in accordance with a deed of settlement, dated 31st of August, 1878, between the said Company, the Canada Improvement Company and the said Charles C. Gregory, the said bonds to attach and to be a first lien and charge upon the said two Railways and Ferry upon the Company, and the rights, property and privileges set forth in section 32 of the said Company's charter,' and by inserting in line 15 of said page 2, after the word 'assigns,' the words: 'Except as aforesaid,' and by further inserting in said line 15, after the word 'incumbrances,' the words: 'Except as aforesaid,' and also by inserting in line 22 on said page 2, after the word 'Company,' the words: 'Except as aforesaid'; also by inserting in line 34 of page 3, after the word 'Company,' the words: 'Except as hereinafter provided'; also by inserting in line 34 on page 3, after the word 'liens,' the words: 'Except as aforesaid.'"

The effect of this amendment was to give Mr. Gregory the first lien upon the Company.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. member had put forward in a very clear and succinct manner Mr. Gregory's claim. But it appeared that Mr. Gregory, out of an issue of \$1,250,000, was only interested to the extent of \$80,000, and a bond for

half of that had been transferred to the Government of Nova Scotia. If the parties who were interested to the extent of \$1,250,000, less \$80,000, did not consider the remote contingency in this Bill, for the purpose of providing for the absolute certainty of this road being continued to be operated, was objectionable, he thought the House did not require to go any further to see that this was one of those claims which parties were always ready to put forward upon however slender basis. It was an amendment that could not be accepted by the Government.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that he could not see that Mr. Gregory was entitled to any further consideration, because there was no bonds issued. He had no claim on the Government, though he might have a claim on the contractor. The Government of Nova Scotia had a joint interest in this matter, and they had not come forward and remonstrated, and that was strong evidence of no claim on the part of Mr. Gregory. This Bill was a very important one, and it seemed to him (Sir A. J. Smith) that it was establishing a very dangerous precedent. There was nothing to prevent the contractors to the Local Government of Nova Scotia, who were making this railway from Truro to the Gut of Canso, getting rid of the road, which they no doubt would, if it were not remunerative, and throwing the responsibility on the Dominion Government at a very great loss to the other. It was a dangerous principle.

MR. TUPPER: The responsibility would not fall upon this Government to work it.

SIR A. J. SMITH said it must be assumed that they would have to work it if it was Government property. If that were the case, the Province of Quebec, which had an enormous amount of railway property would no doubt, be glad to get rid of it, and if the Government assumed the responsibility of working this railway in Nova Scotia, the Government could not draw a line and make a distinction between the Provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia. It was a bad precedent to establish.

MR. MACDONNELL said he hoped the amendment would not pass. MR.

Gregory had no claim upon that portion of the road which was the property of the Dominion. The claim could only affect the Eastern Extension Railway, which belonged to the Government of Nova Scotia. Therefore, the Dominion could not be held responsible for any claims on the part of Mr. Gregory, or anybody else. If Mr. Gregory had claims on the contractors, he should hold that portion of the Pictou Railway which belonged to Nova Scotia responsible. They should recognise no lien on the Pictou Branch, which was only to be transferred when, and upon condition that, the extension to the Strait of Canso was completed. He hoped the fears of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith), that this road might, ultimately, fall into the hands of the Dominion Government, would prove well founded. The transfer of the Pictou Branch to the Province of Nova Scotia, was strongly opposed in this House, and, notably, by the late member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who complained that by that transfer Nova Scotia received millions of dollars as a gift. Now, the hon. member for Westmoreland expressed fear that the Government might become repossessed of the road to acquire the title to the new extension also. It was well known that the question of extending our great railway system to the harbour of Louisburg was often discussed in and out of Parliament. That idea has not been abandoned, and he hoped it would soon be resuscitated. Louisburg is the natural eastern terminus of the great highway now being constructed across the Dominion, with its western terminus in British Columbia, and he hoped the day was not distant when the road would be extended from the Strait of Canso to that fine easternmost harbour of our country. For this purpose he hoped the Dominion Government would, at an early day, become possessed of the road between Truro and the Strait of Canso. The provision in the Bill before the House having this in contemplation, was alone sufficient to secure his support of that Bill.

MR. ANGLIN said he must confess he could not agree with the view taken of this case by the hon. the Minister of

MR. MACDONNELL.

Public Works. He could not believe that any act of another of the parties to the agreement in which Mr. Gregory was interested could diminish the strength of Mr. Gregory's claim in the slightest degree. He was of opinion that the arrangement entered into more recently by the Nova Scotia Government, the company and the Dominion Government ought not to invalidate the claims of Mr. Gregory. He did not think a great Parliament like this should lend itself to any agreement or arrangement which would interfere with the rights of a private individual, or diminish the value of his property.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman was mistaken in the idea that they had increased obligations under this Bill that did not exist before.

MR. ANGLIN said he would like to ask whether it was or was not a fact that, if the Eastern Extension reverted to the Dominion Government, it reverted free from all liabilities.

MR. TUPPER: Yes.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that it seemed to him the right way would be to leave this railway in the hands of the Nova Scotia Government, and take back the Truro Branch.

Question *put* and amendment (Mr. Brecken) *negatived* on a division.

Bill read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Resolution 11 relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (April 9th).

On item—Manufactured tobacco and snuff, 25c. per lb. and, in addition thereto, 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. HOUDE said that the object of the Government in framing the tariff, and of the House in approving of it, was the improvement of the local market for Canadian products. The Excise law in force and the tariff as it stood were not the best to encourage the use of the Canadian

grown article in the manufacture of tobacco. He thought there ought to be some means of remedying this evil. Why not impose a duty of 4c. per lb., for instance, on tobacco imported in leaf, to induce manufacturers to use Canadian instead of foreign tobacco, as far as practicable? As the United States had reduced lately their Excise duty, to prevent smuggling from the States we could reduce the Excise duty from 20c. to 16c. a pound, on all tobaccos entering manufacture, which, with the 4c. per lb. on the imported leaf, would not increase the price of the manufactured article in this country, while encouraging the Canadian producer. While a large quantity of Canadian tobacco was not the best, we raised a good deal of superior quality. Our farmers wished to improve the quality of tobacco, and some had gone to Virginia to learn the best mode of cultivation, and now raised tobacco of the first quality. Let them be better encouraged, and our industry might spring up, which would prove very useful to the farmers and beneficial to the country.

MR. TILLEY said that this subject was surrounded with difficulties. With reference to the suggestion to reduce the Excise duty and impose an *ad valorem* or specific duty on leaf tobacco, the authorities in the United States had recently reduced the Excise to 16c., which, of course, rendered it impossible for us, if anxious otherwise, to increase the duty; because there was 4c. difference between the Excise duties of the Dominion and the United States, and a larger difference would lead to a loss of revenue. It was considered undesirable to make any alteration except reducing the Excise on tobacco on home grown, from 10c. to 4c. per lb., which would be considered after they had passed through the Customs resolutions.

MR. PLUMB said that last year a resolution was introduced by a member from the Province of Quebec, asking the Government to take the Excise duty off home-grown tobacco, and thus encourage the growth of that product, and bring in another article of produce for rotation of crops. In the district where he (Mr. Plumb) resided, tobacco had been successfully cultivated, but, owing to the Excise duty at present existing, the farmers were not willing to experiment in

its cultivation. It could be produced successfully in Kent, Essex, and other counties along the shore of Lake Ontario, and it was well known that, after and during the American war, when the supply of tobaccos no longer came from the Southern States, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Ohio produced tobacco in enormous quantities, and that it was now in those States, particularly in Connecticut, one of the largest sources of profit to the agriculturist. Had it not been for the present condition of the finances, he intended to have asked the Government to relax or entirely remove the Excise duty on home grown tobaccos. He had intended also to ask the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to procure a quantity of the best tobacco seed and distribute it among the different Agricultural Societies of the Dominion, with instructions as to its culture and treatment from the best authorities, in order to encourage the growth of tobacco as one of a series of crops desirable, among other grounds, in the interest of a proper rotation; but he did not think the present a desirable time to press such a consideration. In the part of the country where he resided, the agricultural community would not enter on the experimental growth of tobacco so long as they were liable, whenever they had made a small quantity, to be visited by an Excise officer. After our farmers had entered upon the growth of tobacco, it would not be an act of bad faith to them, nor a subject of complaint, to impose an Excise duty. He would probably ask at some future Session, if he were here, for a removal of this duty. He felt it necessary to say this, because, in speaking of the growth of tobacco in various parts of the country during the late election canvass, he had committed himself to a mention of the subject on the floor of Parliament.

MR. BOURBEAU said, the hon. member for Niagara having stated, in the course of his speech, that the farmers in his county had determined not to grow tobacco so long as the Excise duty should exist, he (Mr. Bourbeau) fully concurred in all that had been said by that hon. member, and hoped that the Government would understand the wants of the people upon that branch of industry, and would remove altogether that duty.

Farmers were so much opposed to paying duty upon that article that, in order to avoid the payment of the Excise, they manufactured an inferior article, and disposed of it before having properly prepared it, and there was no doubt that, if the duty was removed, farmers would take the necessary time and precaution to make a much better and superior article, and that, within a very short time, our farmers would be in a position, by the encouragement given to them, to produce an article in many instances equal, if not superior, to any imported tobacco. When the curing of tobacco would have become more protected, the Government might impose a slight duty if such became necessary,

Item agreed to.

On item—Vegetables, viz.: Potatoes, 10c. per bushel; tomatoes, 30c. per bushel; and on all other vegetables, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*,

MR. ANGLIN said that in St. John and neighbourhood they were dependent for several weeks, in the early part of the year, on the United States, for all the early vegetables. It was exceedingly difficult, if they accepted the theories of hon. gentlemen opposite, to say whether the imposition of that duty would make vegetables cheaper or dearer in the future. He knew no reason why the American gardeners could not combine to raise the prices of vegetables as well as the makers of textiles, hardware, etc., and to injure Canadian hot-beds. These vegetables were not luxuries in spring, but useful food used by all classes. All would find that, if they were diminished in size, or increased in price, the National Policy was not calculated to work all the benefits expected.

MR. TILLEY said that, as those early vegetables were dependent on the climate rather than any competition, it was very likely that the consumer would have to pay the duty; this was one of the exceptional cases. They were not in a position to compete with the Americans successfully in this matter. If people wanted, however, their radishes, or lettuce, a little earlier than we produced them, they could afford to pay a little additional duty. He had no doubt

MR. BOURBEAU.

that this rate would lead to earlier production of those vegetables in Canada, by artificial means. He admitted, however, that the additional \$3,000 or \$4,000 they expected from this source would have to be paid by the consumer.

Item agreed to.

In reply to Mr. BOURBEAU,

MR. TILLEY said that the packages containing lard, referred to, were subject to duty, under the provisions of the Act.

On item—Wool unmanufactured, hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals, free,

MR. CHARLTON said he desired to remind the Finance Minister that the farmers had been generally led to believe, when this scheme of Protection for all classes was inaugurated, that they would receive protection on wool. He wished to inquire why this *quasi* pledge had not been fulfilled—why wool was placed on the free list, while the duties on woollen goods were so largely increased?

MR. TILLEY said that the proposition now about to be considered by the House would be found, taking the hon. gentleman's own line of argument, by giving an increased market for wool in Canada, to benefit the producers of wool more than a specific duty placed upon it. Hon. gentlemen opposite had argued that specific duties on agricultural produce would not benefit us, because we had a surplus ourselves. Taking that view of the case, they could not object to this proposition, provided it could be shown that it would produce a demand and increase the production of that article in the country—that it would be a direct benefit to the producer of wool. He held in his hand a memorandum showing the quantity of wool held in Canada at present, as far as could be ascertained in Ontario and Quebec. There were not the same facilities for obtaining information relative to the other Provinces, because the woollen trade was not a sufficiently distinct trade to induce parties to make a special business of obtaining accurate information as to its extent. In Ontario, there were held in Toronto, 1,600,000 lb.;

in Hamilton, 500,000lb.; in the Province of Quebec, 300,000lb.; making altogether 2,400,000lb. Under this proposition, the brown blankets, for instance, that were made heavy by the addition of Lancashire spar would pay a high *ad valorem* duty; and the coarser description of woollen goods made in Canada, including blankets, would be in extensive demand, thus furnishing a market for Canadian wool at home, which had formerly to seek a market in the United States, and pay a high rate of duty. If woollen goods increased in cost, and he had statements to prove such was not the case, it would be, as in the case of cottons, on account of the advance in the raw material. It was stated here that cotton goods had risen within the past week on account of the tariff, while it was proved, and they had the statement from a manufacturer to-day, that it was increased because the raw cotton had gone up $1\frac{1}{2}$ c.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Does the hon. gentleman say that the increase in cotton goods was due to the price of the raw?

MR. TILLEY: Yes.

MR. BERGIN said that, representing one of those constituencies which the hon. member for Lambton stated was given over to spurious little manufactures—

MR. MACKENZIE: When did I say anything of the kind?

MR. BERGIN said, when the hon. gentleman moved his amendment to the tariff, he stated that agriculture would bring more wealth to the country than by protecting spurious little manufactures in every petty village.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am surprised to hear my hon. friend considers Cornwall a petty little village.

MR. BERGIN said he had quoted the words of the hon. gentleman; he had not given his own opinion. He did not at all admit that Cornwall was a petty village, but he might say that, before the establishment of the woollen industry and the cotton industry in Cornwall, it was one of the pettiest of petty villages.

For years previous it had made no progress whatever, and the farmers were obliged to take all sorts of barter in exchange for their products. Now all that was changed. Manufacturers had converted that village into one of the most flourishing towns in Canada, and, before many years, he expected to see it a great manufacturing centre. To give an idea of the amount of money expended in Cornwall by these petty manufactories, these woollen and cotton industries, he would read a statement of the sums paid during the past year, in wages, distinguishing between the amounts paid to children, and those to adult working people. The wages of skilled male labour were \$1.75 to \$3 per day; unskilled male labour 80c. to \$1; inferior class of labourers, 50c. to 80c.; children, 25c. to 60c. The total wages paid out in the woollen mill, last year, amounted to \$50,000. The different kinds of goods made in this factory included tweeds, flannels, coatings, etc., and they paid out for wool last year \$100,000. The wool used last year was nearly all imported, but the change in the tariff would enable this mill to consume 600,000lb. of Canadian wool this year. Owing to the importation from England of shoddy blankets, as was mentioned by the Finance Minister, the Cornwall establishment, which turned out the best blankets ever introduced into our market, was obliged to close down that department; but under the fostering care of this tariff they had recommenced making blankets, and by renewing that industry they would be enabled to make use of the very large amount of Canadian wool which he had just mentioned. But for this tariff, there would not be a blanket made in Canada this year. While on this subject of manufactures, he would say a word or two in regard to the cotton industry, to show how manufactures converted petty villages into thriving towns. Last year the cotton mill at Cornwall imported 1,917,137lbs. of cotton, costing \$207,899, and they paid out in wages \$2,200 per week. There were in Cornwall now other industries resulting from the previous establishment of these two, the cotton and woollen industries. The farmers there had a home market for everything they produced, and were not

obliged to go to Montreal, paying travelling expenses, and freight to sell their produce, but could bring it into Cornwall and sell it for higher prices at their own door than they could get for it in Montreal. If this had been accomplished under the depressing influence of the financial policy of the late Government, how much greater would be the advantage to the farmers under this fostering tariff? He was surprised, the other night, to hear the hon. member for Lambton, followed immediately by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), each contradicting the other; and though each attacked the tariff, advancing the strongest kind of proof in favour of it. They were discussing the article of earthenware. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), produced an invoice, and to that invoice was added the freight and charges, including the Customs duty, showing that the value of that earthenware was nearly double that of its cost in England by the time it reached here. That he (Mr. Bergin) thought afforded a very strong argument why the people of this country should make their own crockery; and his (Mr. Bergin's) conviction was strengthened by the statement of the hon. member for Brant, who stated that he had been told by a gentleman from Staffordshire, England, thoroughly conversant with the manufacture of crockery, that it could be made in this country with as great facility as in England, and the only additional expense which would be put on would be a slight advance on the price of clay in England, one shilling per ton. What made the early settlers in this country rich? Was it not that each house was a manufactory, that they made within their own four walls everything they required—their boots, their shoes, their stockings, their drawers, etc. Was it not that they made everything they required about their farms? Was it not that the way in which they converted their howling wilderness into one of the finest countries on the face of the earth, and had left to their children well-stocked farms and well-filled farm houses? If the people were now suffering under the depression, it was because they had abandoned that Protective system which their fathers

MR. BERGIN.

followed, because they had sent abroad to purchase that which they ought to make at home. We ought to thank the Government that, by fostering manufactures, they were enabling the people to do now again what had been done by the early settlers. Money would be kept in the country, a home market would be created for everything the farmers raised, and instead of sending their money abroad to contribute to the enrichment of foreign manufacturers, and to the support of foreign labour, or to the support of our own people in a foreign land, for he was sorry to say tens of thousands of our people were now employed in foreign factories, and the adding, by their labour and its products, to the wealth of the United States instead of to that of our own country, it would be kept at home and used in developing our resources. If this tariff should fail to realise all the expectations of the Finance Minister, there need be no difficulty in changing it next year, but that change would be in the direction of increased protection, if it were found in any one instance that the protection now given was insufficient. He might illustrate his argument with regard to these cotton and woollen industries, but would not detain the House by adducing the results in the United States, and by showing that almost the same arguments were used by the Free-traders in the United States against the Protective tariff when it was there introduced, as were used by hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate. But the question had been worn almost threadbare, and he would not further discuss it. He would, however, refer, before concluding, to one fact, that while the manufacturers of woollen goods in Cornwall, last year, had the greatest difficulty in forcing off their goods, they were now unable to fill all the orders they had received. With regard to the cotton factories, before the 17th September he could have bought every dollar of stock in that factory for 10c. on the dollar, now he could not buy it for 20c. Before the late election the storehouses were filled with goods unsold; now they were twelve or fourteen weeks behind with their orders. Need he say more?

MR. OLIVER said he did not advocate the duty on wool. He thought it

was the duty of the hon. the Finance Minister to fulfil the pledges that were made by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last campaign. There was one question he desired to ask the Finance Minister. During his Budget speech, he stated we were to have no more shoddy cloth in this country. Had he taken any steps to keep out the shoddy that was being imported, and to prevent its being manufactured in the country? Was there a duty on it, or how was he to prevent it being manufactured here? There was a manufactory of shoddy in this country at present, and in order to prevent the mixture of shoddy with wool there ought to be a heavy Excise duty put upon this manufacturing institution. He was rather amused at the remarks of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). The hon. gentleman stated that Cornwall had risen from a miserable village to one of the most important manufacturing towns in the Dominion. Under what amount of protection did Cornwall arrive at this stage of prosperity? Under a protection of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., by having twenty cents on every dollar of advantage over those who manufactured the same goods outside of the country. This proved the whole question that $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was sufficient to enable any manufacturing institution in the country to be prosperous. If it was so in the town of Cornwall, why should it not be so in every other manufacturing town in the country? The hon. gentleman also made the statement, that if this tariff did not give sufficient protection, we would have more at the next Session of this House. He (Mr. Oliver) desired to know whether the hon. gentleman spoke by authority or not. They had heard hon. gentlemen speaking, as they supposed, by authority, advocating a duty on wool, but it appeared they had no authority whatever for making such statements. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had no authority for making this statement, and might possibly lead the people astray, as it was more likely that a reduction in the taxes would take place, than an increase. The hon. the Finance Minister stated we had in the country at present, 2,400,000lb. of wool in the warehouses. The inference to be drawn from this statement was that this was Canadian wool. This was not Canadian wool, but wool im-

ported from Africa, from the Australian Colonies, and from South America. He (Mr. Oliver) doubted whether we had 20,000lb. of native grown wool. It was imported by the Americans from foreign countries in bond, sold to the Canadian merchant in bond, and brought in free of duty. The most remarkable statement made by the Finance Minister, and the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), was that this tariff would encourage the consumption of Canada wool in the manufacture of our Canadian goods. Was there a sane person in the country who could suppose that if the Canadian manufacturer could go across the line and buy wool from 15c. to 18c., he would give 25c. to 30c. per pound for Canadian wool? The Canadian manufacturer would go to the United States and purchase the foreign wool in that country, and bring it here in free of duty. The Finance Minister stated the Opposition held the doctrine that as we raised more agricultural products in this country than we consumed, the increased duty would not increase the price of the products. That doctrine would not apply to wool, because we did not raise enough for own consumption. In 1876, we imported 3,621,296lb. at 19c., and exported 2,907,229lb. at 32c. per pound. In 1877, we purchased 4,608,825lb. at $17\frac{1}{2}$ c., and exported 2,476,486lb. at 28 $\frac{1}{2}$ c.; and in 1878, we imported 6,230,084lb. at $17\frac{1}{2}$ c., and exported 2,445,883lb. at 29c. These figures proved conclusively that we did not raise enough wool in this country for the consumption of our people.

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

After Recess.

MR. OLIVER said it had been stated that there was a surplus of wool raised in the country. He (Mr. Oliver) maintained that was not the case. During the last three years there were 14,460,000lb. imported, and 7,890,000lb. exported, showing a deficiency of 6,570,000lb., so that it was clear that there was not a sufficient quantity raised for the consumption of the people of this country. The wool imported cost an average of 18c. per lb., while 30c. a lb. were realised on the wool exported.

Now, there was a very large quantity of wool raised in the country it would be impossible for any Finance Minister or any policy to protect, for the reason that Canada had not the machinery requisite to manufacture the goods. But there was a class of wool—although he was a Free-trader as far as wool was concerned—that could be protected. There was raised and consumed in this country about 1,000,000lb. of short wool, against which foreign wool came into competition. That class of wool could be protected. The growth of some classes of wool might be encouraged. He was amused at the statement of the hon. member for Cornwall to the effect that all the cheese, eggs, cotton, beef, butter, etc., raised in that section of the country was consumed in the town of Cornwall. Was that correct? He asked anyone who knew the town of Cornwall whether any export trade took place there? He thought they did export eggs, butter, cheese, and a large quantity of cereals. According to the statement of the hon gentleman, 5,000 people composing the town of Cornwall consumed all the products raised in that section of the country. Another extraordinary statement made by the hon. gentleman was that when this country was first being settled, and every family manufactured its own goods, the people were wealthy and prosperous. Now, it was well known that if there was a time when the people were poor, it was when the country was being settled. As to the item under consideration, wool was a product that hon. gentlemen opposite had stated ought to be protected. Two years ago the hon. member for Stanstead advocated this policy, as well as other hon. gentlemen; and in the county of Lennox this was one of the items on which the late Finance Minister was condemned. Where were those gentlemen to-day? Two years ago they raised their voices and shed tears over the importation of wool free of duty, but now, when they had an opportunity of bringing pressure to bear on the Finance Minister to put a duty on wool, not one of them uttered a word. If they were sincere at that time, why did they not raise their voices to-day? Their conduct showed clearly that a great

deception had been practised on the people.

Mr. BERGIN said the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had put to him a question, and had also misrepresented him, unintentionally no doubt, on one or two points. He would deal with these points first. He (Mr. Bergin) had not said that the first settlers were rich when they came into the country—but that, by their energy, their industry, their frugality and their practical common sense in manufacturing everything for themselves—not handing over the produce of their labour to importers to be sent out of the country to support foreign industries and foreign labourers—they had improved their positions so as to leave a rich heritage to their children. The hon. gentleman also said that if his (Mr. Bergin's) statement with regard to a home market was correct, that the country surrounding Cornwall must be a poor one indeed; that any average township would produce enough to supply a town of 5,000 inhabitants. Well, he was very glad to inform the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Oliver) that Cornwall, though numbering less than 1,600 people at the establishment of the woollen mills, did now number, at least, 5,000 inhabitants. No doubt there are various agricultural products exported from Cornwall, but they were not the products of Cornwall township alone, but of portions of the counties of Glengarry and Stormont. It was not to be supposed that the town would consume the entire production of the three counties, but the statement he made was substantially correct; so correct that, in consequence of this tariff, when it was proposed the other day to establish a new industry in the town, the people of the township, through their Reeves, said they would be glad to contribute \$5,000, in the shape of a bonus. In the town of Cornwall, before a stone of the woollen factory was laid, a whole block of six acres could have been bought for \$600, but to-day it could not be bought for less than \$6,000. The hon. gentleman said that the statements he (Mr. Bergin) had made, afforded abundant evidence that Protection was not needed by the Cornwall manufactories. If that hon. gentleman were a stockholder in those mills, he

would think Protection terribly needed. And why? Because the profits of a mill must depend upon its production; and unless it can produce according to its capacity and sell that production as rapidly as it is produced, it was not possible for the stockholders to reap any profits. He had explained that owing to the market being flooded with shoddy goods their blanket industry was completely destroyed. And if they were not able last year to get off their tweeds and flannels it was because the market was flooded with English and American goods. He found, by calculation, that the quantity of woollen goods imported into this country, and which we could make ourselves with our own wool, was more than ten times in excess of the production of wool in this country. We did not grow wool enough by 75 per cent. for our needs in this country, if our mills were running at full time. This showed that there was no necessity whatever for putting a duty on wool, and he could not help thinking that the speech of the hon. gentleman upon this question was more in view of the local elections than in the interests of this country, and that he, with the other gentlemen around and behind the member for Lambton, were of opinion with that hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) that the farmers of this country were lamentably ignorant. He said the other day that "He was amazed at the lack of intelligence that led them to approve of this policy." In no other way could he (Mr. Bergin) account for their now advocating protection on wool, after three weeks opposition to protection of any article or any industry. Most of the wool brought into this country was of a fine quality not generally grown here. The six million pounds of wool the hon. gentleman said had been imported into this country last year, did not represent more than four million pounds of good wool; one-third of it, at least, was filth, and could not be used in manufacture. Farmers reaped more profit from their sheep in the way of mutton than they did in wool, and he regretted that the people of this country did not eat more mutton than they did and less pork, more fresh meat and less of salted meats. In England sheep were bred more for the mutton than for

the wool. They were here, he supposed, having but one interest on both sides of the House—the public good. He did not think it spoke well for the patriotism of gentlemen opposite to be casting sneers and slurs from their side of the House to his, and to say to them that "No sane man in the country could believe in the doctrine they on the Ministerial side believed in, that their policy was tyrannical, arbitrary, idiotic and indecent." It might be that they were all insane on his side of the House, all idiotic—but it is not very Parliamentary or very generous for those gentlemen, who claim to monopolise the wisdom of the country, to say that they (the Ministerialists) were not sane, and did not know what they were talking about. At all events, they were obeying the voice of the country, and, if they were insane, so were the great mass of the people; and if the people are insane they had been rendered so by the policy of the late Finance Minister and his colleagues.

MR. GALBRAITH said the farmers of Canada ought to feel exceedingly gratified to know that their interests were so well taken care of by the doctors, lawyers, lumbermen and manufacturers. When the manufacturers held their convention in Toronto, the first resolution adopted was one in favour of the agricultural interests of Canada. They went on immediately after to provide, by other resolutions, that the greatest possible care should be taken of the respective industries they represented. They knew well that unless they could persuade the farmers that they would be protected and benefitted by a change of policy, and thereby secure their assistance, that they could not carry the elections. The principal benefits pointed out to be obtained by the farmers were, that under a new policy of Protection, and a change of Government, the manufacturing industries would become so numerous all over Canada that the people connected with them would be able to consume the entire agricultural products of the country. They were told they would have a home market, that they would be raising the cost of freight, and that the money of the country would be kept here. Well, gentlemen would shortly have an opportunity, under the policy that had been

adopted by this Government, to ascertain in how far those representations were correct. They were told that it was necessary to put a stop to the slaughter of our industries by American importations. The woollen industry had little reason to make such complaints. The entire importation of American tweeds into this country, last year, did not amount to over \$10,000—a very small amount indeed to come into competition with the large manufacture of those goods in Canada. He understood that the class of cloth generally worn by workingmen ranged from fourteen to sixteen ounces to the yard; and, at 7 per cent. on the yard, they could easily ascertain how much a family would require to pay extra on their woollens during the year. The hon. gentleman from Cornwall had spoken of the happy state of the farmers of Canada, previous to the establishment of the manufacturing industries, when every family did its own manufacturing. He (Mr. Galbraith) could not agree with the hon. gentleman. He could remember perfectly well the great difficulties and the hardships the early settlers had to encounter. The farmers were now in a better position than formerly, but it was greatly owing to the construction of railroads which afforded such excellent facilities of communication, and which had opened up for them an outside market for much of their surplus products. The House knew very well that the woollen industry of the country had not asked for protection against American importations, but they had asked for protection against importations from England, that country which admitted every dollar's worth that we were able to send there free to her markets. The hon. the Minister of Finance told the House that 7½c. per lb. was to be imposed on cloth, to prevent shoddy cloth from being brought in, in order to keep the workingmen of Canada from being cheated and imposed upon by a rotten worthless article. Supposing no shoddy cloth, under the new restrictions, came in from England, he (Mr. Galbraith) wanted to know what provisions the Government was going to make to protect the workingmen against the manufacture of Canadian shoddy cloth? The hon. member for North Wentworth had told the House that there was a mill

MR. GALBRAITH.

in the western part of Ontario for the manufacture of shoddy and the Government might find, before the year was out, that a mill for making shoddy, to be incorporated with wool in the manufacture of cloth, would be started within the precincts of the city of Ottawa. If the workingman had to pay 7½c. extra per lb. on the cloth required by his family, as a protection against imported shoddy cloth, how was he to be protected against the Canadian-made article? Would the Government confiscate the cloth after it was made, or impose a heavy penalty upon the person who manufactured it? He thought the Government ought to see to it, in view of the taxation imposed, that a good article only was produced in Canada and sold to our people.

MR. SPROULE said that if the showing of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down was correct, there must be a duty of about 14c. a pound on wool. He thought the argument of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) regarding wool, was about as correct as that of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) in reference to freestone, who argued that, because he was not aware of the fact that there was plenty of it in the country, a duty should not be put on it; and who, even after he had been informed by several members that it could be obtained in Canada in sufficient quantities to supply the demand, still insisted that it was not necessary to protect it. The member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) thought if there was one article more another, in reference to which the Minister of Finance should redeem his pledges to the country, it was the article of wool. It did not necessarily follow that because those hon. gentlemen could scarcely see an inch beyond their noses, that the country was going to be ruined. There was brought into this country about 144,803 pairs of blankets, which required 1,000,000lb. of wool to make them; and now that those blankets, from the duty that is put on that article, were to be manufactured in the country there was evidently a duty put on the wool, because it took the wool raised in this country, instead of as formerly foreign wool, to manufacture those blankets. Then again, take carpets, into the manu-

facture of which wool largely entered. There were imported last year 1,145,150 yards of carpet; but now that they would be manufactured in Canada, instead of being imported, it would be a substantial duty on wool. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) appeared to forget the fact that, owing to the low rate of duty under which woollen goods could be brought into the country, almost every factory in the country was going down. A few years ago Barber's factory, near Toronto, turned out a large number of the finest blankets to be found in Canada, but that factory had long since ceased to turn out any at all. However, it was confidently expected that under the impetus that would be given to this industry, that establishment would be able to produce as many blankets as it ever did. If there had been a duty on carpets, blankets, tweeds, and all those millions of dollars' worth of woollen articles imported last year, then there must be a duty on wool.

MR. FLEMING said the argument of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was certainly a very ingenious one, but he was afraid it would not stand any very severe test. He (Mr. Sproule) said the duty placed on the manufactured article afforded protection to the raw material of which that article was made. Suppose the duty was taken off pig iron, would the Londonderry Iron Company think they had received sufficient protection by the increased duties on articles manufactured out of iron? He thought not. Neither did he think that the increased duty on twine, for instance, gave the Canadian farmer increased protection on his wool. He could hardly restrain his feelings when he heard the hon. gentleman opposite proclaiming that they had redeemed every pledge made in the House and in the country with regard to a duty being placed upon wool. If there was any promise more emphatically made than another, during the late election, it was with regard to this duty. On almost every hustings in the country, especially in rural constituencies, the article of wool was mentioned as one on which it was most desirable to have Protection. In the campaign sheets, circulated through the country, were given a list of the various

agricultural products sent from this country to the United States. Under the heading of "Canadian tariff," wool was marked free, and under the heading "American tariff," wool was marked 25 to 50 per cent. What was the object of circulating these statements, if it was not to make the people believe that they would receive protection on their wool? He (Mr. Fleming) believed that some hon. gentlemen opposite owed their return—their small majorities—to promises made to their constituents that a duty would be placed on this article. What benefit was it to the farmers that the manufacturers were sufficiently protected? What reason could hon. gentlemen bring forward in favour of increased protection to the woollen manufactures? It could not be said that that industry was in its infancy, that it was just starting into existence. But the truth was a protected industry never got beyond its childhood, if they were to judge by the appeals made for aid. It was forty-six years since Henry Clay said, in the United States, that if "manufacturers were given nine years' protection they would stand alone;" yet, to-day, if it was proposed to withdraw that protection, they would say they were going to be ruined. So it would be with all manufactures pampered and fostered by this means. Although opposed to extreme protection he was no enemy of the manufacturer. He believed they would find out that, in the long run, high duties were injurious to themselves, and that greater ultimate benefit would be enjoyed by having a fair field and no favour. He did not say that all duties should be taken off manufactured goods. So long as our revenue was derived from duties upon imports there would be protection to similar goods made in the country; but what reason had hon. gentlemen opposite to give in favour of granting to woollen manufacturers special legislation for their own particular benefit? Why should capital invested in belts and spindles be made by law to yield a larger return than the same amount of capital invested in lands and cattle? There was no doubt but the woollen manufacturers, with the moderate protection they enjoyed in the past, were making good profits. The census returns for 1870 showed that

the annual value of woollen goods made in Canada, was \$5,507,549. The cost of raw material was \$3,217,068, the wages paid being \$917,827; thus every dollar's worth of woollen goods represented 18c. for labour and 25c. for capital. When alluding, a few minutes ago, to the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite, with regard to Protection to the wool growers of the country, he noticed that the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) was not in his seat. That gentleman had frequently spoken in the House on the subject of agricultural Protection. In 1876 he made special allusion to the wool question. It might be interesting to know what his words then were, and compare them with his conduct to-day. These words, moreover, were endorsed by the party now in power, for the speech referred to formed part of the contents of a pamphlet which was circulated throughout the whole country, so that the farmers might see that protection on wool was one of the planks of their platform. The hon. gentleman in his speech said :

"Our Ontario and Quebec farmers are wool-growers to-day, but how long will they be wool-sellers without Protection? The time is not far distant when wool from Texas, Colorado, and those immense agricultural regions, will be coming into our markets and under-selling the wool produced in Canada. It was a simple question whether our farmers were to be driven from the agricultural industry of wool raising, or whether we should adopt the policy of excluding American wools, except upon the payment of a high rate of duty. The multitudes of sheep which were now being raised upon the immense plains of Texas and Colorado would stock our mills to the exclusion of our wool, unless they were hindered. It was calculated that wool could be produced there at the rate of 10c to 12½c. per pound. With the advantage of these immense feeding grounds, where there was ample pasturage, and a climate of such a character that sheep required no shelter, how long could we compete with Western wool. If it was not to-day, it would only be a year or two, when, if our farmers wanted the benefit of selling their own wool in their own markets, we must make our American friends pay tribute on all that they send to our markets."

These were the statements made by the hon. member for Stanstead in 1876, yet we find him voting for a tariff in which wool is admitted free of duty. As a considerable amount of latitude had been given to members during the debate, he would avail himself of the privilege by

MR. FLEMING.

calling the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to a statement he made the other evening during the discussion of the coal duty. The hon. Minister said, "During the year when the duty of 50c. a ton was imposed on coal the price throughout the Province of Quebec and at Montreal was less than at any previous time," leading one to infer that the duty had no effect in raising the price. He would like the hon. gentleman to reconcile his statement with the fact that in the nine months of 1870, in which the duty was in force, there were imported into the Province of Quebec 187,000 tons of coal, on which was paid a duty of \$93,350. Perhaps the Minister would say this duty was paid by the Americans or the people of Great Britain. Well, if this was the case, he (Mr. Fleming) would like to know what protection the coal owner of Nova Scotia received from the duty? Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. Minister, he was rather inclined to think the purchaser of the coal paid the duty; and in order to show that he had good grounds for that belief, he would make reference to the Journals for 1871. On the 6th of March of that year, there was received by the House a petition from the Montreal Board of Trade, praying for the repeal of the duty upon flour, coal and salt. In the list of names composing the council of that body, that of M. P. Ryan appeared, who, he presumed, was the hon. member for Montreal Centre. The petition went on to say that, "In northern climates fuel of all kinds should be cheap, and that the tax of 30c. levied on coal tended to the injury of the manufacturing interests, while it became a hardship to the poorer classes." How could it become a hardship to the poorer classes, if the price was not increased? He found, on March 8th, the Quebec Board of Trade had petitioned the House also, praying for the repeal of the duty. They said "The coal tax was unwise, unnecessary, and injurious in every respect to the Province of Quebec." How could the duty be injurious to the Province, when the price was less than at any previous time? He would like the hon. gentleman to reconcile his statement with the facts which had been submitted.

MR. HAGGART said he desired to briefly reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Galbraith). The manufacture of woollen goods was very largely conducted in both the Riding which he had the honour of representing and in the Riding which the hon. gentleman had the honour of representing. No gentleman in the House ought to be more qualified to speak upon the subject than the hon. member for North Lanark. The kind of wool they raised did not enter at all into the manufacture of woollen goods in our country. It was called long combing wool, and it was principally bought up by Americans, who exported it into the United States, paying a 30 per cent. duty. The Americans paid a higher price for that wool than was paid for the wool imported from South Africa. The wool they raised was chiefly used in the manufacture of carpets, merino, and women's wear. This tariff put a Protective duty on such kinds of goods of 10c. per square yard, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. This was a direct encouragement to the manufacture of this kind of goods in this country. The Government, by this tariff, offered an inducement to parties to start the manufacture of these goods in Canada. As to the argument of his hon. friend that the poor man would have to pay an enhanced price for his goods, their answer was that the goods would be manufactured in the country, and that, consequently, the price would not be increased one cent per yard. This tariff was framed with a view to so prevent the importation of the rotten goods which in the past had entered into competition with the better class of goods manufactured in Canada. His hon. friend asked what was to prevent parties from starting manufactories for the manufacture of shoddy goods in the country. He (Mr. Haggart) in response to that question had to say that that had been tried over and over again. Whenever a manufacturer in Canada put shoddy into his goods, the purchaser in Montreal found it out. He might carry on his business for five or six months at a profit, but in the end he was obliged to close it up. Not so with the English manufacturer. He could send that kind of goods into the Canadian market continuously by changing the name. There was no industry in Canada that would

be more benefitted by the tariff introduced by his hon. friend the Minister of Finance than this one. The price would not be increased to the consumer, but they would get a better class of goods.

MR. SCRIVER said the county which he represented was mainly a dairy county. The people were also engaged largely in the sheep industry. Many of them had imported sheep from the Old Country, had improved the breed, and made the industry a very successful one. During his canvass in the previous election, he met with a great many agriculturists, and he naturally discussed the issues of the day with them. He found that many of them had been led away by the *ad captandum* cry raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, that because the Americans taxed our products very heavily, it was but reasonable that we should tax theirs to the same extent. His constituents, however, were intelligent enough to see that it would be impossible to do them any great good by protecting their dairy products. They knew very well that we had a duty of 4c. per pound on butter, and 3c. a pound on cheese, and that they were not benefitted at all by that duty. And so in regard to their cattle and their corn; they were intelligent enough to understand that no duty imposed on corn would be likely to benefit them. But those persons did anticipate, and they asserted to him, that they were warranted in anticipating, by the assertions made by leading Protectionists—notably, his hon. friend from Stanstead—that a duty would be imposed on wool. He (Mr. Scriver) had not heard from them since this tariff had been discussed, but he was quite satisfied that those persons to whom he alluded would be seriously disappointed to learn that this tariff had become law, and that no provision had been made for imposing a duty on wool.

MR. DUBUC said that he rose at a very advanced stage of the discussion, and that he did not intend to speak on the item now under consideration. As he had already been called upon to vote several times since the new tariff had been brought down, in the first place upon the tariff as a whole, and later, on

several items, he thought that he should not allow the debate to close without offering a few remarks in order to explain his votes. He would occupy the attention of the House for a few moments only. The Province of Manitoba, of which he was one of the representatives, would be considerably affected by the new tariff. It was a young Province, possessing no manufactures, its industries were still in their infancy, it imported nearly everything, and exported but very little. The new tariff would materially raise the price of imported goods, and might be considered as unfavourable to his Province. That was a point that he could not hide from himself. On the other hand, he was of opinion that the National Policy inaugurated by the hon. the Minister of Finance would have a satisfactory result in other parts of the Dominion. Without hoping that it would bring immediate wealth to every home, he had reason to believe that it would help to lessen the crisis that was now making itself felt, and to bring back that prosperity that everyone longed for. He had, therefore, found himself in a rather difficult position. Looking at the general interests of the Dominion, he was obliged to vote for the resolutions; from the standpoint of what might seem to be the immediate interest of Manitoba his vote should have been cast the other way. He was, therefore, obliged to decide what stand he would take upon this important question. It was true that he was a representative of Manitoba, and as such he was specially entrusted with the care of watching over the interests of that Province. But he should not forget that he was, at the same time, a citizen of Canada. He was a member of the Federal Parliament, and this Parliament was entrusted with the care of legislating for the whole Dominion. Anything that concerned the general welfare, could not be indifferent to him. By opposing this measure, which he sincerely believed to be in the well understood interests of the country at large, because it might affect, in a rather unfavourable manner, the immediate interests of Manitoba, he would be exhibiting a narrow spirit of selfishness and exclusiveness that was not congenial to his tastes. He had been an eye-witness to the stagnation of business, to the terrible

effects of the crisis through which the country was passing, to the want that was making itself felt, in a woeful manner, in all the great centres of population, and it would be ungenerous for him to say: Let this state of things go on, let want continue, let the people of Canada continue to suffer, provided the population of Manitoba be not affected. No, he would look upon the question from a broader, a higher standpoint, and he believed that he had several good reasons that would justify his way of thinking and acting. In the first place, Manitoba would not be affected by the new tariff, in such a disadvantageous and prejudicial manner as might be supposed. The people of that Province would have to pay a little dearer for the articles they imported, but the duty on wheat was in their favour, and protected them. They produced great quantities of wheat and the protection granted to this grain would permit them to compete with the Western States, at least in the Canadian market. Therein they would find a consumption for the increase of the price of other articles; and this compensation would encourage agriculture which was the principle and the most sure of all the industries that ought to be developed in a country like Canada. Again, if the National Policy, by protecting the industries of the country, by encouraging agriculture, had the effect of bringing back a little more wealth and prosperity, this prosperity would naturally extend to Manitoba. If wealth was seen coming back to the other Provinces capital would soon find its way to Manitoba, where industries of every kind might be started, where it was known that there existed immense resources waiting only for a little capital in order to enrich those who would work them, and at the same time enrich the country; and, when this new policy would leave no deficits in the Treasury, Manitoba could obtain more freely from the Federal Government grants for the great public improvements so necessary in a new country. But especially when the people of Manitoba could point out to the Government the considerable amounts that the Customs Department would collect in the Province under the new tariff, they would then have the

right to demand an increase in the subsidy, which would enable them to carry out the great public works, the need of which was so seriously felt from one end of the Province to the other. And in that way the interests of Manitoba would be served better than by continuing the old tariff and the small subsidy that was now granted, and which was inadequate to meet the new requirements created by the continual increase in the population. Now the Protection granted to the national industries would also have the effect of encouraging the establishment of manufactories in the Province of Manitoba; the people of this Province would be able to keep and spend among themselves the enormous sums that they sent abroad every year for goods that they could manufacture themselves. The settlers, both old and new, would have the benefit of it. Another reason that induced him to support the policy brought down by the hon. the Minister of Finance was the stand the Government had taken with regard to the line of the Pacific Railway in the Province of Manitoba. The route adopted by the late Government passed to the north of Lake Manitoba, across a hundred miles of marshy plains quite unfit for cultivation. The people of Manitoba had made many representations on this subject, but these petitions had been laid aside, their just requests had received no consideration, and it had been good news for Manitoba when the hon. the Minister of Public Works had stated the other day that the Government had decided on building the principal line of the Pacific Railway to the south of Lake Manitoba, and through a fine agricultural region already filled with industrious and well-to-do farmers. This would be an advantage for the railway itself and for the population inhabiting that part of the country. This reason, if there were no others, would be sufficient to induce the inhabitants of Manitoba to accept the new policy without murmuring. The last reason which induced him to support a Protectionist policy was the following, and it was not the least. He asked himself what he would gain for his Province, under the circumstances, by voting against the new policy? Would his vote have any effect? Would it affect in

any way the result that was to be obtained? He was quite convinced that it would not, even should he possess the eloquence of the greatest speakers, and should he use his utmost endeavours to prevent the adoption of the National Policy, his voice and his vote would change nothing. And this was not to be wondered at, after the verdict rendered by the people on the 17th of September last; it was not astonishing if hon. members were not disposed to ignore the wishes of their electors, and the interest of their respective constituencies, in order to be particularly agreeable to Manitoba. He knew that, and he did not feel disposed to uselessly come in contact with an impossibility. But it might be said that he was entrusted with the interests of Manitoba, and, even though he had no hope of succeeding, it would be agreeable to his electors for him to vote according to their wishes. He was aware that this reason carried some weight with it. He knew that a member was not to ignore the wishes of those he represented. But he counted on their intelligence, on their characteristic good sense, to make them understand that, under the circumstances, he had not betrayed their interests by voting in favour of the National Policy. To accept with good grace, what could not be prevented was a just principle, and one that was always timely. He was convinced that his electors would approve of his voting according to his convictions, in favour of the well understood industries of the country, rather than to endeavour to please them only by taking a step that was absolutely useless, and without any chance of success. By voting against this tariff his only object would be to throw dust in their eyes, to use a common expression, and on such an important question he did not think that he ought to have recourse to such petty means in order to make himself popular. For these different reasons he had not hesitated, and he did not now hesitate, to cast his vote in favour of the National Policy.

MR. CHRISTIE said he only desired to detain the House for a very few moments, as the items now under consideration were of special interest to the farmers of his constituency. They depended

largely upon stock and dairy farming, and the raising of sheep, for which the county was specially adapted. Now, wool was one of the few articles which appeared to enter into competition with their farm products; indeed, the only article which they imported largely (excepting wheat and corn) were wool, hides and pork. He found that last year they imported into the Province of Quebec wool to the value of \$570,533, and \$588,733 worth of hides and pelts, and of pork \$161,869 worth, while they exported very little. And, strange to say, wool and hides were admitted free, and pork was only 1c. per pound, almost the same duty as before. Now, before the elections, they were told that their markets were glutted with American products, such as butter, cheese, pork, wool, etc., and that that was the cause of the low prices from which the country was suffering, and that if there was a change of Government and a Protective tariff, these articles would be excluded, and they would get better prices for everything which they had to sell. But these promises had not been fulfilled. The delusive hopes and expectations which were exacted, had not, and could not be, realised. The articles which really competed with our products had virtually no more protection than before. It was true we had nominally got an additional duty of 10 per cent. upon live stock, but that duty was more ornamental than useful, and was virtually of little or no benefit, for the simple reason that our imports of live stock were so limited. The Trade and Navigation Returns for last year, for the Province of Quebec, showed that for every horned animal which was imported, they exported about fifty; and for every horse imported they exported about sixty; and for every sheep imported, they exported upwards of 2,000. Now, what could Protection do for them; it was a perfect delusion. If all the live stock which they imported from Great Britain and the United States were excluded, the whole value would not amount to one cent *per capita* of our population. But it was quite the reverse with wool, pork and hides. Now, if we were bound to adopt a Protective policy, he thought it would be wiser to impose duties on such articles as were imported largely and came into competition with our own products,

MR. CHRISTIE.

rather than upon those which were only imported to a very limited extent, and from which we derived no appreciable benefit.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said hon. gentlemen must see that the claim made that this tariff was framed more in the interests of England than the United States, was utterly groundless. The Trade and Navigation Returns showed that on the article of woollens, \$172,000 worth were imported last year from England, and \$28,000 worth from the United States. In carpets, the imports from England were \$651,000, and from the United States, \$15,000; in flannels, the imports from England \$261,000, and \$68,000 from the United States; in tweeds, \$933,000 from England, and \$10,000 from the United States. On all these articles greatly increased duty had been put, which would, therefore, operate heavily against Great Britain. But when we came to look at the article of wool, we found their policy entirely reversed, for while we imported 235,212 lb. of wool from Great Britain, we imported 5,688,422 lb. from the United States. But on that article, imported in such excess from the United States, there was no duty whatever. It was not necessary again to remind gentlemen opposite of what their ante-election promises were, with reference to this article of wool. They were conscious that one of the means by which they secured their election in September, was the unconditional promise that a duty should be placed on foreign wools coming into this country. They told their constituents in the rural parts that they did not produce as much wool as the country required, that a duty on foreign wool would enhance its price, and they (the candidates) would support no Government that would not do the farmers justice in this respect. Yet these gentlemen, by their mouthpiece, the member for East Grey, had declared that the farmers were looked after, and were satisfied, though no duty was placed on wool. That is the way those gentlemen treated the pledges they gave to the electors, and no wonder they manifested symptoms of impatience when they were reminded of these things. The hon. gentleman from Cornwall said the re-

marks of the hon. member for North Oxford were made more with a view to influence the coming Ontario elections than to accomplish good in this House. He (Mr. Paterson) supposed the hon. gentleman from North Oxford was conscious that nothing that could be urged from this side of the House would have any influence so far as the formation of this tariff was concerned, but he was conscious of the fact that it would at any rate not do the cause of good government in Ontario any harm to point out to the people that the men of a certain political stripe had sought their suffrages and obtained them under false pretences. As those elections approached, hon. gentlemen were becoming sensitive, for if they succeeded in carrying a majority of 30 in Ontario, they might reasonably claim that the National Policy had fulfilled the expectations of the people, but if they failed to carry that majority, then it would be seen that the people pronounced against them. If this tariff had fulfilled all the pledges of hon. gentlemen, if it was all the country had asked for, then the more prominently it was brought before the electors of Ontario the better it would be for the cause of those gentlemen in the local strife. Hon. gentlemen said there was necessity for a duty on wool. The hon. gentleman from North Brant read the utterances of one of the ablest, if not the very ablest, of the advocates of Protection on the other side of the House, the hon. member for Stanstead, in his speech of 1876. They, the then Opposition, now the Government party, admired that speech, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cheered it to the echo—and their cheers could almost be heard still lingering in this hall—as he spoke on the wool industry, and pointed out that it could not be ruined without Protection. Another Government has succeeded the last one, pledging itself to do this, yet hon. gentlemen sat there with their mouths shut, recreant to the promises they made, and would fain drown the voice of one who recalled to the memory of the country the promises they made only to break them.

MR. POPE (Compton) said the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat need not think he could terrify the mem-

bers of this House by his furious declamation, nor think to deceive the people of the country as to their true interests. The farmers of the country fully understood their position. They all understood that by the tariff brought down by the hon. the Finance Minister they had got Protection on wool. Goods into which coarse wool entered, such wool as was generally grown in this country, had all received Protection. Much of the imported cloth sold as woollen goods was shoddy, containing very little wool, thus reducing the demand for our wool, so that by this tariff what went into the products of coarse wool had got a very large protection. In those returns the hon. gentleman would find that a large amount of wool manufactured in this country was brought from the Cape, Australia, South America and Brazil, and that it was necessary it should come in free if they were to have cheap goods, and these fine wools did not come into competition with those produced here. All our coarse wool would enter into the manufacture of blankets and other cheap goods, for which prices quite satisfactory would be given to the farmers. The hon. member for Brant was trying to draw the wool over the farmers' eyes, but would not be successful. He (Mr. Pope) understood something of the woollen business, and was sure the farmer would get very much higher prices, through this tariff, for wool than for many years before. It would give the poor people a cheaper article, and a better, than hitherto, as it would keep the shoddy out of the country, which had more show than wear, besides effecting other improvements. The manufacturers would be able to give the farmer a better market for his produce, while finding themselves a larger demand for their commodities. They had been getting goods of the worst materials, which they were attempting, and he believed successfully, to replace by a cheaper and superior home-made article. The very object and genius of the tariff was this: the protection of goods made of wool, and a better market for the farmers' wool. What about those other things of which they had heard so much—cattle, wheat and flour? His hon. friend opposite (Mr. Paterson), knew the tariff would not raise the price

of flour—that we always raised wheat enough for our wants, and more. It was foolish then to talk about a rise in the price of such articles. But the Canadian produce would be protected against the United States farmer deranging the market. Only a few days ago oats had been taken from Quebec to Ontario, and readily sold, and within a few days, in Quebec, they had risen 7c. to 8c. per bushel—an hon. friend beside him said 8c.

MR. CHARLTON: Do oats not generally rise at this season?

MR. POPE said they did when there was a scarcity, but he only knew of one previous instance of their ever sending oats from Quebec to Ontario. They had never told the people that it was not possible that they might not on some things have to pay for a short time increased prices. What they had said was this: that they would protect goods that could be produced here, after a little fostering, as cheaply as anywhere; that competition would supply them to the farmer and everybody as cheaply as now, and that goods they could not produce in this country cheaply would be subjected to a revenue tariff. He did not exactly agree with the Finance Minister, that they would be obliged to raise \$2,000,000 more by taxation. He believed that under this tariff the prosperity of the country would be such as to afford the required revenue without an increased tariff. He believed, however, it was necessary to prepare for that contingency,—but that before twelve months they would be able to reduce taxation to the original rates. The farmers of the country were not so blind as hon. gentlemen opposite thought, for they knew that their prosperity depended upon that of the whole country, and they were as willing as any class to bear their fair share of the burdens of the community. Every syllable that fell from the lips of the hon. gentlemen opposite, on this question, was the merest clap-trap. He told them that these speeches were made for the electors in Ontario. Were they to have this kind of discussion continued after its having lasted for a fortnight? Were they to have a repetition of such speeches and a repetition of the argu-

MR. POPE.

ments on Free-trade and Protection on every item? On this tariff, Free-trade and Protection had been discussed half-a-dozen times. No hon. gentleman opposite rose without discussing it fully over again. He was not afraid of what the farmers would think of the tariff, but must say those discussions sadly wasted time. But in view of the Ontario and Quebec elections—in view of the desire of hon. gentlemen opposite to influence the people of this country—he did not care if they stopped here for the next few months, feeling satisfied that every word they uttered told against themselves. If they, on this side, looked at the matter in the same way as the hon. gentlemen opposite, with reference to those elections, he would say that the best thing they could do would be to keep those gentlemen here for the next two months.

MR. CASEY said that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture had complained of the waste of time in this discussion, and stated that members on his (Mr. Casey's) side had spoken with a view to the Ontario elections, and that every word they said would tell against themselves. If so, the hon. gentleman could wish nothing better than that they should spout here to all eternity. But if, on the other hand, as he (Mr. Casey) really thought was the case, that hon. gentleman felt annoyed at the close examination of the tariff, and exposure of its numerous errors to the House and the electors of Ontario, it was natural he should feel sore and object to further discussion. But they had had proof to-night that, despite the frequent discussion of the subject, it was not yet threadbare. At this late stage not only had something new come up, but a new rule for taxation, a theory the first time advanced in his hearing by the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and adopted by the Government through its mouth-piece, the Minister of Agriculture. It was that, if they imposed a duty on a plough, or other such implement, they gave protection to the manufacture of pig iron, or the raw material. He was sure that, if anything was required to satisfy the farmers of Ontario that their interests were not in safe hands in regard to the present tariff, it was the assurance that the raw material was protected by the imposition of duties on articles manu-

factured from it. But this theory would be even less satisfactory to a great many of the manufacturers. The makers of agricultural implements, and everything into which iron entered might say to the Government: "Why did you propose a duty on our raw material? Also on certain kinds of imported timber, on wood-screws, and other articles which are raw materials for certain industries?" The Minister of Agriculture had stated that the protection of the manufactured article secured the protection of the raw material also. Why, therefore, had the Government subjected that material to protection? If they conciliated the farmers in this matter, they would array against them all the manufacturers whose raw material had been unnecessarily taxed, if this theory were true. He thought it was a matter of very serious importance that a theory of that kind should be seriously promulgated by a member of the Government. It required no discussion to show its hollowness. Hon. gentlemen opposite had said as regarded wool, that it had been left on the free list because it had to be got from the Cape and other distant countries, and was the raw material of certain manufactures. This rule would apply, however, to all raw materials, including pig iron; and, if they were protected, the farmer had a right to demand that the raw materials which he produced should be protected. The Minister of Agriculture said, although only Cape or foreign wool would be used in certain manufactures here, by some mysterious process a better market would be created for Canadian wool; that manufacturers that did not use Canadian wools would create a market for it, with a result of cheaper goods than before. That, therefore, too, only required to be stated to be discarded. With regard to the rise in the price of oats, it was always witnessed in spring. The hon. gentleman might as well take credit for a good crop next fall as for that improvement. With regard to wool, he wished to discuss the question whether it was possible to protect the farmer in the item of wool, or whether the increase of the woollen manufacture would assist him. It was stated by his hon. friend that, when the woollen manufacturers got

to work, they would use five pounds of wool for every pound that could be raised in Canada. If that was the case foreign wool must be still imported, and would compete with Canadian, when it would be possible to raise the price of it by a duty on the foreign article. If this manufacture would lead to the increased use of Canadian wool, it would be possible to protect the Canadian farmer. But if the manufacturer would only use certain grades of short wool, the Canadian farmer could not be protected till he grew that kind. Possibly it would pay him to grow short wool, if he received a certain amount of protection. But another thing was possible, that under an enormously increased protection to woollen goods, manufactories would be started for goods that required our combing wools. Indeed, it was promised that such would be started. Hon. gentlemen opposite had made statements before the electors, with regard to what would be done for the protection of wool and the woollen trade, which, though successful in gaining them many votes, had been falsified during the discussion in this House, in which it had been asserted that no amount of protection would lead to the use of long combing wool. They were thus placed in a regular dilemma. Only two things were possible: either the farmers could be protected on wool, and, in that case, it was a great shame to leave it on the free list; or, on the other hand, if he could not be protected, it was quite certain that Ministers obtained their places under false pretences. Everybody knew that one of the chief cries to obtain the support of the farmers of Ontario was protection on wool. If it was possible, Ministers should have given it; if impossible, they were convicted out of their own mouths of having falsified the actual facts before the electors. Our combing wools had hitherto found a market on the other side. It was not at all improbable, however, that that market would be played out before long, to use an American expression. In fact, late events had shown that it probably was. Late in the season last year, fortunately for the present members of the Government, the price of combing wool, fell from 25c. to 20c. per pound. This was explained by those hon. gentlemen as being the consequence of the free admis-

sion of wool; it was explained by the Liberals as the consequence of surplus production in the United States, or stoppage of manufacturing, or both. We could no longer depend confidently on a good market in the United States for our combing wool. He must, in this connection, quote from a speech delivered in 1876 by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), one of the most convinced, honest, and logical Protectionists in this House, if not the most, and which had been used as a campaign document:

"With the advantage of these immense feeding grounds, where there was ample pasturage, and a climate of such a character that sheep required no shelter, how long could we compete with Western wool? If it was not to-day, it would be only a year or two years, when, if our farmers wanted the benefit of selling their own wool in their own markets, we must make our American friends pay tribute on all that they send to those markets. Some hon. gentlemen, on speaking of the wool trade of the past, said that low prices would not affect us at all, as our long combing wools were a specialty; but he begged to assure his hon. friends from Ontario that the Ontario long wool business was a matter of short duration, for to his knowledge that was a thing that was as well understood on the other side of the line as it was here to-day, and there were sections on the American side where they were going very largely into this wool raising. This business would increase so that in two or three years further the Americans would not take wool from Canada on the terms of paying a high duty on it. The Americans were a shrewd, observant people, and when they saw that a certain class of wool was required by the manufacturers in that country, they were quick enough to perceive that there was no natural obstacle in the way of the raising of that product in the Northern States, and that it was better to raise wool that would fetch 50c. per lb. than wool that would only bring 25c. per lb. They were now paying attention to the breeding of Cotswolds, Leicesters and long-wooled sheep in the United States, for the purpose of preventing the Ontario wool-grower from coming into their markets with their combing wools."

Now this was a clear, and, he might say, a beautiful presentation of the case which was made by those hon. gentlemen, and on it the votes of numbers of wool-growers were obtained. The idea presented was that our market in the States would in future be filled by the Americans themselves, and that it was an absolute necessity for us to arrange the duties as to secure a home market for ourselves. This was not being done, and the excuse given was that by putting

a duty on woollen goods they protected the wool grower. The farmers of Canada, like those of the United States, were shrewd, observant people. They would look to their parallel case, they would see it was not looked upon as Protection in any other case, except where the farmer was concerned, and they would believe that the farmer had been systematically disregarded in the formation of this tariff.

MR. BUNSTER said he was astonished at the opposition to the Government for allowing wool to come in free. It was well known that we did not raise sufficient wool at present to accommodate manufacturers, and when we did, he was satisfied the Government would see the necessity of imposing a duty on wool. In British Columbia there were no woollen manufactories, and he did not believe they would ever have any if the Government were to impose a duty on wool, but having imposed a duty on woollen goods, they were certain woollen manufactories. Hence, instead of taking into consideration the interests of the people, the Opposition, in asking for a tax on wool, were looking only to the coming local elections in Ontario. There could be no doubt in the minds of any sincere man that allowing wool in free of duty would encourage the manufacture of woollen yarns.

MR. ORTON said he had entertained the hope that the Government would have seen the necessity of placing a duty on wool, so much so that he waited on the hon. the Finance Minister to try and impress upon him the necessity of a small duty being levied on wool. He (Mr. Orton) had never advocated a heavy duty on foreign wool, but the explanation the Finance Minister gave him satisfied him to very large extent, that he, the Finance Minister, had earnestly endeavoured to benefit the farmers as far as possible in framing this tariff. With regard to wool, the hon. gentleman showed very clearly that the Protection afforded certain classes of woollen manufactures would cause very rapid increase in the price of wool in this country, and he felt convinced the farmers would find they had ample Protection on their wool. The hon. the Finance Minister also stated that should it be found, in the

future, that the farmers had not ample Protection for their wool in this tariff, the Government would deem it their duty to impose a duty on wool. In the meantime, if a duty were placed, it would have an injurious effect on woollen manufactures. He was rather astonished to hear hon. gentlemen opposite complain that a duty had not been placed on wool. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) had, on former occasions, stated in this House, that no benefit could be derived from any duty on foreign wool, and argued that it would have a very damaging effect on woollen manufactures. Year after year hon. members opposite, in this House, and outside, argued that the only way to increase the price of wool in this country was to encourage woollen manufactures, and that would be done by admitting wool free. In 1876, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) stated, in reply to the hon. member for Stanstead :

"That the latter urged that a duty be placed on wool, but this would be a direct tax on the people. The quality we required for manufacture was very different from that which we raised; the latter was long and fine, used in the New England States, and the former was short."

He must congratulate his hon. friend upon the fact of his having, at last, become converted to the idea that Protection could benefit the farmers of this country, and welcomed the hon. member as one who would, in the future, assist members on this side of the House in advocating the true interests of the farmers. Not only the hon. member for North Oxford, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and other prominent gentlemen opposite, over and over again, reiterated the fact that it would be a very ruinous policy to impose a duty on wool, and, therefore, when we found them now getting up in this House, and asserting that the Government was doing wrong in not putting a duty on wool, we must feel that they were very inconsistent, and were merely time servers. He (Mr. Orton) believed still it would become necessary, at some future time, to impose a duty on wool. We could raise in this country a certain amount of the kind of wool that we imported from foreign countries. There

was one class of sheep, the Southdown, which we could raise profitably. He had not the slightest doubt that the tariff, as now arranged, would have the effect of increasing the prices of all classes of wool, and even the Southdown sheep would become more valuable, and be raised in larger numbers than at present. The flesh of the Southdown sheep was much more valuable than that of the other descriptions, and as the attention of our farmers was directed to a large extent just now, to supplying the British market with meatstuffs, the Government should encourage the production of Southdowns in Canada. There was another fact we must consider in framing the tariff, as the hon. the Finance Minister had stated over again, it was that it was absolutely necessary there should be a little give and take amongst the various classes in our community. It was only by that means a tariff could be arrived at which would do justice to all classes; and if the farmers felt they had not got full justice in reference to this woollen matter, they must remember that they had a very large protection on their other products; on cereals the benefit would be immense, also the increased duty on animals. He had not the slightest doubt that the effect of this tariff would be an increased revenue to every farmer in the country, and in Ontario, with a farm of one hundred acres, well improved, of at least from \$50 to \$100 per year. The farmers would recollect well that every attempt to obtain Protection in this House in their interest was repelled by hon. gentlemen opposite, who, over and over again, stated that the Government could not possibly do anything to benefit them, that they were "flies on the wheel." Hon. gentlemen opposite had also stated that the duty on oats would have no effect. There was not a section of the country in which oats had not risen in price since that duty was imposed, and the effect would be that, instead of importing oats from the United States, the people of Ontario would import larger quantities of oats from Lower Canada. He remembered that, some years ago, even in his own village, they used to import large quantities from Lower Canada for the manufacture of oatmeal; and he understood that lumbermen were import-

ing large quantities from Quebec at the present time, since the duty was imposed. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) stated that there was a possibility that the United States farmers would be able to supply that market with all the long combing wool they required. That was a very singular argument to come from the hon. member's side of the House, who did not believe in Protection, because, if it meant anything, it must prove that it was very important indeed that every effort should be used to create a home market for our wool, and he (Mr. Orton) thought the present tariff would have that effect. There was one fact to which he would refer, a mistake in the Trade and Navigation Returns, according to which we were supposed to import from the United States 5,600,000lb. of wool. If he was properly informed, the largest part of that came from the Cape and Australia, and should be entered as wool coming from those countries. This tariff, he believed, would give entire satisfaction to the farmers of this country, and they would, for a long time to come, gratefully remember the efforts made by the Government in their behalf.

MR. BOULTBEE said this question had been dwelt on at great length by the various speakers who had discussed it, some of them going so far as to take in butter in its consideration, others diverging into the questions of iron and coal; but it was remarkable, as far as every speaker from the Opposition was concerned, that they all claimed that, more or less, during the late contest, a proposition was formulated that a duty should be imposed on wool. He (Mr. Boulton) did not recollect this to have been the case, and he had something to do with various elections besides his own. The general proposition involved in the policy formulated by the then Opposition, was that there should be a Protection to Canadian industries, such as the best wisdom of the best statesmen, who might have to deal with the question, could manage to bring about. It was a remarkable feature in this discussion, that not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who condemned the Government for not putting a duty on wool, said there ought to be a duty imposed on it. Not one of them stated that any loss was going

to ensue through a duty not being put on wool. But they only set up the theory that that proposition was put forward by their opponents in the late election, and then proceeded to say a duty should be imposed. One of their speakers, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Oliver) said he did not want any duty on wool. Surely they were not so unpatriotic as to want an evil duty imposed merely because it was promised by their opponents in the late election contest. The wool from the United States did not come into competition with the class of wool raised in Canada, and it would be a disadvantage to the country generally, and the encouragement of home manufactures, to impose a duty on wool. It was but right that they should import, as freely as possible, the wool that could not be produced in the Dominion. Almost every hon. gentleman who had spoken on this subject had told the House what a set of fools the Canadian farmers were, in having placed power in the hands of Conservatives again. That, in their eyes, had been the one great fault of the Canadian farmer. But hon. gentlemen now said they looked forward to a different result in the elections of the future. That was the first remark that had been made on the Opposition side of the House, to the effect that the Canadian farmer was a shrewd man. He (Mr. Boulton) thought the Canadian farmers were shrewd and intelligent men, at least they were so in his constituency. Perhaps in other ridings, where gentlemen opposite came from, they were not so shrewd and intelligent, but perhaps during the period between now and the next election they might become further enlightened. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) had clearly indicated that the next Local elections were to be fought on the question of a Protective policy—that the issue before the country in the late election was to be made the cause of political warfare in the next Local election. It was not proper, perhaps, that this issue should come up in the Local election, and yet it was important that they should not shut their eyes to the fact that it added a good deal to the power of the Dominion Government to be in accord with the Local Governments.

They could not expect to carry out their measures with as much satisfaction to the people if they were on hostile terms with the Local Governments, particularly the Government of the strong Province of Ontario, as they could if in accord with those Governments. So it would be for the people of Ontario, at the coming election, to say whether or not the National Policy, after a trial, met with their approbation. He would say, in spite of the assertions of hon. gentlemen opposite, that this tariff was not going to bring misery on the country. Even at this moment, a better state of things obtained in the Dominion. He spoke of his own personal knowledge. He had been in some of the cities, towns and villages of Ontario lately, and it was a remarkable fact that this tariff was received everywhere throughout that Province with perfect satisfaction. The tariff was not much discussed, probably because the people were satisfied that a better state of things was to be brought about by it. The people of the Province of Prince Edward Island had, in their late election, given evidence that they took the same view. It was the people of Canada themselves who demanded protection to Canadian industries, which they saw were going to rack and ruin, and who, determining to have some redress, brought about the remarkable result that took place in the recent election, and the expectations of the people has been fully realised in the tariff which had been submitted by the hon. the Finance Minister.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman had better inform the House, in detail, what his computations were of the revenue to be received, and how much goods, particularly under this item, he thought it was likely would be manufactured in this country.

MR. TILLEY said the whole imports of woollen goods of every description last year amounted to a little over \$8,000,000. There was imported \$1,700,000 worth of blankets from Great Britain, \$1,162,659 worth from the United States. After a careful examination it was assumed that when the Canadian industries were fairly in operation, they would be able to produce, under this tariff, something like \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 worth of

the goods imported last year, particularly of the coarser class of woollen goods, such as blankets, etc. If the reduction of imports should reach \$1,500,000, there would probably be from \$150,000 to \$180,000 additional revenue, possibly \$200,000; but the hon. gentleman would see that that would very much depend upon the increased production of these goods during the next twelve months. If the result expected by the Government were produced, employment would be given our people, machinery and capital, and a better article would be produced, and if the article were not produced to the extent expected there would be an additional revenue, which would go towards making up the deficiency that must be raised. He knew that gentlemen opposite had stated that the tariff would increase the prices of everything; but he had evidence that the prices were the same now as before the tariff came down. Mr. Rosamond, of Almonte, whose mill was a credit to him, and, no doubt, an advantage to the portion of the country in which it was situated, telegraphed him some weeks after the tariff was brought down, that he made no advance in his prices, so that he did not anticipate a rise of prices under the tariff.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he doubted whether the evidence of Mr. Rosamond, or any other gentleman deeply interested in getting this tariff passed was to be taken as a good authority. With respect to this particular duty, although he did not think it was worth while going over it in great detail, it was quite clear that they were about to put an enormous additional tax on somebody for the purpose of getting \$1,500,000 goods manufactured here. There were three vices inherent to this tariff, all of which were most marked in regard to these particular articles. In the first place, this tax would discriminate heavily against the poorest class of persons. In the next place, as our trade returns showed, and as pointed out by the hon. member for South Brant, it was perfectly clear this would discriminate most heavily against the English importations, which constituted very nearly three or four times as much as our importations from the United States,

and, in the last place, it was perfectly clear they would throw away a large amount of revenue without getting any adequate return in the shape of employment given to persons engaged in this manufacture. Now, as regarded the extent to which this would discriminate against certain classes of goods, he found that the duty on blankets would vary from 40 to 45 per cent., an enormous rate to pay on articles of that description. In the case of certain descriptions of flannels it would vary from 40 per cent. as low as 28 per cent. In the case of certain descriptions of cloth from 41 to 29 per cent., 27 to 26 per cent., and so on all through. In the case of certain tweeds of 1s. sterling, a specific duty of 27 per cent. would be paid, wholly irrespective of the *ad valorem* duty, while tweeds of a high value, ranging to 4s. 6d. sterling, would only pay some 6 or 7 per cent. So it was in the case of cloths; those less than 2s. a yard paid a specific duty amounting to 20 per cent., while those of a higher value would only pay 10 or 12 per cent. As to the argument which the hon. gentleman appeared to rely most upon, that by this tax they would exclude shoddy goods from our market, he begged leave to doubt very much whether that would be the result for any length of time. He was afraid that they would find that our own manufacturers, after a short time, would begin to introduce the manufacture of shoddy goods here. He remembered that several attempts were made, even under the former moderate tariff, to introduce that description of manufacture. How short or how long a time might elapse before this was done, it was impossible to say, but the only advantage he suspected they would derive from that tariff would be that shoddy would be made in Canada instead of in Lancashire. There were two points he desired most particularly to call attention to. There was no doubt, whether the Finance Minister did or did not make the promise during the late election, that innumerable promises were made by a great number of candidates to the agricultural part of the community that they should have a tax on wool, and there was no doubt whatever that that promise had been entirely violated. As respected the advantages to be derived in

the way of employment of additional hands, there was no evidence, unless they accepted the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance that he did not expect, for a considerable time to come, that more than \$2,000,000 worth or thereabouts of the \$8,000,000 worth imported into this country would be manufactured under this tax. Therefore, the great advantages the agriculturists in particular were to derive from the number of persons who were to be employed in factories of various kinds was an utter and entire delusion. He had kept a careful note of everything the hon. gentleman said would be manufactured here, and it was clear, from his own computation that, at the outside, only two million dollars' worth of the goods now imported were likely to be manufactured, or expected to be manufactured, under this tariff. Now, the result was this: that the whole commercial policy of the country from the commencement to the end had been subverted, that an enormous annual loss was going to be inflicted on the people of Canada, that their taxation would be literally quadrupled, that was to say, in proportion to the amount the hon. gentleman expected to bring into the Treasury. The sole result, as far as the farmers were concerned, was that they might have the benefit of substituting a million bushels of one kind of grain for another kind, and that they might supply, with their products, at the outside, five or six thousand factory hands, or persons engaged in one occupation or another throughout Canada. In return for this, they would have to pay treble taxes for any article they were in the habit of consuming to a considerable degree. In this the last discussion they were likely to have on the details of this tariff, he would content himself with saying that he did not believe it would have been possible, by any ingenuity, to have contrived the tariff which would take more out of the pockets of the people of Canada, and put less into the Treasury, than this tariff proposed to do; or that it would have been possible to have inflicted greater burdens on all the great leading industries of this country and to have given to these industries less substantial return than the hon. gentleman had contrived to do in this tariff. If these were his objects, as it would appear they were from what they

had seen here, he (Mr. Cartwright) could congratulate him on having achieved his mission well.

MR. GUTHRIE said that the hon. the Minister of Finance and many of his followers had stated that the effect of the duty on woollen goods would be to induce the manufacture of wool grown in the country, and, therefore, provide a ready market for it, at an increased price. The charge that was made by gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House was that Ministers had not fulfilled the promises they had made to the farmers of the country. The promise was not that they would give a ready market for their wool, but that they would put a duty on foreign wool. He was prepared to say that he believed, if the whole of the wool produced in this country should be called for, and some foreign wool should be required to be imported, to make up the amount required by our manufactures, an advance in the price of wool might take place to the extent that it would cost to bring wool from some other country. That was the utmost extent that the farmers of Canada could possibly be benefitted in respect of wool, by taxes on woollen goods. He understood that our long wool could be taken from Canada to Liverpool, and all charges paid, at from 1c. to 1½c. per lb. He also understood that wool could be brought from Liverpool, the great long wool market of the world, and laid down in this country, at about ½c. per lb. for freight, Western bound freight being somewhat lower than Eastern bound. Now, that being the case, and there being no duty on wool coming into Canada, no matter how much demand there might be for wool, it was impossible to get more from manufacturers, however liberal they might be, in addition to the Liverpool quotations, than ½c. per lb., the charge for bringing the wool from Liverpool. That was the full extent of the benefit the farmers would derive from these impositions on woollen goods, according to the hon. gentleman's own showing.

Item agreed to.

Resolution read the first and second times and agreed to.

On Resolution 12, item—Until the 1st day of January, 1881, steel in ingots,

bars, sheets and coils, railway bars or rails and fish-plates, shall be free of duty,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he would like the hon. gentleman to explain why that limitation was made.

MR. TILLEY said it was considered desirable to leave it in that form. There was a proposition to establish a steel manufactory in the country, and it was left in that manner; and it was left as a declaration of the policy of the Government, if the manufacture was undertaken in the meantime.

Item agreed to.

Resolution read the first and second times and agreed to.

Resolution 13 read the first and second times and agreed to.

On Resolution 14,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he did not rise to object to this resolution, but for the purpose of remarking, that he was very much afraid that the hon. Minister of Finance, in imposing this duty, had overlooked the risk of increasing illicit distillation, which notably prevailed in certain parts of the country. They had been attacked by the hon. the Minister of Public Works for increasing the duty in 1874, by some 12c. per gallon. That hon. gentleman on that occasion pointed out, and with truth, that in an increase of this duty there was considerable danger, that instead of getting more revenue they might increase illicit distillation. They knew to their cost that there had been unhappily a very great increase in the illicit manufacture in many parts of Canada, and he dreaded very much that the result of this might be still more largely to increase illicit distillation, which would be a double misfortune, not alone on the cost of revenue, but on account of the demoralisation which would attend the growth of that particular traffic. If his memory served him correctly, the experience of the United States was very strongly in the direction of the view he was then presenting to the House. There they found that the imposition of a heavy duty on spirits led to a direct

loss of revenue, and they were obliged to reduce very largely the duties on spirits before they were able to collect anything like a reasonable revenue from them. Even to this day there were most formidable gangs engaged in the manufacture of spirits, and within the last few months he had seen several cases in which the Government troops had been called out, and rather serious skirmishes had taken place between what were known as the whiskey outlaws and the troops engaged in collecting the revenue. He was aware that in the Mother Country very much heavier duties were levied, but the conditions of society and the opportunities for illicit distillation were much less favourable there than in Canada. Therefore, although he did not intend to oppose the resolution, he desired to take this opportunity of warning the Government, and especially of warning the hon. the Minister of Finance, that he was very much afraid he (Mr. Tilley) would not receive any additional revenue from this duty, and he was still more afraid that the illicit distillation of whiskey might be considerably increased by the imposition of this duty.

Mr. TILLEY said the points to which the hon. gentleman had referred had not escaped the consideration of the Government. Of course, they looked, in the raising of the duty, at the possibility of not only increasing illicit distillation, but the possibility of its being illegally imported into the country. But, looking at the present Excise duty imposed in the United States, they felt there would be no difficulty in that regard. The high duty which formerly prevailed in the United States, and which gave rise to a great many fraudulent operations, was double that now proposed. During last year the duty in Canada was 30c., and now it was only increased 10c. The American duty, although the proof gallon was not exactly the same, was equal to from \$1.12 to \$1.20. The American duty being higher than ours, there was no inducement to import. The hon. gentleman, in referring to illicit distillation, said that the duty on corn increased the temptation in that direction. He (Mr. Tilley) maintained that it decreased the temptation to the extent of the increased

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

cost of corn. He thought, with their experience in the past, and the strict supervision that was exercised by all their officers throughout the Dominion, and the reduction of the duty on malt, that the facilities for distillation were largely diminished. It was estimated that under this duty the Government would obtain \$100,000 more than they obtained last year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he did not object to the hon. gentleman collecting every cent of revenue that could possibly be collected from this article. If there was one article which they were justified in taxing to the fullest extent it would bear, it was the article of whiskey. He only called the hon. gentleman's attention to the risk of increasing the illicit distillation. He rose more particularly to remark that, corn being used by the legal distiller, rye or barley would be used by the illicit distiller, or some other grain of that kind, and consequently they ought to add the duty on corn. He did not know what the exact cost of manufacturing whiskey was, but at any rate an enormous profit was made on the article. The hon. gentleman was probably aware, or at any rate the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was aware, that there were an enormous number of stills in the country so constructed that a very considerable quantity of whiskey could be manufactured and concealed. He knew that within the last three or four years the convictions of illicit distillers had been increasing in a very rapid ratio. All the evidence submitted to him when he was Finance Minister tended to show that illicit distillation was increasing in certain sections of the country, and that for one still their officers succeeded in seizing, there were, perhaps, three or four in active operation.

MR. GUTHRIE said it was quite true that, when the Excise duty was \$2 a gallon in the United States, they collected a great deal less money than they did when the duty was considerably less. This increase of the tax to \$1 was something to be approved of, and he thought the hon. the Finance Minister had done wisely in that respect, even running the risk of a little extra illicit distillation. He believed himself that

illicit distillation was not carried on as extensively as was supposed. The number of seizures was no indication of the amount of illicit distillation. Very little liquor had been sold that had been made in an illicit manner. The discovery had been so prompt, and the parties had been caught before they had any opportunity of making the whiskey to any very considerable extent. Almost as soon as the still was started, the seizure was made. It got into the newspapers, and the impression got into the public mind that the operations were carried on extensively, whereas, as a matter of fact, he had reason to believe, from the officers who made many of the seizures, that very little of the illicit liquor had been disposed of.

MR. CAPTWRIGHT said he must remind his hon. friend that the opinions he had now expressed were expressed to the late Government two years, eighteen months and one year ago, and their version of the case was that undoubtedly believed by the most experienced officer of the Inland Revenue. He was afraid that, although what the hon. gentleman had stated might possibly be true in certain localities, it was undoubtedly not true as regarded the country at large. There might be certain localities in which public opinion was not in favour of illicit distillation, in which offenders were soon caught. But, where public opinion rather favoured illicit distillation, as it undoubtedly did in certain sections, it would be difficult indeed to detect an illicit distiller until a large amount of his liquor had gone into consumption.

Resolution read the first and second times and agreed to.

Resolutions 15 to 18 read the first and second times and agreed to.

TARIFF BILL.

(Mr. Tilley.)

FIRST READING.

MR. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 93) To alter the duties of Customs and Excise.

Bill read the first time.

House adjourned at

Ten minutes before

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 25th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 94) To amend the Indian Act, 1876.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 95) To reduce the salaries and allowances of certain public functionaries and officers, and the indemnity to members of the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Béchard.)

Bill (No. 96) To regulate charges on railway palace and sleeping cars.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :—

"That for the rest of the Session, on every day after 6 o'clock, p.m., Public Bills and Orders, not Government Measures, shall have precedence over Notices of Motions, Government Measures still retaining their precedence on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays."

Motion agreed to.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS BILL.

[BILL 67.]

(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

THIRD READING.

Bill reconsidered in Committee of the Whole, reported as amended, read the third time and passed.

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT AMENDMENT

BILL.—[BILL 75.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

THIRD READING.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

[BILL 51.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

THIRD READING.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

MANITOBA DOMINION LANDS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 72.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill again *considered* in Committee of the Whole, and *reported*.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.—[BILL 21.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for second reading *discharged*, and Bill *withdrawn*.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR BRITISH
COLUMBIA BILL.

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

FIRST READING.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to provide for the salaries of two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

(In the Committee.)

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that he was, at first, under the impression that only two Judges were obliged to live on the mainland in British Columbia, but he found that the Statute provided that not less than three should remain on the mainland. The total expense of the new system, according to the estimate of the Attorney-General of British Columbia, would be little, if any, more than under the old system.

MR. MACDONNELL asked how many Supreme Court Judges there would be under the new system.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said five. There were three at present, and the two additional were provided for by the recent Local Act. The Supreme Court Judge would hereafter perform the duties performed by County Court Judges heretofore. The Union Act provided for the retiring allowance of the retiring Stipendiary Magistrates.

MR. MILLS said he thought there was some apprehension about the provisions in the terms of Union. His recollection

was that these gentlemen, in addition to being Stipendiary Magistrates were also Commissioners of Mines, and that the salaries they were receiving were partly for their services as Magistrates, and partly for their services as Commissioners of Mines. As he understood the proposition of the Minister of Justice, it was to give these Stipendiary Magistrates a full retiring allowance, as if they had been only officers of the Dominion Government. The retiring allowance to which they were entitled was only in regard to the salary they received as Stipendiary Magistrates, and not in regard to the whole salary they received as Stipendiary Magistrates and Commissioners of Mines.

MR. DEWDNEY said the hon. gentleman was mistaken. The Local Government relieved those gentlemen of all local duties, as they were found to be incompatible with their duties as Dominion officers.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he did not make a positive statement with regard to these retiring allowances, but his impression was, that, under the Terms of Union, they were entitled to two-thirds the amount of the salaries they had received.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that he approved of the change, but these gentlemen, as County Court Judges, could not be legislated out of office, and the Local Government had no power to do so.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he understood that at the time those gentlemen were appointed that contingency was anticipated, and they were expressly appointed during pleasure, in order that in the event of the Local Government desiring to dispense with their services, they could do so, and that the difficulty contemplated by the hon. gentleman should not arise.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said that the Act recently passed by the British Columbia Legislature enacted that the duties now performed by the County Court Judges should be performed in future by the Judges of the Supreme Court, and that *ipso facto* the present Judges of the County Court should cease to hold any power whatever.

As regarded the assertion made by the hon. gentleman from Bothwell that these County Court Judges were also Mining Commissioners, he might state that, after Confederation, these gentlemen, upon their becoming County Court Judges, in some instances refused to perform any duties appertaining to mining whatever, and the only way by which the Local Government could compel them to do so, was by passing a special Act, by which additional jurisdiction which was given to the County Court, enabling each Judge to hold terms of what was called the mining jurisdiction of the County Courts. Those gentlemen had been since acting as County Court Judges, holding Courts under that Act. Under the former arrangement, their jurisdiction was limited to cases not exceeding \$500; but, under the mining jurisdiction of that Court, those gentlemen had jurisdiction to an unlimited extent. While this British Columbia Act might, perhaps, be an improvement upon the present judicial system, there were still some clauses which needed more attention. The Act provided that the Supreme Court should, in future, consist of five Judges, three at least of whom should reside upon the mainland. There were at present three Judges of the Supreme Court, and two more must be appointed. These three Judges now on the Bench all resided in Victoria, and, while this Act stated three Judges should reside on the mainland, there was no provision as to which of the three now residing in Victoria should remove to the mainland, and no power was given to the Governor in Council or any other person to compel anyone of these Judges to reside there. Nor was there any provision made stating upon which portion of the mainland these Judges should reside. According to the Act, as it now read, the two Judges to be appointed might reside in New Westminster, close to the sea-coast, and the Judge who removed from Vancouver Island might make his residence there too. In that case, the people of Cariboo would be much worse off than they were now, as they now had two County Court Judges within the district, one residing in the mining district, and another at Clinton, 250 miles away. If these County Court Judges were allowed to select their residences, and all lived in

New Westminster, the whole interior of the country would be left for months at a time without the services of any County Court Judge, and consequently the people would be placed at great disadvantage. They had always been in the habit of having a County Court Judge among them, and there were many cases in which it was absolutely necessary that one should be living in the mining district. In cases coming under the mining jurisdiction, it had always been customary to issue summonses returnable in seventy-two hours. If a Judge resided 500 miles away, great inconvenience would result in such cases. Also in cases where a debtor wanted to abscond, there would be no power of granting a *caapias* to prevent his leaving. He trusted the attention of the Government would be directed to these points.

Resolutions *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions *reported*, read the first and second times and agreed to.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou), introduced a Bill (No. 97) To provide for the salaries of two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Bill read the first time.

TONNAGE DUES IN CANADIAN PORTS
BILL.—[BILL 80.]

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)

THIRD READING.

Bill *considered* in Committee of the Whole, *reported*, read the third time, and *passed*.

BANKS AND BANKING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 71.]

(Mr. Tilley.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

SUPPLY.

III.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of Supply.

3 The Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.	\$15,730 00	31 Salary of Registrar of Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec..	666 66
4 The Department of Justice...	12,800 00	32 Salary of Marshal of Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec....	322 34
5 The Department of Justice, Penitentiaries branch.....	3,950 00		
6 The Department of Militia...	37,380 00		
7 The Department of Secretary of State.....	32,550 00	V.—POLICE.	
8 The Department of Interior..	55,210 00	33 Dominion Police.....	\$12,000 00
9 The Office of the Auditor-General.....	16,850 00		
10 The Department of Finance..	49,930 00	VI.—PENITENTIARIES.	
11 The Office of the Treasury Board.....	2,650 00	34 Kingston.....	\$130,917 58
12 The Department of Inland Revenue.....	28,105 00	35 St. Vincent de Paul.....	71,944 92
13 The Department of Customs..	29,700 00		
14 The Department of Postmaster-General.....	89,700 00	Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said that, in examining the accounts this year, he found that, while at Kingston Penitentiary the cost of maintenance, <i>per capita</i> , of the convicts was \$170; at St. Vincent de Paul it was \$324.15; St. John, \$261; Halifax, \$277; Manitoba, \$561; British Columbia, \$570. In the item of maintenance, the cost of the Kingston institution was \$78.28 <i>per capita</i> last year. This year the Government proposed to reduce it to \$74. At St. Vincent de Paul, last year, the cost was \$149, as compared with \$78 for the Kingston Penitentiary. The Department proposed to make an attempt to maintain that institution at \$76 <i>per capita</i> , instead of \$149, which was giving it \$2 a head more than the Kingston institution. At St. John, last year, the cost was \$76.84; Halifax, \$92; Manitoba, \$252; British Columbia, there was no comparison made. In the Manitoba Penitentiary, the Department proposed to reduce the expenditure, <i>per capita</i> , for maintenance, to \$86. So far as he could understand the demands of the wardens of the several institutions, he did not see why this calculation should not be successfully carried out. In making the Estimates, he had allowed the prices set down in the different localities by the wardens in their estimates, but the reductions had been made largely in the quantities they asked for. In fact, the Department had taken the Kingston Penitentiary as a sample institution.	
15 The Department of Agriculture	31,150 00		
16 The Department of Marine and Fisheries.....	27,530 00		
17 The Department of Public Works.....	53,830 00		
18 Departmental Contingencies.	136,750 00		
19 Stationery Office for stationery	13,000 00		
20 To meet the possible amount required for new appointments by an extension of the Staff, or any other change.....	10,000 00		
IV.—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.			
21 Miscellaneous Justice, including North-West Territories	\$15,000 00		
22 Travelling expenses of Stipendiary Magistrates in North-West Territories.....	4,500 00		
23 Circuit allowances, British Columbia.....	10,000 00		
24 Circuit allowances, Manitoba.	1,500 00		
25 Précis-Writer of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court.....	1,900 00		
26 Clerk in the Office of the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court.....	525 00		
27 Senior Messenger of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court.....	500 00		
28 Second Messenger of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court.....	360 00		
29 Contingencies and disbursements, including printing, binding and distributing reports, Judges' travelling expenses; also, salaries of officers—Sheriff, Usher, etc.—in the Supreme and Exchequer Courts of Canada, and \$150 for books of Judges.....	5,000 00		
30 Sundry disbursements connected with the Maritime Court of Ontario, Seals for Court, Judge's travelling expenses, Court books, etc.	500 00		

MR. MACKENZIE: I find in the St. Vincent de Paul account four items that were last year left out altogether, namely: returns, maintenance of buildings, capital account, machinery and material for manufacture. Is there nothing allowed for repairs and maintenance of the buildings?

MR. McDONALD: That is transferred to Public Works.

MR. MACKENZIE: That should be stated in a foot-note. It makes an unfair comparison. There is an apparent decrease of \$12,000, whereas, if all the items were represented as before, there would be no decrease. Material for manufactures does not belong to the Public Works Department. Are there no materials to be supplied this year?

MR. McDONALD: None.

MR. MACKENZIE: How are the convicts to be employed?

MR. McDONALD: There is sufficient stock there, and we propose, with reference to one item, the clothing made at St. Vincent de Paul, that it shall be made at Kingston, because we believe it can be made much cheaper there.

MR. MACKENZIE: All the clothing was formerly made in the Penitentiaries themselves.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: A good deal of the difference as regards Kingston might arise in this way. I think the Penitentiary at Kingston, having control of a good deal of land, is in the habit of producing a considerable portion of its own vegetables and other articles of that kind. I fancy that goes to the benefit of the institution, and does not appear as swelling the expenditure, and is not taken into account on one side or the other, though, as a matter of course, that would reduce the apparent cost per head.

MR. McDONALD: I think that is the case.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I see, all through, material for manufactures is struck out. Are there any new branches devised for employing persons at Kingston or elsewhere?

MR. McDONALD: None.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: How are they employed at present?

MR. McDONALD: I do not know. The report of the Inspector shows that, I have no opportunity of giving information, other than that derived from the Inspector himself.

MR. MACKENZIE: Last year we had some discussion on the question of the employment of convict labour, and the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government made some very strong criticisms against the Government competing with other trades. I would like to know what his views are this year, what changes he proposes to introduce in order to avoid that competition which he denounced last year; whether he is prepared to condemn the present Government because they have carried on certain branches at the Penitentiaries?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have no objection to gratify the laudable curiosity of my hon. friend. My opinions have always remained the same on this point, that it is a great misfortune that the labour of convicts should be brought into competition with that of honest men outside, and that that should be cured as much as possible. We commenced with the view of doing away with the contract system by degrees before 1873. It could only be done by degrees, because we had contractors there who had much plant and had running contracts. The principal will be carried out as much as possible that the convicts should interfere as little as possible with the honest labour of the country.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is no answer. The late Government were also pursuing that course, but the hon. gentleman undertook to criticise us because we were competing with trades outside. The hon. gentleman must admit that the convicts must be employed in some way. I am aware of it, and I do not blame the Government for it. I assume quite as much responsibility as they for it. I am aware that the clothing of the police force, their boots and shoes, that everything that was required that could be made, was made in the Penitentiary. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he is not competing with the tailors' trade and shoemakers' who are outside, with those who made furniture for the Government buildings? I gave an order myself that all the furniture for the Military College should be made at the Penitentiary, but still that entered into competition with the cabinet-makers at Kingston and else-

where. It is, in short, impossible to provide any labour for the convicts that does not enter into competition with labour outside, and, however much a politician may condemn the course we pursued, and that the hon. gentleman is now pursuing, the fact remains the same, that whatever labour is done by criminals deducts that much labour from what is available for men outside. Unless you adopt the system of solitary confinement, and provide no labour at all, it must be continued. The reason I brought the matter to notice now is to point out the unfairness of the hon. gentleman last year, in making the remarks he did, when he knew perfectly well that, if he came into office the next year, he would be compelled, perforce, to pursue the same system, and he is now pursuing it. We have come to the common conclusion, that the best mode of dealing with criminals is to imprison them at hard labour. That has to be provided, and it is the duty of those who administer the affairs of the country to see that it is made profitable. In the neighbouring Republic they have succeeded in making convict labour profitable to such an extent that a number of the institutions have managed to meet the expenditure by the products of the convict labour. We are behindhand in that respect, and anything that can be done by this side of the House to aid the Government in reaching that point will be done.

MR. JONES: Great complaints are being made against convict labour competing against honest labour, and I think that the answer given by the Premier was a good answer, that he is doing all that he possibly can to prevent that labour competing with the labour outside. The Government have only been in office six or eight months, and it is impossible for them to make a complete change in that time. The parties who contracted for this labour have their plant and machinery; they have to be considered. I trust the Premier will do what he said he is going to do, that is, to prevent that labour, as far as possible, from competing with honest labour. I do not think the example of the United States is any example for us. It is a despicable thing that that labour should

be utilised against the honest labour of the country. Why cannot we utilise convict labour as it is done in England, where it does not compete with other labour to any great extent? They break stones and pick oakum there, and are not fed with roast beef and white bread. The cost in this country is enormous, compared with the cost in England. It is a disgrace to this country that we should so utilise that labour that it is competing with honest labour.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am not surprised to hear the hon. gentleman express his entire approval of what is done on the Treasury benches. He does that regularly every day. In his anxiety to support the Government, he says it will take some time to get rid of the contractors with their plant. Who are the contractors, and what is the plant that is now in their hands?

MR. JONES: How am I to answer that question? Does not the hon. gentleman know himself that boots and shoes, for instance, are made in the Penitentiary, and many other articles that could be made outside?

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member said it would take some months to get rid of the contractors and the plant. I asked, for he spoke evidently with authority, who were the contractors and what was the plant. I am not aware there is a single contractor there.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): There is one locksmith.

MR. MACKENZIE: We found, when we came into office, that there had been a locksmith there, but found him unable to continue his contract, and the material he had remained in the hands of the Government, and, if there is one now, it is an arrangement made to use up the half-made materials lying around. Does the hon. gentleman take the ground that we ought not to have had the furniture for our own buildings made there, that the ironwork on the library, the points for the Pacific Railway, should not have been made there? He said, that in England, they broke stones and picked oakum, which did not enter into competition outside. Does it require no labour to pick

oakum and break stones? Can he name a single thing that can be done by convicts, in the shape of labour, that does not enter into competition with outside labour? All labour is profitable, no matter how simple it may be, and there is just as much competition in picking oakum and breaking stones as in anything else.

MR. COURSOL said it was well known, and experience had proved it, that all sentences given by criminal Judges had not, in most cases, the desired effect, if the persons were not sent to hard labour. Unfortunately, if the prisoners were not employed, they left, at the end of their terms, worse than when they were convicted. But, at the same time, the moment these prisoners were employed, the result of their labour must be utilised in some way. It must be disposed of, and, if it was only breaking stones, they interfered with the labour of honest men engaged in breaking stones, which was the only means, probably, of saving thousands of families that would otherwise starve. He thought some way might be devised of making the United States the slaughter market for these goods, as Canada had been made a slaughter market for American goods. The labour did not cost anything, and they had only to take the raw material account. The goods might be collected from the Penitentiaries and then sent across the line to be sold. That would, no doubt, pay all expenses and we would lose nothing. At the same time, there would be no sort of competition with the labour of our own people. He did not suppose the suggestion would be adopted at once by the hon. the Minister of Justice, but, at the same time, he suggested it as a means of getting rid of these articles, and utilising the work of these prisoners.

MR. MILLS said he was rather surprised, although he had heard some very extraordinary doctrines of political economy laid down since this Session began, at the opinions advanced by the hon. member for Montreal East. He remembered very well the discussion that took place on the subject last year. He thought it was the hon. member for Frontenac that suggested that

the convicts in Penitentiaries should be employed at some labour that would not be of the slightest use to them when they had served their time. Now, the position taken by the hon. gentleman on that occasion, and the position taken by the hon. gentlemen who had spoken that day, had intimated that these people were in a wholly different position, or their industry was in a wholly different position to the industries outside. In the Kingston Penitentiary, they had 800 or 1,000 convicts. These people, if they were outside, would probably be producing a greater number of articles which would come into competition with the products of the rest of the community. Then the labour of the convicts was less efficient than it would be if they were outside. Nothing could be more preposterous than the arguments of hon. gentlemen in this particular. They might as well legislate criminally against the introduction of emigrants into the country. In proportion as the Penitentiary was self-sustaining, in the same proportion it was advantageous to the rest of the community. The community suffered in proportion to the amount of tax it was obliged to pay to support these people. If the convicts were taught trades it would be a practical advantage to them when they went back to the community.

MR. HOUDE said he thought the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was mistaken in one of his contentions. He said the work of convicts was a benefit to the country, and, if they were free, they would do still more work in competition with other workmen. They ought to make convicts work—first, to improve them morally, and, secondly, to reduce what they cost the country. But he (Mr. Houde) was of opinion that they should leave competition in manufacture and labour in general in a normal condition, but they did not want competition with slave work. Such work ought not to be placed in competition with the labour of fathers of families. Such work tended to place the Government in competition against the individual, and deranged the normal condition of labour and industrial enterprise. He thought the suggestion of the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) ought to be taken into con-

sideration. It was well known that frequently foreign manufacturers sent their goods into the Canadian market, and sacrificed the surplus of their productions because they did not want to destroy the normal condition of their own markets. It was better that our Government should get a little less revenue from the labour of convicts than disturb the natural state of competition in labour and industry.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the proposition of the hon. member for Montreal East had something of a comical air about it. It amounted to this: that the Legislature would be asked for an additional vote of say \$50,000 to enable the Government to send their goods out of the country at the expense of the whole people, and sell them at less than they were worth. That was really the proposition of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HOUDE said he did not mean that the goods should be sacrificed at a decided loss. The Government could produce the goods at a less cost than ordinary manufacturers. It was only the raw material that cost anything. The labour cost nothing.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It costs a good deal.

Mr. HOUDE said he contended the labour cost nothing in that case, because the Government had to provide for the living of the convicts anyway. There was another point worth consideration. It was always dangerous to make a class of the population believe that the Government was doing them an injustice, and a portion of the people of the Dominion believed that the Government, in placing the labour of convicts in competition with that of citizens of the country, were doing injustice to honest fathers of families.

Several Hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOUDE said hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear," but he knew in what sense they meant it. They pretended that the policy of the Government had given dissatisfaction to the people. He knew it had given dissatisfaction to some, whom it would prevent for a long time from returning to power.

Vote agreed to.

Mr. HOUDE.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa Loan and Investment Company, and to change the same to "The Manitoba and North-West Loan Company, Limited."—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

SUPPLY.

VI.—PENITENTIARIES.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

36 St. John.....	\$27,708 55
37 Halifax.....	19,806 50
38 Manitoba.....	17,385 20

Mr. MACKENZIE said the bill for food and wages, last year, came to \$19,468, which the Department considered so enormous that it caused a detailed statement to be prepared by the Warden. He found the items generally were charged at excessive prices.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said the present estimate had been handed in by the Warden. The Department allowed the prices estimated by the Warden, but did not allow the quantities, which, per capita of the convicts, were more than was required in the Kingston and other Penitentiaries.

Vote agreed to.

39 British Columbia.....	\$16,145 55
--------------------------	-------------

Mr. McINNES said he found only \$1,200 was allowed for the Warden's salary, though the Wardens, and even the Deputy Wardens of the other Penitentiaries, received \$1,400 a year. Living was just as high in British Columbia as elsewhere, and he did not see why the Warden's salary should not be as high.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said the Warden had made no complaint about his salary being too low.

Vote agreed to.

VII.—LEGISLATION.

Senate.

40 Salaries and Contingent Expenses of the Senate.....	\$51,518 00
32 To meet expenditure in connection with Senate Hansard.....	3,000 00

House of Commons.

41 Salaries, per Clerk's estimate.	\$58,350 00
------------------------------------	-------------

MR. ANGLIN said he wished to refer to a matter connected with this vote, in regard to the salary of the Speaker. The law regulating the salary of the Speaker, as interpreted, ever since Confederation, was this : that the Speaker of the House of Commons was entitled to his salary up to the day on which his successor was elected. His (Mr. Anglin's) predecessor was paid up to the day he was elected. In the same way he drew his salary during recess, and performed the duties of Speaker as head of the Department up to the last. He drew the quarter's salary up to the 31st of December. When he went to draw a portion due for January, and for the first thirteen days of February, he found some difficulty. He made enquiry about it, and found that the Auditor, having some doubt, referred the matter to the Minister of Justice, and that the Deputy Minister advised that he was not entitled to the payment of salary after the dissolution of Parliament. He could not understand on what grounds the Minister of Justice came to that conclusion. However, the result had been that he was without his salary for a month and thirteen days. The right hon. the leader of the Government, early in the Session, promised to introduce a Bill relating to the office of Speaker and other matters, and he intended, when that Bill came before the House, to bring this matter up. He supposed he could go to the Courts for a remedy, but that, even if he gained the case, would cost him more than the whole amount due—some \$500. Something should be done to let the present Speaker know what position he would be in when his period of office came to a close. The Speaker was appointed when the House met, and his expenses began immediately, and his duties continued

from that time up to the day of the election of his successor.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he knew the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) would not suppose that the members of the Government desired to do anything but most ample justice to himself (Mr. Anglin) individually. Mr. Lash, the Deputy Minister of Justice, had some difficulty with reference to the strict legality of the payment under the Act. At the very earliest opportunity he (Mr. McDonald) would inform the hon. gentleman what the Government proposed to do in the matter.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) asked why the allowance of \$200 for Deputy Clerk, House of Commons, had been struck off, whilst no change in that respect had been made with regard to the Senate staff.

MR. TILLEY said he could not recollect for the moment why the reduction had been made ; but he thought it was because it was considered he did not occupy the same position as the Deputy Clerk in the Senate, and it was not considered necessary that the sum should be continued. The increase was only made within the last three or four years, and had never been paid before.

MR. ANGLIN said Mr. Hartney was appointed Deputy Clerk some four years ago, and his salary was increased from \$2,600 to \$2,800, not because he had any duties as Deputy Clerk to perform, as he did not perform any work in that capacity, but because he performed duties for which the sum paid him was not fair compensation. Mr. Hartney was an old and experienced officer, who discharged many onerous and responsible duties. His time was fully occupied. When he (Mr. Anglin) had occasion, as Speaker, to go into the matter of salaries of the House, he never thought of such a thing as cutting down Mr. Hartney's salary a single dollar, and he never anticipated that it would ever be done. The best mode of economising was to reduce the number of officials, dispensing with those who had little or nothing to do.

MR. BABY said it was thought, by the Commission of Internal Economy, that the

office of Deputy Clerk of the House, should not be continued, because there were no duties attached to the office. Therefore, as it was necessary to economise as much as possible the expenses of the House, the allowance of \$200 for that office was dropped. It was not done because Mr. Hartney was not considered a good officer. On the contrary, that gentleman fulfilled his duties to the satisfaction of everybody, but as Deputy Clerk he had no duties whatever to do. He would now receive \$2,600 instead of \$2,800, as before.

MR. MACKENZIE said Mr. Hartney's salary, in the first place, was increased to \$2,800, because he was Deputy Clerk. The hon. gentleman would observe that the Deputy Clerk in the Senate had \$2,800, and the late Commissioners conceived that Mr. Hartney was better entitled to \$2,800 than the same officer in the Senate. Why was it his salary had been reduced, and the salary of the gentleman in the Senate left at \$2,800?

MR. TUPPER said his recollection of the circumstances was this: the title of Deputy Clerk, with an allowance of \$200, was, some two or three years ago—he could not fix the date exactly—conferred on a gentleman who had been very properly and justly described as one of the best experienced and able officers of the House. But this Government considered that that gentleman was sufficiently paid by the salary of \$2,600, which he received as Accountant, and, as he had no duties whatever to perform as Deputy Clerk, the \$200 allowance attached to that title was taken off.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman must admit that the officers of this House should be equally well paid with officers of the other House. If there was a general reduction made, there would be no objection. But it was quite evident, in looking at the Estimates, that that was not the case. The Clerk of the Upper House received \$3,400, and the Deputy Clerk, \$2,800. The Clerk of this House received \$3,400, and the Deputy Clerk, \$2,600. The Deputy Clerk was not, as hon. gentlemen supposed, commissioned by the Government, but by the Clerk of the House, and if

MR. BABY.

the Clerk should be taken ill on any day, the duties would have to be discharged by Mr. Hartney. He did not think it was fair at all to that gentleman, who was one of the most efficient officers he (Mr. Mackenzie) ever saw. He never knew any officer so exact and thorough in the discharge of his duties. He should not be placed in a position of inferiority to the same officer in the Senate, who did not discharge one-third the duties performed by Mr. Hartney. He hoped the Government would yet consider the matter, and do Mr. Hartney the justice he was entitled to.

Vote agreed to.

42 Expenses of Committees, Extra
Sessional Clerks, &c. \$10,300 00

MR. MILLS said that, by a return which was brought down early in the Session, it appeared there had been 78 extra sessional clerks employed, though it was stated that 20 had been dispensed with about the time the return was brought down. It was now stated that these had been all re-employed, with the exception of four, and that a large number in addition had been taken on. He thought the number now employed exceeded 100. It was also stated that a considerable number of persons, who were representatives of various Conservative newspapers, received four or five dollars a day as extra clerks. The names of some of these gentlemen had been given him, and he trusted to be able to bring this matter again under the notice of the House. He thought it was a great abuse. It should not be tolerated that gentlemen connected with the press, who were here for the purpose of representing hon. gentlemen opposite, should be employed at the public expense, under the designation of sessional clerks, for the purpose of advocating the views and acting as the exponents of hon. gentlemen on the Government benches.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he hoped the hon. gentleman would bring the matter up; and, when it was brought up, the House would have an opportunity of discussing it. It would put him (Sir John A. Macdonald) in mind of what was done last Session. Such things were done last year to a very large extent.

MR. ANGLIN said he understood that during the early part of the Session, the Clerk of the House asked for a dozen extra clerks, and he received sixty; and, before there was anything to be done, some seventy-eight had been employed. He understood that there were now some hundred extra clerks, and he could not see upon what pretext so many were employed.

MR. BUNSTER said he could not see that, because gentlemen happened to be members of the press, that they would not make just as competent clerks as any other persons.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if this estimate of \$10,300 was based upon the expenditure of this Session so far?

MR. TILLEY: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if the hon. gentleman could tell what had been the expense up to this period of the Session.

MR. TILLEY: I cannot.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought the hon. gentleman ought to know. He was satisfied, judging from the number of clerks employed, that the estimate was not nearly sufficient. He wished the hon. gentleman would give this statement before the item was carried.

MR. TILLEY: I shall make enquiries.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he wished to know whether the whole of the extra clerks were to be paid out of the vote of last year, than which he saw no other. A return brought down showed that they had, almost at the commencement of the Session, 75 extra clerks drawing from \$4 to \$5 a day, representing a daily expenditure of over \$300, or at the rate of \$9,000 a month. The estimate for those clerks had been \$12,800; and, if the statement of the member for Bothwell was correct, that a great many of those discharged on the 20th of March were reappointed and more added, a very serious abuse had been committed, and that item would range from \$25,000 to \$30,000 for the pay of those clerks alone. That large item might possibly hereafter be charged to the account of the late Government, the members of which were not, and particularly he himself, disposed

to bear the responsibility of expenditure to that extent, which was all the worse if many of those clerks had been practically employed and acting as correspondents of newspapers.

MR. TILLEY said that, as the hon. member for Lambton had asked that this item should stand over, he would not discuss it now.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said that the number of employes of all kinds, messengers, pages and extra clerks had been greatly increased in 1879, and particularly as compared with 1877. The extra clerks in 1877 numbered 36; in 1878, 41; and in 1879, 75. Seventeen were dismissed on the 20th of March, but the reappointments exceeded that number.

43 Contingencies	\$19,600 00
44 Publishing Debates	15,000 00
45 Salaries and Contingencies, per Sergeant at Arms' Estimates	28,050 00

Miscellaneous.

46 Grant to Parliamentary Library, including \$3,000 for Law Books	7,000 00
47 Salaries of Officers, (additional) and Contingencies of Library	5,000 00
48 Printing, Binding and Distributing the Laws	12,000 00
49 Printing, Printing Paper and Bookbinding	70,000 00
50 Contingencies of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery . .	1,200 00
51 Miscellaneous Printing	2,000 00

VIII.—ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

53 To meet expenses in connection with the care of Public Archives	\$3,000 00
54 To meet expenses in connection with the Patent Record	7,200 00
55 To meet expenses in connection with preparation of Criminal Statistics	5,000 00
56 To meet expenses in connection with the Census.	5,000 00

IX.—IMMIGRATION AND QUARANTINE.

57 {	Salaries of Immigration Agents and Employes ..	\$22,950 00
	Salaries of Traveling Agents.	5,200 00
	Medical Inspection, Port of Quebec.....	1,300 00

Quarantine, Grosse Isle	\$9,556 09
do St. John, N. B.	2,400 00
do Pictou, N. S.	800 00
do Halifax, N. S.	3,200 00
do Charlottetown, P.E.I.	1,000 00
To meet expenses of further precautionary meas- ures for the Public Health, viz. —	15,000 00
Public Health.. \$5,000 00	
Cattle Quarantine	10,000 00
Contingencies of Canadian and other regular Agen- cies.	24,000 00
Travelling expenses of trav- elling Agents.	7,000 00

MR. ANGLIN asked why this large staff was maintained. If he understood all that was said last Session and during the recess, as reported in the newspapers, hon. gentleman opposite found fault with the late Government for having maintained so large a staff of officers at a time when employment could not be found for the people of the country, when the only work these emigration agents did was to overstock the labour market. Perhaps, when the Government framed the Estimates, they had an idea that the National Policy would revolutionise the country, and that employment would be abundant.

MR. POPE (Compton) said the Government had carefully considered the whole question of immigration, and they felt that the money of the country should not be spent in bringing labourers into the country to compete with the overstocked labour market of Canada. Upon that principle they had acted, and, if hon. gentlemen looked at the Estimates, they would find that the amount had been reduced by more than one-half. With reference to the permanent agencies established in the country, they could not reduce them very much. They must continue those agencies, in order that the immigrants coming to the country might be directed aright, and protected on their way to Manitoba from American agents, anxious to allure them to the Western States. Then there had been no time in the history of the country when it was more important to the Dominion to bring out men with money, who could purchase our small farms, settle on our lands, and become contributors to the revenue of the country.

MR. CARTWRIGHT enquired what steps had been taken to invite the immigration to this country of English farmers and persons of that class possessing means. For several years the harvests in England had been of a very indifferent character, and farmers were casting about for some mode of bettering their condition, and he would like to know if any special means had been taken on the part of the Department to call the attention of these people to the openings which existed in Canada just now? A very considerable number of our own people, in the older Provinces, were endeavouring to sell their settled farms in order to move into the North-West.

MR. ROCHESTER asked whether it was the intention of the Government to prevent immigration agents from turning out to canvass and interfere in the elections, and whether the item, \$14,000 for travelling expenses for immigration agents had been used for that purpose or not.

MR. BUNSTER enquired why the reduction had been made in regard to British Columbia; it seemed to him altogether uncalled for. An agent was very much needed there to direct the immigrants upon their arrival, and he trusted that vote would be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for this officer.

MR. POPE (Compton) said that their agents had been instructed to represent to small tenant farmers and men of capital the inducements offered to them in Canada. They had published pamphlets, they had advertised in the papers, they had done everything that could be done to show the people the exact position they might occupy if they came to this country. Such had been the work of most of the agents up to the time that they left. From all the information he could obtain, we were going to get comparatively a very large number of immigrants this year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked if the attention of the hon. gentleman's agents had been called to the fact that there was a large emigration from the older settled parts of this country to Manitoba, and that, in consequence, a considerable number of good farms would be in the market.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said the agents had been instructed to bring that fact before the people, and to tell them that many small farms could be cheaply purchased.

Mr. ANGLIN said he understood from the hon. gentleman that, while the means employed in Europe to induce emigration to this country were to be seriously diminished, the means employed on this side for the reception of immigrants were to be maintained in the old condition. He would like the hon. gentleman to state how the reduction from \$8,700 to \$7,000 in the London agency had been brought about, whose services had been dispensed with, and why, and whether it was his intention to make any more changes in the establishment.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said there was less work to do now, and many of the agents had been withdrawn. When, in 1872, he sent these agents to Europe, he never contemplated they should remain there permanently. He supposed they would be able to complete their work in three or four years, and that the immigrants to this country would themselves become agents for their friends at home. Six or seven of these agents had, consequently, been withdrawn. The reason of the reduction in the London office was that there was not so much work to do here. One man, named Talbot, had resigned, and, altogether, the expenses were less.

Mr. MILLS said the hon. gentleman had stated that he was very careful in determining who should emigrate to this country—in fact, he controlled the entire emigration. He had taken good care that parties emigrating hither should not be persons whose labour would bring them into competition with those who were already in the country. They all knew that last year the intending emigrants were told that manufacturing industries were to be built up, and they would have plenty of work to do, and that emigrants from foreign countries would receive employment which these industries would be able to afford them. But now the hon. gentleman intimated that this could not be done, that it was only agricultural labourers that should come here, and that it would never do

to have those who were engaged in manufactures to emigrate to Canada, because they would come into unfair competition with those engaged in those pursuits. He would like to know how the hon. gentleman was going to reconcile this policy he had marked out here and the policy he and his friends advocated some months ago. The hon. gentleman said he wanted to secure immigrants to occupy the waste lands in the North-West, and to take the place of the farmers who sold out in the older Provinces, but that he did not want immigrants who would come into competition with those engaged in skilled industry. They were assured, over and over again, during the past year, however, that the Government were going to adopt a policy that would give them a home here, and would create a demand for their labour. The hon. gentleman said he was not going to be a "fly on the wheel," and yet he said the Government had done all it could, had exhausted its resources, and could do nothing more. The last step of this great National Policy was to take care that no one in the Old World, engaged in any skilled industry, should have any encouragement to come to this country.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said there was about as much knickerbocker in the hon. gentleman's remarks as in anything he had heard for a long time. He (Mr. Pope) said nothing of the kind attributed to him; what he said was this: anybody could come to this country that liked, but the Government did not encourage people to come here who would come into competition with our labourers.

Mr. MACMILLAN said he understood the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to say that the Government did not encourage people to emigrate to this country to come into competition with our labourers. He (Mr. Macmillan) thought that was very desirable. He knew that in the West many hon. members carried their elections partially on the ground that it was not desirable to have persons of a certain class come to this country; that if they came of their own accord it was all right, but that it was not desirable that any considerable amount of money should be expended in encouraging immigration. For several

years back we had been expending considerable sums in that direction, and had got very poor returns for it, indeed. As for those persons who were anxious to come here, we would be glad to receive them, if they could come at their own expense, and assist in settling up our country. A circumstance had taken place in Ottawa within the last few days which, he thought, justified his hon. friend in the course he had pursued. A few days ago many labourers, in this city, came to the Parliament buildings and demanded that the Government should either give them work or bread. Now, if the Government were doing all in their power to afford employment to these men, by prosecuting public works, and if, at this moment, there were still so many of these people unemployed, it was not at all desirable that considerable numbers more should be brought over here at the expense of the Government, during this summer. He had also observed that many young children were being brought to this country by different parties, and among others, a Miss Birt was bringing many children to this country. He sincerely hoped the Government would not assist in bringing these children here, for we had plenty of that class at the present time in this country. In many cases they were brought to the cities and kept there, and many of them became vagrants, and he did not think it was at all desirable to have any more of them.

MR. CURRIER said he had the greatest confidence in the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. In 1872, when that hon. gentleman first sent agents to the old country, he said, at the time, he only expected it would be a temporary arrangement, and that in a year or two they would be dispensed with. Soon after that, he went out of power, and could not control matters since that time. Now, he (Mr. Currier) would suggest that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture should make a trial, and see whether he could not get along without those agents. Perhaps those who had come out would hereafter act as agents to their friends behind. He observed an item of \$23,000, to assist Mennonite immigration, but he thought it might be better to expend money in helping our own people who were not able, without

MR. MACMILLAN.

assistance, to go to the Prairie Province. He had always maintained that we might help poor people to remove from this country to the West. There was much talk in this city, a few weeks ago, about forming a joint stock emigration society to raise a sum of money to assist partially to remove people who wished to go to that country from Ottawa. They applied to the Department of the Interior to ascertain upon what terms they could get a portion of the land set apart for that purpose, and the answer was that no inducement of that kind would be given, that a township could not be set apart for that purpose to be settled by emigrants removing from this city. The only inducement they would offer was such as was applied to all—that of 160 acres of land free, with the privilege of buying 160 more at \$1 an acre. He thought that the Government might do a little more in this respect. He believed they might have set apart one or two townships for that purpose, to be settled on certain conditions that might be imposed by the Department who had control of the matter. He would be glad if that would be carried out. For his part, he objected to the spending of a large amount of money to bring immigrants to this country. He did not believe that the Minister of Agriculture would be able to make or control a selection of the people that ought to come here. They had still a large number of labourers coming to this country. He regretted that such a large sum was expended in agencies. The United States, he understood, never had any agents in the old country, and yet thousands of emigrants went to that country. He believed just as many emigrants as were required would come to Canada, if all the agents were withdrawn.

MR. BAIN said no doubt there was a difficulty in dealing with the immigration question, which had been aggravated by the depression which had existed in Canada in common with other countries. He had no doubt that his hon. friends from the large centres of population had found great difficulty in dealing with the labouring men out of employment in their midst, already pressing upon their attention the fact that that they were out of employment, and asking for means to

alleviate distress. He remembered that a year ago, when the House was in Session, that had been the prominent difficulty on the Opposition side of the House, and presumed that his hon. friend who had just sat down (Mr. Currier) had realised this Session the serious difficulties that surrounded the Government in dealing with this question. There had been a good deal of talk, a year ago, in respect to the class of immigrants that had been encouraged by the Government to come to this country. He remembered that it reached that degree of importance that at last the immigration agent in this city undertook, for the purpose of having the question investigated, to receive applications from parties who were anxious for employment, or wished for aid to remove, and he (Mr. Bain) recollected that there was not a single case presented where the applicant had not been a resident of this country for at least three years, and many were born and bred in Canada. That was the best refutation of the charges made against the administration of the Immigration Department by the Government of that day. He was not disposed to taunt his hon. friends on the Government benches, and to ask them to carry out now, in office, the line of policy advocated by them a year ago. His hon. friend opposite (Mr. Macmillan) had said what everyone in the House acknowledged to be candid and true when he said that a great many hon. members supporting the Government owed their election to the votes they secured from the workmen out of employment, by the cry that the introduction of immigrants was competing with their labour. But he would ask every fair-minded man, without regard to political connexion, how it was possible to increase the wealth of the country unless it were by increasing the producing population? He was pleased to hear that the Minister of Agriculture did not propose to withdraw the emigration agencies from the old country, and that Canada would still be brought under the notice of the tenant farmers of the Mother Country, and those classes possessing limited means there, who every year felt increasing difficulty in earning a livelihood, and who were a desirable class to induce to come here. Evidence had been recently

given before a Committee of the House, with regard to the reduction in the value of agricultural products, and the consequent inability of farm tenants to pay the high rents of former times, that landlords had, in many cases, allowed reductions on their rents of from 15 to 25 per cent., and he (Mr. Bain) thought this was a peculiarly opportune time to place before those agriculturists the advantages Canada had to confer on small capitalists, who, in England were now struggling from year to year, and working to maintain their position. If this country ever expected to secure a due proportion of this desirable class, who, from circumstances, would thus be disposed to leave the Mother Country, it was necessary that the inducements offered by Canada should be placed prominently before them. There was evidence to show that the class of immigrants that came here during the last four or five years had not been a burden but a clear gain to the country. It would be found that eight out of ten of the class that was a burden upon the community, in our cities, were those who never were very anxious, at any time, to work for a living if they could beg, borrow, or secure a living in some easy way. There was another feature in connection with this question that showed the class of immigrants that were induced to come to this country under the late Administration. He found, on looking over the returns for last year, and it was about the average of previous years, that there was over \$760,000 in money brought in by immigrants to Canada, besides between \$400,000 and \$500,000 worth of settlers' effects. Here was about a million and a quarter brought into this country annually. Considering these circumstances, he thought every hon. member would agree that it was desirable to secure as large a proportion of this class as possible. There was another difficulty to which he desired to call the attention of the House. His only plea for referring to this matter was that, having been on the Immigration Committee for the last few years, he had been compelled to give this subject some little attention. He found there was a tendency on the part of the agents of steamboat companies in the old country to accept any class of the population there

who might be willing to accept the offers made to them, and accept the glowing descriptions of the benefits that would accrue to them by coming to Canada, without regard to their fitness as settlers, and often the class they induced to immigrate was a most undesirable one. He trusted that the Government would keep before the Mother Country the inducements which Canada held forth to the tenant farmer of small capital, and for the man who was willing to work, because he was satisfied that, if the country was to be built up, and its resources developed, he could not say whether under a Protective policy, or under a more liberal policy, we could best do it by doing all we could to attract the small capitalist and the industrious workingman, and as rapidly as possible thus increase both our producing and consuming population.

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. POPE (Compton) said that, with a view to investigate the localities and extent of the cattle disease in the United States, the Canadian Government had sent a veterinary surgeon to several States where it was believed to exist. They wished to satisfy the people on the other side of the Atlantic that there was no disease in Canada, and to be certain themselves as to the reality of any danger in the importation of cattle disease from the States into Canada. It was found that there was no serious risk of that kind.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he would like to know if they obtained any further information, since the opening of the Session, on this subject. Did matters remain in the same position? If he recollected aright, quarantine was declared for a certain time.

Mr. POPE: Yes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: Would it expire on the 17th of next month?

Mr. POPE said he feared they would not be able to dispense with it without exposing Canadian cattle to be slaughtered on their arrival in England. The matter depended on Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. BAIN.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that it would be better to continue the blockade in the West than to have Canadian cattle slaughtered immediately on their arrival in England.

Mr. POPE said that he had got all the information he could with regard to the cattle in the West, and done everything he could to call the attention of the Privy Council to the difficulty and trouble this Order would cause our shippers and railroads, and, when navigation was opened, our steamboats. He had also made a representation to the Government at Washington, that, if they would send a veterinary surgeon into the Western States, the Canadian Government would send one also, with a view to a report, after a thorough investigation as regarded the disease, and in order to a representation to the Privy Council in England; also, that if the United States Government would prevent the exportation of cattle from the Eastern States into the Western States, they would see whether they could get permission from the Privy Council for the bringing of cattle from the States through Canada, on the way to England; but that Government made no reply.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had had communications with many persons largely interested in this trade, who thought it was absolutely necessary to prevent the spread of the disease into our own country, to avoid sending animals through Canada, which might be suspected of having it. The next most important thing for a trade so lucrative to us, was that it should not suffer any unnecessary injury. He had no doubt that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture would give the same attention to this in the future as in the past. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was not able to make any suggestions in the matter beyond the maintenance of a careful enquiry in order to the ending of the present interregnum as soon as possible. So long as the trade ran out of its wonted channels, there was less chance of diverting it back to the channels advantageous to Canada. No effort ought to be neglected to restore the equilibrium that existed, and that enabled us to carry a great deal of

our neighbour's trade, as well as our own.

In reply to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. POPE said that, within the last few months, as late as the 1st April, some deceased animals had been sent from Portland and Boston to England, but not in Canadian steamers. The imports from Canada into England had been perfectly free from disease. One of the propositions he made to the Privy Council was whether, if the Canadian Government made a thorough examination of the cattle in the West, and placed an inspector at the Canadian port of entry and another at the port of shipment, to see that no diseased animals were admitted, American cattle could not be brought through this country to England. The answer was distinctly this: There was no alternative; that, if cattle were brought from the United States through Canada, they must be scheduled.

Vote agreed to.

58 Towards assisting immigration and immigration expenses, including estimated expenses of transport of Mennonites.....	\$86,200 00
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

In reply to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. POPE (Compton) said that the arrangement with the Mennonites was not closed this year. The condition made with them in 1872 was that, up to 1876, they should come from Hamburg to Manitoba for \$30 a head. After 1876, up to 1882, the time during which they could leave Russia, the charge was not to exceed \$40 per head. In view of our position and the depression, and the difficulties of making ends meet, the Government felt that it was their duty to inform the Mennonites that, from this time, they must pay the \$40 per head, which was in accordance with the arrangement in 1872.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: How much does that leave us to pay per head?

MR. POPE: It would leave about \$5.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: That is very small.

MR. POPE said that for \$45 they could get from Hamburg to Manitoba. The contract was that the Dominion line of steamers should bring them from Hamburg to Quebec for \$25. At that time, he had not expected to pay much in excess of that for the additional distance, as he was calculating on transit by the Dawson route, over which they could have been carried for a small sum. The cost from Quebec to Manitoba, by Lake Superior, would be about \$20, being in all about \$45 from Hamburg. That included everything, as they would furnish their own food.

MR. DAWSON said that the Mennonites were a quiet, law-abiding people, and were very industrious. The same objections could not be urged in their case as in that of the Chinese immigration, of which they had heard the other day, because they brought their families with them, and established themselves permanently in the country, which the Chinese did not. Still, they were a community of peculiar habits and customs, and, until these were modified and changed, they would continue to be an isolated community. We had planted them in the very garden of the continent, where they would prosper and grow rich, and he (Mr. Dawson) wished them every success; but he was not sure that it would not be to their advantage, as well as to that of the district where they had settled, that they should be somewhat mixed with other nationalities—English, French and Scotch. He thought the present a good time to encourage the immigration of people of our own race, and, if they could only be made fully aware of the advantages conferred on the Mennonites, and encouraged to believe that they, also, would be planted in such a fertile district, where they and their descendants were sure to prosper, there could, in his opinion, be no doubt of our ability to induce the immigration so essential to the development of the territories which we were opening up.

MR. ANGLIN said that all hon. members who were members of this House last Session must remember that a great deal of noise was made then because, while money was appropriated for the encouragement of Mennonite settlement, no appropriation was made by the late

Government to assist the French, who were in the United States, to return to this country and settle in Manitoba. Very strong complaints were then made, but the same old policy was now being pursued. If it were a crime in the late Government to neglect the claims of the French seeking repatriation, he did not see that it could be a merit in this Government, although some members of it were those who joined in the clamour the Session before. It was strange to find gentlemen changing their views so completely when they changed from one side of the House to the other.

Vote agreed to.

X.—PENSIONS

59	John Bright, Messenger House of Assembly.....	\$	80 00
			(Mrs. Antrobus.....)

New Militia Pensions.

60	Mrs. Caroline McEachern and four children.....	\$	238 00
	Janet Anderson.....		110 00
	Margaret Mackenzie.....		80 00
	Mary Ann Richey and one child.....		288 00
	Mary Morrison.....		80 00
	Louis Prud'homme.....		110 00
	Virginie Charron and four children.....		150 00
	Paul M. Robbins.....		146 00
	Charles T. Bell.....		73 00
	Alex. Oliphant.....		109 50
	Charles Lugsden.....		91 25
	Thomas Charters.....		91 25
	Charles T. Robertson.....		110 00
	Percy G. Routh.....		400 00
	Richard S. King.....		400 00
60	George A. Mackenzie.....		73 00
	Edwin Hilder.....		146 00
	Fergus Schofield.....		73 00
	John Bradely.....		109 50
	James Bryan.....		109 50
	Ensign W. Fahey.....		200 00
	Mary Connors.....		110 00
	Mary Hodgins and three children.....		191 00
	John Martin.....		110 00
	A. W. Stevenson.....		110 00
	Mrs. J. Thorburn.....		150 00
	Mrs. P. T. Worthington and three children.....		278 00
	Mrs. J. H. Elliott and children		130 00
	Ellen Kirkpatrick and three children.....		266 00
	Mrs. George Prentice and children.....		352 00
	Mary Hannah Tempest and child.....		298 00
62	Compensation to Pensioners in lieu of land.....		7,000 00

Mr. AYLIN.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes before

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 28th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 98) To amend and consolidate the Railway Act, 1868, and the Acts amending it. —(Mr. Tupper.)

BREAKWATER AT BAYFIELD, N.S.

QUESTION.

MR. McISAAC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision this Session to continue the construction of the breakwater, commenced last Session at Bayfield, N.S.

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

GOVERNMENT BRANCH RAILWAYS TO CAPES TORMENTINE AND TRAVERSE.

QUESTION.

MR. YEO enquired, Whether the Government intend, during this year, building a branch railway from the Intercolonial Railway to Cape Tormentine; and also, a branch railway from the Provincial Railway at Prince Edward Island to Cape Traverse.

MR. TUPPER: The report of the engineer charged by the late Government to make the surveys, only came into my hands a couple of days ago, and I have

not yet had an opportunity of placing them before my colleagues.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Will the hon. gentleman lay the report on the table of the House?

MR. TUPPER: There is a motion on the paper for this report to be brought down, and I have directed that the report shall be brought down.

PORT ELGIN HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the current Session, to grant a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of improving the Harbour of Port Elgin, in the North Riding of Bruce.

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

PACIFIC RAILWAY ROUTE WEST OF SELKIRK.

QUESTION.

MR. MACDOUGALL enquired, Whether this House has been put in possession of all reports, recommendations, maps and suggestions of the Engineers of the Department of Public Works on the subject of the best route for the Pacific Railway westward from Selkirk to the Pacific Ocean; if not, whether it will not be in the public interest to lay all such reports, maps, etc., before this House as soon as possible.

MR. TUPPER: I expect to be able, in the course of a few days, to lay additional reports and maps before the House on the subject referred to. All reports and maps, consistent with the public interest, will be laid on the table of the House.

NATIONAL CURRENCY.

RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED.

MR. WALLACE said the resolutions which he was about to submit, he knew ran counter to the prejudices of the many and to the interests of some. He

had been characterised by his opponents or by the opponents of the principles contained in these resolutions, as a swindler, a fool, and an idiot. But he had only this to say to his assailants—that if their motives in opposing the principles involved were no more selfish than his, they would have no cause to regret having given expression to their views. He was content to abide by the decision of the future in regard to who was the greatest fool. It might be supposed that the opponents of the measure would have some better principles to advocate than those they condemned. He would, therefore, touch upon some of the objections that had been raised to the measure he advocated. First of all, paper money had been characterised derisively as the rag-baby. He was not aware that abuse had ever hurt any person or question, neither did he think that abuse in this case would do anything to deter the rag-baby from becoming a fact, if the principle embodied in it was true, as he believed it to be. He contended that the present system was a worse rag-baby than the one he was advocating, because he did not propose to do anything except present a paper token that should be endorsed and have the confidence of the Government, that should be made law, and pass as a legal tender in this country. Whereas what was the fact at the present moment. The system was dishonest and a fraud. The banking system of to-day promised to pay in gold. Was it able to fulfil its promise. He found, on referring to the banking returns, that the banks had in circulation \$19,000,000 and upwards of notes promising to pay in gold. They had also over \$5,000,000 of Dominion deposits payable on demand. They had also \$598,000 provincial deposits payable on demand, and they had other deposits payable on demand, amounting to some \$31,000,000, making in all \$57,804,007. What had they in gold to represent this amount? He found that they possessed in specie \$5,922,191, as against \$57,804,007 of deposits. Then they had Dominion notes payable on demand in gold amounting to \$8,341,532, or a total of gold and Dominion notes of \$14,263,723, which was equal to a fraction less than 25c. on the dollar on their liabilities payable on demand. This statement shows that the

banks had liabilities payable on demand for over \$43,000,000, against which they held neither specie nor Dominion notes. For this amount the general public, their creditors, had no security except the solvency of the banks and their customers, and the responsibility of their shareholders, a security which, although unquestioned, could not be as good as if the whole country was held for the amount. He would ask which of the two systems was the best, which was the worst rag baby, was it the honest paper money which made no promise to pay gold, or the paper which promises to pay gold, when its promisors had not the gold to pay? Again, the Government has in circulation \$10,527,502 and had deposits in savings banks amounting to \$5,741,435, a total of \$16,268,938 against which, it held only \$2,633,916 in gold. The other \$13,000,000 was represented by the confidence the people had in the Government of the country; and he was convinced there was not a man in this country who was not perfectly satisfied with these legal tender notes, although they were only backed by a little over two millions of gold. Take the bank circulation and the bank deposits, and the Government liabilities, payable always on demand. The bank notes and deposits amounted to \$57,604,007, the Government notes and deposits in savings banks amounted to \$16,268,938; total, \$74,872,945, against which the banks held, specie, \$5,896,408; the Government held, specie, \$2,663,913; total, \$8,560,321, or about a fraction under 12½c. of gold on the dollar of liabilities, leaving unrepresented by gold, and represented by nothing but the confidence of the people in the Government, and the banks \$66,312,624. He would ask hon. gentlemen what difference in the circulation there would be if these 12½c. on the dollar were taken away? Was it not, when we came down to fact, the confidence the people had in the stability of the Government, and not the gold, which made legal tender notes pass current. Only the importer or the man leaving the country wanted gold, others never thought of it; the legal tender answered all their purposes, and if there was no gold to-day, that confidence would not be impaired in the least.

MR. WALLACE.

Another thing these honorable gentlemen said was, that this was fiat money. He would like them to show any money that was not fiat. It was all, whether gold or silver, paper or copper, fiat money. It would require something stronger, some objections more reasonable and better, than these to convince the people that an irredeemable paper money, convertible into everything, was not a correct system of money. Again, it was said we were taking up the worn-out clothes of the United States. That country, it was said, had gone back on the paper money, and was resuming specie payments. There was no such thing in the United States as the resumption of specie payments, as we understood it. A man could not take up a National Bank note there and go to any of the banks and demand gold for it, as banks were not bound to pay gold. It was true they were equivalent to gold, and the banks, as a matter of convenience to their holders, might give gold for them, but they were not payable in gold, and there was no place where gold could be had by right for them. Greenbacks, or legal tender notes, were exchanged for gold at the Sub-Treasury Office in New York, in sums of not less than \$50. As we understand specie payments, a dollar note ought to be payable in gold, by the party issuing it, anywhere, if required. It would have been impossible for the United States to have paid gold to even that extent, had it not been for other circumstances that had materially changed the state of things in that country. For the last three or four years the United States had been exporting more than they imported, the effect of which was that gold had been brought into the country to the extent of sums varying from \$19,000,000 to \$257,000,000 a year, for the last four or five years, showing that gold was not wanted, and the much-abused legal tender note was to-day considered better than gold. There was, therefore, no such thing as a resumption of specie payments, as we properly called it. To prove how impossible it would be, he would cite the last returns, which showed that they had not a tithing of gold equal to the currency in circulation. On the 1st November, 1878, paper

money in circulation in the United States was National Bank notes, \$319,000,625 ; legal tender, \$346,000,681 ; a total of \$666,000,333. Against that how much specie did they hold. The banks in New York and elsewhere held of coin and bullion \$17,394,111 ; in the treasury there was \$144,539,441 ; total, \$161,933,552, as against a total currency in circulation of \$666,383,137. How was it possible for the country to pay \$666,000,000 with \$161,000,000 ? It was impossible. But gold was not wanted to the full amount. There was but one man in the country, the importer, with the exception of the man who was about to leave the country that wanted gold. For all the internal trade of the country, which was vastly greater than its exports and import trade, the currency was equal, and, in some instances, better than gold as he would show. Another thing with which the opponents of this policy attempted to frighten the people was a depreciated currency. What was a depreciated currency ? If a thing would buy its full value it would not be a depreciated currency. Look back to the old bank of Upper Canada which issued notes for which it promised to pay 100c. on the dollar in gold, and could not pay 50c. in gold. That was a depreciated currency. The Commercial Bank showed a depreciated currency also, because it could not pay its notes. The Colonial Bank, the Bank of Brantford, the International Bank, the Farmers' Joint Stock Company, and numerous other banks, which purported to pay gold, but could not do so, their notes were a depreciated currency. The legal tender note only promised to pay an indebtedness. It did not promise to buy a given quantity of gold, a given quantity of flour or butter, or anything else, but it promised to pay its face value of any article in the country in which it is made the money of the country. Hon. gentlemen would distinguish between money of the country and money out of the country. Money was only money in the realm in which it was created ; when it went beyond that it was only a commodity. Its value was its purchasing power in the country where it was issued, because beyond that it was of no value. He had shown them what constituted

a depreciated currency. They might as well apply the term to gold, because it did not at all times buy the same quantity of flour, and then was a depreciated currency. In that case they would say flour had gone up ; in the other case, where the paper dollar lost part of its purchasing power, they would say the currency is depreciated. But the paper was not depreciated, it paid its face value, and never purported to do more. But, admitting it was a depreciated currency, it was not half as bad, in the interest of the country that issued it, as the depreciated property that we now had under certain circumstances. This currency would only be depreciated when it was brought into contact with values outside the country. If the country imported more than it exported, the result would be that the currency, or money, of that country from which we exported, would be wanted to pay for the difference between the imports and exports, and, if the currency were not valuable outside, it would take more of it to pay the difference. The effect of that would be, the importer, and he alone, would feel the loss sustained by the depreciation of the currency. There would be no lack of money to meet the requirements of the country. If the importer imported more than the country required, and had to give more for the gold than his circumstances warranted, he would properly come to grief, because he had mismanaged his business. The state of things now was infinitely worse than a depreciated currency ; it was a depreciated property. The exports were not sufficient to pay for our imports, and the consumer had to find the gold to pay for the excess of the former, and the fact of gold being scarce required great sacrifice on his part to obtain it. All property became depreciated, and the result was collapse of trade and ruin. In this case the value of all property suffered, while, in the former, it was only the man who over imported that felt the effects of a depreciated currency. Which, he would ask, was the worst, a depreciated currency, admitting it was depreciated, which he denied, or a depreciated property, that created trade disaster and brought ruin in its wake such as was seen to-day ? He contended that the depression we were

suffering from was not from a legitimate cause, but simply from the fact that we had too little money in circulation, and credit was at present destroyed. He thought, therefore, that a depreciated currency was not so bad as a depreciated property resulting from an over importation of goods as compared with the exports. In any country where gold was the basis of its currency, and it had to be withdrawn to make up the vacuum between the exports and imports, the circulating medium of the country was withdrawn and the stoppage of trade was the result. Look at what the much abused greenback did for the United States. The credit of the Union, the Union itself, could not have been maintained except through it. Every one knew that the United States borrowed all they could, that their bonds and promises to pay were selling at one time at 35c. on the dollar, and that they could not borrow a dollar more. All the gold they could get from their own banks was about \$12,000,000, but they afterwards succeeded, by their legal tender notes and fractional currency, in getting from the people a loan of between from \$400,000,000 and \$500,000,000 free of interest. The result was that the people of the whole country had the use of \$346,000,000 since the year 1864, the year in which it was issued, and the interest upon that at 5 per cent. would be \$260,000,000, showing that the American people got, principal and interest, over \$600,000,000 that never cost the Government a cent. If they had borrowed that amount of money from outside, they could only have done so at a third of its face value, and they would have had to pay 5 per cent. interest to outsiders on the whole sum, or \$260,000,000, and to-day would have owed \$346,000,000 for the \$120,000,000, or \$140,000,000, which they would have got if that amount in bonds had been sold out of the country. Other causes, besides the issue of money, operated on the American currency. It was not due entirely to the amount issued that it depreciated in value. For, on looking at the returns of that country, it would be found that, in 1864, when they had \$833,718,000 of paper money in circulation, it was only worth 38c. and a fraction in gold on the dollar; that the

very next year, when they had \$983,000,000, or \$150,000,000 more, in circulation, their currency was worth 71c. and a fraction in the dollar, so that everyone must see that it was not the issuing of the quantity of currency so much as the fact that the people of the world believed the American nation was going to pieces, and would never be able to redeem its liabilities, which caused the depreciation in 1864. Even the American people themselves did not believe the Government would be able to outlive the war, and thought that their money would be of no value. It was worth twice as much in 1865 as it was in 1864, although in 1865 they had \$150,000,000 paper money more in circulation than in 1864. There was another reason why the paper money of the United States became depreciated. They decried their own credit. The Government issued this money to pay all the debts it owed the people, but would not take it in return for debt the people owed the Government. They said: If you owe a debt to the Government you must pay it in gold, but you must take this paper money for any debt owed to you. Every man knew what the effect of any country repudiating its obligations must be. Its currency must come down in value. Americans discriminated between their own money and gold, not from choice, but from necessity. They wanted gold to buy materials to carry on the war: they could not get them at home and they had no credit abroad—they had to get gold to buy their goods, therefore, they had to discriminate against their own money, and so it became unequal to gold. These two facts contributed far more to depreciate paper money in the United States than all other circumstances. But he would inquire what money was, that we might have a proper understanding of it, because, although even all men liked to get money, they would fight for it, toil, rob and murder for it, yet he believed there was a great misapprehension as to the nature of money. It was neither a product of nature nor of labour, it was impossible to produce it by either. It was neither gold, silver, copper or paper, nor any material substance, it was simply a creation of Government. It could be made

out of anything, and, therefore, could be nothing of itself. In this country we had gold, silver, and copper money, and in the common acceptation of the term, we had paper money also. This latter was made a legal tender for all that it promised to pay; but when you looked into it, these promises to pay had only 12½c. on the dollar in gold at their back. Yet there was not a man in Canada who was not as well satisfied, nay better satisfied, with the paper money of Canada than with the gold, because it was convenient to carry. Give a man \$1,000 in gold, and although he would like to have it very well, he would change it into paper because it was more convenient to carry about with him. He could stick a \$1,000 note into his pocket, and never know it was there. He said it was the creation of a Government, but it was more, it was a legalised measure. It was more than a legalised measure, it was a token of value, it was a convenience, and it was a power. He would like to ask hon. gentlemen, why insist on a measure being made of any particular material? Why insist that the measure of value—which money was—should be made of gold any more than a yardstick; why a measure of cloth should be made of gold? There was no reason for it, in his apprehension. Look at the absurdity of the thing—it would embarrass commerce, embarrass the exchange of production. Admit for a moment that a yard measure must be made of some particular kind of wood that was not common in this country, and that no other measure should be or could be used, what would be the effect of that? All the transactions of the country would be brought to a stand-still, or nearly so, on account of the difficulty of getting the measure. Men would substitute something else for it, as they do now for money. Gold, as a measure, was so scarce that men substituted credit for it. So they would substitute for the gold yardstick one of pine, or of white ash. But suppose, for a moment, that an edict was passed that a golden measure, or a foreign wood measure, was the only legal measure, some men would say: I shall not take the cloth by any other measure. Look at the derangement of trade in the case. All would have to get these measures,

and trade would have to be stopped until they did get these measures. Would it not be a great inconvenience to have such a measure? But why should measures be limited? Why should not the measures be as numerous as the requirements of commerce demanded? Then why should we not have all the money required by the commerce and business of the country? Why should there be any limit to the measures of value any more than to any other measures we used? He thought there should be none, and if any hon. gentleman would give the matter serious consideration he would see the absurdity of having the measures limited. Then again, he held that an article of value was not fit for a measure, simply because being a changing quantity it could not be a measure. What would be the value of a yard measure that to-day was two feet eleven inches, next day two feet nine inches, and next day three feet one? The thing would be an absurdity, and this must be the case with any measure made of value, because, being itself a commodity, and subject to the law of supply and demand, it must be a changing quantity. Therefore, he contended that an article of value was not fit for a measure, and, therefore, that gold was not fit for a measure. In the first place it was not abundant enough to enable us to have a sufficiency of the measure, and because it was a changing quantity, unless, as was the case now, we made a fixed quantity of it by declaring by law that it was worth so much, and that was the only way we could make it a measure at all. Again, it was not fit for a measure, because it would not measure its own value—it was measured itself, its cost was the labour expended in finding it. A man who was starving would give all the gold in the world for a loaf of bread, so the man who was dying of thirst would give all the gold in the world, if he had it, for a drink of water. Therefore, when the system said that gold could measure anything, the thing was the most palpable absurdity that a man could utter. The only measure of anything, the true measure of everything, was man's necessities, just what a man would give of his labour for that which he wanted. What a man wanted to do with gold, what its use would be worth to him, was the mea-

sure of its value. Then, again, money was a convenience. Every man would admit that neither gold, silver, nor copper money was as convenient as paper money, not being as easily transmitted from place to place, nor so easily carried around as paper money. Money as a legalised value gave gold, which was money and the standard of value, an unjust supremacy over all other values, because if gold was scarce every other value was lessened or destroyed without reference to its cost or to its usefulness, which was its intrinsic value. Then, again, it was a power,—and here he held was where money did the greatest wrong if limited in quantity. It destroyed production in this way: You take money that is of value, and that value difficult to be got, and limited in quantity, what was the effect of it upon production? No one value bore any proportion to all other values, but by law we make one value measure all the others, and it measured them in this way: It made them go down in value until the greater meets the lesser, and in putting them down it put production out of existence. For instance, it takes so much labour, or the proceeds of labour, to buy a little gold, that men cannot live by labour. He believed that to-day one of the great causes of trouble was the scarcity of money or gold, which is the purchasing power, had put labour out of existence. Look at the absurdity of it—before a man could exchange his labour for bread he must have gold in between. And it being scarce it took so much of his production to buy a little gold that he could scarcely get bread enough to eat with his labour. If there was no gold in this country then, according to the principle now prevailing, we could do no business at all, because gold was the only legal measure, the only legal value, and consequently commerce must be at an end, all production must cease, and men must starve. The argument, therefore, of those hon. gentlemen who urged that gold was a necessity of commerce, had no logical sequence, it was an evident absurdity; and he also held that, in the power of money, the greatest wrong was in that way committed. For instance, he held that it ought to be true in political economy that the more a man worked the more he ought to have, and that the

measure of his ability to purchase ought to be his ability and willingness to work. But was that the case? No. As it stood now, his ability to purchase was measured by the gold he could get by his labour. Was that right? The fact was that labour destroyed itself. The abundance of labour, instead of making more happiness, and giving the laborer more comforts, gave him less, because it made his labour less valuable as compared with gold, and because there was a limit to gold in comparison with labor and its products, to the extent that labour almost went out of existence if there was no gold. There is where the great wrong was done; that we made gold the purchasing power, or money the purchasing power, and, under our system, gold was money, and the only money that the law recognized, except the legal tender notes we had issued, and they were promises to pay gold. The wrong consisted in making the workingman, before he could purchase, exchange his labour into gold with which to purchase, instead of allowing him to exchange his labour, by some easy and convenient method, into the labour of some other man. A man who wanted labour ought to be able to exchange it freely and easily without the interference of gold, which was difficult to be got, and which took so much of the labour to get the purchasing power that the latter was almost destroyed. Now, look at paper money for a moment. He had said it was the best money as a measure, because it had comparatively no value of itself, and therefore was not a changing quantity. It might change in this way, however: If you made it abundant, it would have less purchasing power, but, just in the same way, if you brought into the country a large quantity of gold and put it in circulation, you decreased its purchasing power as you decreased the purchasing power of paper money by increasing its quantity. But what was the fact? When hon. gentlemen were talking of the great advance made by commerce in the last half century, they forgot that the great discoveries of gold in California and Australia gave a circulating medium to the business of the world that enabled it to expand. Gold became less valuable, and other articles went up in value, and that was the effect of the laws of supply and demand. The great

feature of money was that, if you increased it in quantity, other articles which it purchased had a tendency to increase in value. Now, paper money being an article of no value, it could never of itself change; it would only represent the power that the law printed upon it. He maintained that paper money afforded the true system of protection to industry—a far better system than customs duties, which were merely a tax upon industry; but these collections of taxes were the method adopted for protecting our industries from coming into injurious competition with foreign industries. We placed a toll-gate on our frontiers, and allowed no one to come in without paying the toll. But paper money would afford industry the means of protecting itself. For illustration: our country imported more goods than it exported, and money had to be found to make up the difference, that is to say, gold had to be found, or its equivalent, because no country would accept as money the money of any other country except gold, or some article of equal purchasing power. If the imports were large, or likely to be large, or if the crops were likely to be short, the importing merchant seeing this, and seeing that gold was going to be scarce, that there was not going to be exports enough to pay for his imports, what did he do? He saw that he had to pay more for the gold and placed a higher price upon his imported goods, to cover the cost of converting them from the money of the country into gold. In this way paper money would afford true protection to production at home, because it increased the value of imported goods, and stimulated the production of articles in the country. Then again he contended that paper money gave stability to the Governmental institutions of the country. A man who held his money in gold could put it in his pocket and walk away if trouble came upon the country, but a man who held his wealth in the money of the country, must stay there, and must use it there, because it was comparatively of little value outside, and if there was a revolution in this country it would be valueless elsewhere altogether. Therefore it was his interest, as well as his duty, to remain in this country, to maintain its governmental

institutions. He had said that paper money had, of itself, no intrinsic value; gold itself had very little intrinsic value either. Take an article of food, it had an intrinsic value, beside the labor it cost to produce it; that is, its value as an article for the sustenance of life. Both paper money and gold had a purchasing power, but gold had a purchasing power all over the world on account of the value put upon it by law. But of what value was gold as an article of use to man? Very little indeed. The savage used it to decorate his person, the civilised man to decorate his house as well as his person; but, compared with food or clothing, it was scarcely of any intrinsic value at all. Paper money had just as much value as gold, so far as its legal value was concerned. It was money just as much as gold in a country where it was made money. The two articles as money were on a par in the countries in which they were made money. Then, as far as the purchasing power was concerned, it was regulated by the law of supply and demand, the one just as much as the other. Increase the quantity of either, and the effect was at once to raise the price of everything that you bought with either of these values, because both were inevitably subject to the same laws, and it was impossible to increase the supply of anything without decreasing its value. It mattered not whether it was labour or the production of labour, gold, silver, or anything else, they had only to increase the supply in order to lessen the value. He had endeavoured to show what money was not; what, in his estimation, money was, and what were its uses, and that paper money was the true, the best money. He proposed now to show how it could be utilised by the people of this country. They were all the time borrowing. He believed that any country that borrowed was going to ruin. One party accused the Finance Minister of the other with not having made as good a loan as his predecessor, but he (Mr. Wallace) apprehended that both did equally well if they put the loans upon the foreign market on the same principle. There could be no difference, except in the terms on which the loan was offered. If one Finance Minister

went to the old world and put his loan on the market at a certain price, and got it, he did not know but he could have obtained more. Another went to the same market and fixed the least price he would take, leaving it to open competition, knowing that he would thus get the best price, which was certainly the better plan of the two. In the difference of the plan the superiority or inferiority of skill was shown. Both were just in the position of all men borrowing, who were compelled to give the men that had the money what they asked. What did they see? They saw this great country, backed by its enterprising and intelligent population of 4,000,000, the almost untold wealth of its mines and forests and fertile lands, compelled, when they wanted to expend \$1,000,000, or \$1,500,000, to send the Finance Minister, hat in hand, to England, to the Jews of Lombard street, to ask how much they would give him on his securities. Was not this a humiliating position? He contended it was not a necessary position. If they would allow the intelligence of this people, backed by their enormous resources, to set to work, they could carry on their public works without borrowing from abroad. He contended that if Canadian credit and Canadian resources were good enough to build them with the intervention of English and foreign capital, they were good enough, if they could utilize them, to do so without it. No man, for a moment, would contend that the Englishman, or any other man, was going to invest his money simply for the benefit of the Canadian people. If he invested, it was because he believed it to be to his own interest, and he hoped and believed that when inducing the English capitalists and others to invest in this way, Canadians expected they would be repaid. He trusted the people of Canada had not come so low as to want to cheat them out of their money. They might cover the Canadian Pacific Railway from ocean to ocean with gold and it would not build a yard of the road. It would employ labour which must build it. He believed that Canadian resources could be utilised in a better way for employing Canadian labour than by borrowing gold upon them. He proposed to submit a plan by which it

could be done according to his sincere belief. Meantime, people of this country were boasting of their prosperity all the time. Now, what did this pile of buildings, for example, in which they were assembled,—and of which they were so proud—represent—was it Canadian prosperity? No; but rather Canadian degradation, as being the evidence of Canadian indebtedness. It was the same with their Canadian railways, which were not, either, evidences of Canadian prosperity. Every \$90 out of \$100 invested in those roads belonged to English people, Canadians having but little interest in them, except in their working. Then go down to individuals, and see what the people were doing. The farmers, through the various loan societies, had mortgaged their farms in many instances, the process continuing daily. A large portion of the business of the professional men throughout the country was connected with those mortgages, for which the societies borrowed money from England, at a less rate of interest, loaning it afterwards at rates impossible for our people to pay. The result had been and would be that their farmers and business men had gone and would go to the wall through borrowing money at extravagant rates; and this was what the Canadian people had been calling prosperity. It was his firm belief that the continuance of this system would lead either to Canadian slavery or knavery. Either the Canadian people must become slaves or knaves—must repudiate or become slaves to enable them to repay. They had wealth in this country, and if they could sell large debentures in England could we not sell small ones here to our people? They had lands enough, and let them utilise them for building their public works, and see what their people could do. After the United States had exhausted their power to borrow from abroad, they made a loan at home of \$300,000,000 which the people took up, to the advantage of the country. Some hon. gentlemen might say it was Protection that gave the impetus to the manufacturing industries of the United States; he believed it was the much abused paper money of that country that did the most in that direction. Protection helped, but paper money gave the

people the wherewith to start manufactures, cheap money enabling them to compete with the cheaper labour of England and other countries. The labour was higher in the United States than in them, but the difference between money and 3 and 10 per cent. had much to do in the decision as to whether they should have manufacturing industries in a country or not. The result of putting that large amount of money in circulation in the United States, although for the destruction of property and life, bringing no useful return, was to start manufactories, because every man had money and wanted to use it to make it worth anything, it being so cheap. But returning to this country, he would try to show how they could utilise such money and the public credit. It was not a credit if they gave a paper dollar for a man's labour; he had earned that money, and, so far as he was concerned, there was no credit about it. Therefore, he contended that this was not credit for the people as a whole, for the people had the work of the man to represent the dollar. It was only giving an acknowledgment in the shape of money, and utilising it as a means for the payment of the people by the Government of the people. The people as a whole could not credit themselves. If they borrowed from outsiders then they owed a debt, but what the country owed to itself was not a debt. They had any extent of wild lands unoccupied, and forests and minerals, and could make iron, and wood-work out of their timber. All they wanted was labour. Let them issue legal tender notes to pay for that labor, and make them convertible into lands of the Dominion, or into bonds of 4, 5 or 6 per cent. interest, for which lands would be sold. At the same time that they issued this land scrip, and commenced building the public works, let Dominion land prospectuses be issued fixing the price of lands within a given distance of the railway; and before the 10 or 15 years that would be required to construct this road—a period long enough—they should have the railway finished, and the money paid for finishing it, back into the hands of the Government for the payment of its lands, those of the Executive of the people, and therefore the people's. So, in that way, the road would be built

without creating indebtedness either upon individuals of this country, or the people as a whole. He would ask hon. gentlemen on both sides to consider whether it was not possible, by utilising their own resources, to do better than by mortgaging them to the people of England, or any other country? He believed that they could, and that there was not a moment to be lost in the adoption of this or some similar principle; because, if any country ever wanted assistance, Canada did at present, when everything was at a standstill, when no man knew whom to trust, or when or how business could be done. Such a scheme would give instantaneous relief to the industries of this country, and Canada, under such a system, would take a bound. It was not the kind of system they had had of late. They knew that only a false and fictitious prosperity could be created by borrowed money, which always went out of the country again, and when it was gone left a depression as great in proportion as was the apparent prosperity by which it was preceded. The Dominion owed \$170,000,000, that entered in the shape of gold to build its railroads and other works. Where was it now? All that was left of it, apparently, was \$8,000,000, all the rest having gone out to pay for imported goods. During the time that money was in circulation, they had a false prosperity—created, not by production or by the labour of the country, but by the increase of the price of both by borrowed money. They then spent more on luxuries; but, in a few years, the money was all gone, and they came down to hard pan, with years and years of depression, such as they now suffered from. The money spent on the Intercolonial Railway, and by the municipalities of Ontario and Quebec to build railroads, had all left the country, and the people were now called upon to pay interest on those loans, without the money to do it. And, to-day, what do we see? Bankruptcy and ruin everywhere. For the last three or four years this country had been borrowing to pay interest on its indebtedness. By adopting this plan, money would be more plentiful in the country, would create production, stimulate industries, and would not go away. Which of the two systems was the best in the interest of Canada? If they believed as he

did, they would adopt the system he proposed, and without the loss of a moment. Contrast the two systems briefly. Every now and again they heard of waves of depression, which phrase was thought sufficient to explain disastrous conditions, of which they ought to find out the real causes. He understood depression brought on by the forces of nature, such as a storm, inflicting untold misery by destroying the food of the people, but he could not understand depression bringing severest misery in its train without apparent cause. What did they see? Often the hard earnings of a lifetime gone in a night without any reason; and men, whose arms were paralysed by hunger, willing to work and unable to find it to do. And why no work? Was it because the people had all the comforts that work would create? No; because look abroad and they would see an infinity of suffering men—millions suffering and almost naked, hungry and homeless; and yet people would say there was no work to do. Why was this suffering? It would be said it was on account of one of those waves of depression which periodically sweep over the world. If it was not due to natural causes, it must be due to false regulations imposed on society. He believed that the cause of the depression from which we now suffer was due to the present system of money. They had idolised gold, placed it on a throne, made it master of the world, and, to-day, it was crushing the life out of capital and destroying labour. Yet, when people spoke of anything like this scheme, that he believed would have the effect of alleviating the prevailing suffering, and relieving their industries from their present paralysis, there was no better argument to hurl against them than that it was a rag baby, that its advocates and the opponents of hard money were swindlers and fools. The supporters of the present system undertook to do what was a physical impossibility; they undertook to make the lesser contain the greater; they undertook to say that gold, which bore no comparison at all to the other products of the world, should measure them; they said that it was the only legal value. Could hon. gentlemen say, dare they say, that it was such a perfect system that it should not be touched, that no substitute should be sought for it? And yet they

were following a course which would destroy the labour and industry of the country. They were advocating a system which must involve both capital and labour in one common ruin, and putting both within the grasp of gold and of the usurer. Although the fetters were golden and glittering, they were not the less cruel. They were as inexorably destroying both capital and labour, as the locomotive destroyed the unfortunate victim who, whether through accident or design, came in its way. The cause of the depression to-day was that there was not gold enough to carry on the business of the country. Take the commercial transactions of the world, and ninety out of every hundred were done on credit, because there was not sufficient circulating medium. Let hon. gentlemen look back and see if those credit transactions were not the beginning of the cause—the sole cause he might say—of the terrible burdens imposed on the workingmen and business men of the world to-day. When Jay Cook & Co. failed, other business men were brought down, and these brought others with them, with whom they were involved in business transactions. Credit collapsed, and the whole fabric fell like a child's house of cards. So credit was adopted simply because there was not gold enough to carry on the business of the world. They had undertaken to do what could not be done. They had substituted credit which had been followed by the abuse of credit, and credit itself was the result of a false system compelling gold to be the only medium of exchange, the only legal value. It did not matter how much a man had in the shape of wealth—if he owed \$1,000 and had \$10,000 worth of property, if he had not the gold he would have to give that \$10,000 worth of property for his \$1,000 indebtedness, for which his creditor insisted on being paid in gold. And that, he (Mr. Wallace) believed, was the cause of the wave of depression that swept over the commercial cities of the world. He asked if that system—if it had that effect on the people—could be called a system of perfection? On the other hand, he proposed a system that would be as expansive as the industries of the country. It was not difficult to give, because paper money was easily made. Hon.

MR. WALLACE.

gentlemen might say he proposed to make the country rich by making money. He never knew any Government make a country or any people rich; but Governments could do this. They could give facilities for becoming rich—means whereby industries could be developed. If hon. gentlemen said it was impossible for a Government to make money, then he (Mr. Wallace) was at issue with them. It was only the Government that could make money. But nothing would make a country rich except nature and the wealth that labour produced. This was the only true wealth of a country. There was no wealth that was not the creation of labour, either active or accumulated, because capital was only labour realized. Nature and labour were the only producers, and, therefore, the only enrichers of a country. It might be said that because paper money had been abused in the past, this measure should be opposed now. He had no doubt that hon. gentlemen who would take the opposite side of this question would tell the House about the French assignats, Continental money, and speak of American greenbacks, refer to George Law's scheme, and tell them about the money of the Southern Republics. But they might as well say a man should not drink water because he could be drowned in it, or approach fire because it burned, as to say they should not use paper money because it had been abused. He wanted hon. gentlemen, when they spoke about those things, to remember the difference between money and a promise to pay. Money completed a payment, whilst the other was an agreement to pay, and only transferred the indebtedness. An agreement to pay became valueless when there was nothing to pay it with. A man who sold 100 bushels of wheat and got \$100, accomplished a complete transaction, but he was no wealthier than he was before; he had only exchanged his wheat for money. He held that the adoption of this system of financing would do away with the waves of depression, because it would, in a great measure, put an end to the credit system by which they were produced. He held that this system of money would be expansive and keep pace with the growing industries of the country, and that it would benefit the whole people of

Canada. It would do away with the necessity of borrowing from abroad, and thereby save interest. He noticed that the interest on the public debt of Canada amounted to \$7,000,000, or \$1.75 per head of the population. Well, he proposed, in these resolutions, that the Government should issue \$10,000,000 annually for carrying on the public works of the country. They were now paying \$1.75 for interest; could they not, to far better advantage, invest in the securities of this country to the extent of \$2.50 per head of the population? That would be \$10,000,000. For instance, a man with a family of four would subscribe to the extent of \$10, and he did not think there was a laboring man in the country that could not invest to that amount in these securities. He thought it could easily be done. In this way, our public works would be built and our country benefitted. If this plan were adopted, it was his belief that the man who saw Canada to-day would not know her ten years hence.

MR. CHARLTON said the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) had frequently advocated, upon the floor of this House, the views put forth to-day, and, while believing that the views embodied in these resolutions would be not only detrimental but ruinous to the interests of Canada, still the hon. gentleman was sincere in his advocacy of these resolutions, and his sincerity warranted him in the expectation that his views should be received with courtesy. That the issue of inconvertible money would quicken industries, and increase the national wealth in some mysterious way, was a fallacy which, though often exploded by irresistible logic, and the practical lessons of cruel experience, continually cropped to the surface, as it did in Canada to-day. In his opinion, circumstances were likely to arise in this country within a short time, which would make this fallacy peculiarly dangerous. They had recently, under the leadership of the hon. members on the Treasury benches, entered upon a fiscal revolution, one of the effects of which would, he believed, be to diminish the revenue of this country. He believed that another effect of that policy itself, already foreshadowed by the manner in which it was received in England, would be to greatly impair

the credit of the country. Then the views advocated by the hon. gentleman would become peculiarly dangerous, and then the party in favour of the inconvertible, irredeemable issues of paper money, might become a powerful party, possibly the dominant party in Canada. The hon. gentleman affirmed in the first resolution that money was the creation of Government. That was an error, from which the hon. gentleman proceeded to draw false deductions. He (Mr. Charlton) denied that money was the creation of Government. The time once was that mankind in their transactions had to resort to barter; such a thing as a measure of value or medium of exchange had no existence. They had to confine themselves to the exchange of commodities; under such circumstances trade was crude and limited, and extensive commercial transactions were impossible. Under these circumstances, necessity, the mother of invention, compelled man to invent money. It was not created by Government; it was invented by man. Various articles had, in times past, served for money. Cattle had been used as money; cowrie shells were used among the Africans, and wampun belts made of shells, had been used among the American Indians as money; various articles had, in different countries, at different times, served the purpose of money. But there was one essential requisite it must possess, that was, value. That was the first requisite. Now, the hat before him (Mr. Charlton) possessed value. It possessed a specific purchasing power. If he found a man who wanted that hat, and was willing to give in exchange for it something that he (Mr. Charlton) wanted, that hat formed the basis of a barter, and had a specific purchasing power. The article chosen to serve as money must in itself possess value and have a specific purchasing power. The next step was to make the article chosen as money and possessed of value generally valuable, and to give it a general purchasing power, thereby making it a measure of service and a medium of exchange in which the terms of all values could be expressed, for which all commodities could be exchanged; or which could be exchanged for any and all commodities at the pleasure of buyer and seller. The

MR. CHARLTON.

money invented to serve this purpose was not created by Government; it could only be regulated by Government. The Government stamped upon a \$20 gold piece, a doubloon, or a sovereign, its money value. The public took that stamp as evidence of the fact that that piece of money had a certain degree of fineness and weighed a certain number of grains. Should the Government put their stamp upon a coin that weighed only one-half it professed to do, or that was of base metal, the coin would not pass current; it would be a debased coin. The coin that passed the Government mint did not owe its current value to the Government stamp, but sold within a small fraction of its expressed value for commercial purposes or the arts. For certain good reasons, gold and silver had been chosen as articles that should be made money. They had an account of a commercial transaction which had occurred 3,800 years ago, when Abraham purchased a burial place of Ephron, and paid him 400 shekels of silver, current money with the merchant. In that remote age, silver was used as money, as the medium of exchange. There were good reasons for selecting silver and gold to serve the purposes of money. Naturally, men looking out for some commodity possessing value, for money purposes, looked for something which had a steady value. These precious metals possessed a comparatively steady value for several reasons. First, because a steady demand existed for purposes of art, and steadiness of value would be more completely secured by their use as money. Next, the cost of production was tolerably uniform; they were produced at the cost of great labour and expense, which secured steadiness of value. During the last 1,000 years there had been but two material changes in the value of these precious metals. First, in the sixteenth century, when the mines of Mexico and Peru were discovered. Next, in this century, when gold was found in California and Australia. With these two exceptions, gold and silver had maintained their values, almost without variation, for many centuries. They were eminently suitable for money, also, because of their quantity. The quantity in circulation was enormous; so enormous that the amount annually

produced bore no considerable proportion to it; nor did the amount annually lost by shipwrecks, etc., materially affect it; and yet, enormous as the quantity was, it did not exceed, and probably could not be produced in excess of the requirements of commerce and the arts, in consequence of which, the precious metals bore a value steadier almost than any other commodity that could be named. Another feature, as regards these precious metals, and which rendered them all the more desirable for the purpose of money, was their fluency—they passed from one continent to another, and from one nation to another, according to the laws of supply and demand. They were universal money. If gold was scarce in the United States to-day and plentiful in England, by the law of supply and demand, gold would flow from one country to another, like water seeking a level. The value, or purchasing power of gold was regulated and made uniform by this attribute of fluency throughout the whole of the commercial nations of the globe. Another reason why they were suitable for money was, because of their physical peculiarities. One of their peculiarities was, that they were uniform in quality. The silver found in the Comstock lode to-day was precisely the same in quality with that which Abraham used 3,800 years ago; and the gold mined in California and Australia to-day possessed exactly the same qualities as did the gold of Ophir which was used by Solomon in decorating the Temple in Jerusalem. Another quality which rendered it peculiarly adapted for the purposes of money was its portability. They had in gold a great value in a small compass. Another thing which rendered it peculiarly fit for the purpose was its divisibility without loss. If they took a \$20 note, and divided it into two parts, five parts, or twenty parts, its parts were worthless. But if they divided a \$20 gold piece into two, five, or twenty parts, it was still valuable. It had been divided without loss in its aggregate value. Another reason why it was admirably adapted for the purposes of money was the universal and instinctive desire of man to possess the precious metals, because they were always objects of beauty, and, lastly, it was adapted to the purposes of money because it was indestructible. Gold and

silver had been used for the purposes of money, to our certain knowledge, for 3,800 years, and during all that time the ingenuity of man had failed to discover any substitute for gold and silver for the purposes of money. As he would have occasion to show, before he concluded his remarks, men had sought out many inventions in this respect, and all of them had brought men to recognise the principle in political economy that there were great dangers attendant upon the issue of money by Governments, even while the Government professed to issue it upon a promise to pay in gold coin, while irredeemable issues had never yet failed to result in loss and disaster. There was some safeguard in respect to the issue of notes by banking institutions which did not apply to Government issues. Bank issues were paid out on loans, and almost immediately returned in the form of deposits, payment of loans, or demand for specie. So it was impossible for a bank to place in circulation a larger amount than the commercial wants of the country required. A Government, on the contrary, had not this safeguard, and notes would almost inevitably be issued in larger amounts than the healthy demands of trade required, and would not be returned to the issuer as in the case of banks. The scheme of his hon. friend from South Norfolk purposed three different modes for the floating of paper money. The first mode was provided in the third resolution, in which he provided for expenditure upon public works to the extent of \$10,000,000 annually, provided subsequent considerations did not induce the promoters of this scheme to increase the payment beyond \$10,000,000 annually, which was very likely to be the case. Now, when public money was expended upon public works in excess of the revenue which that Government received, that money at present must be borrowed. The very fact that the money must be borrowed exercised a restraining influence upon the Government. In the first place, the Government had to bear in mind the fact that, whenever money was borrowed, the interest must be provided for by taxation. That furnished one check on the acts of a Government. Another check was that a Government, on going into the markets of the world to borrow

money, must satisfy capitalists, who had money to lend, that the purpose for which the money was to be expended, was a judicious one. No capitalist would continue to lend money to a Government which was reckless in its expenditure and destroying their means of paying the interest on the public debt. Now these considerations did not obtain in the issue of Government money for the purpose of constructing public works. No such safeguard, no such restriction existed. The Government might lavish out its issues by the hundred of millions if they chose. There were no restrictions except the fear of ultimate total worthlessness of the issues, which the advocates of the scheme would not believe. The reckless sowing of millions—jobs, rings, speculations and corruption would inevitably be the result of any such system as the contemplated issue of public money, in large amounts, for the purpose of constructing public works. In the ninth resolution the hon. gentleman provided for the floating of the Government issues, by proposing to make the Government a note broker for the banks. The banks were to receive from the Government Government notes, and in return for this money loaned to them they were to deposit with the Government their notes, and also bonds of the bank as security. Now, in the first place, this scheme would involve most cumbersome details in the management of this business, between the banks and the Government. It would make an opening for manipulation and favoritism, which it was not necessary to dwell on at this time. One feature which would condemn it, apart from all others, was that it would necessarily end in the ruin of the banks, because this Government currency furnished to the banks would constantly depreciate, as he would, in the course of his remarks, satisfactorily show. The banks would be called upon to give their bonds and assets for the currency furnished to them, which was constantly depreciating, and rapidly approaching worthlessness. The third mode by which the hon. gentleman proposed to float this money was by the exchange of currency for the bonds of the Government. He (Mr. Charlton) presumed that, by this scheme, very little money would

MR. CHARLTON.

be floated, as the widening gulf between inconvertible currency and gold-bearing bonds would speedily end all transactions. In regard to the fifth resolution, he must give the hon. gentleman credit for his honesty. In that resolution he provided "That all debts or other obligations heretofore incurred shall be payable in gold or in Dominion money, at a rate that shall make it equivalent to gold, and that hereafter every contract or agreement to pay gold within the Dominion shall be illegal, and shall not be enforceable by law." The hon. gentleman was much more honest in this respect than were the originators of the greenback scheme in the United States, because no such provision was made by them. But the hon. gentleman, in making this honest provision, also made a confession. He practically confessed that it would be impolitic and dishonest to compel creditors of the Government to accept this money for loans made in gold, and therein he confessed that this money would be a depreciated currency that would constantly tend towards worthlessness. The hon. gentleman's scheme was distinguished from all other irredeemable money schemes of which he (Mr. Charlton) knew by the fact that he proposed to repudiate the gold standard. He solemnly repudiated the use of gold as a standard of value. The continental money which the hon. gentleman had referred to, and which became worthless, stipulated that the redemption should be made in Spanish mill dollars. The American greenback stipulated that the United States would pay, at some future time, in gold. He thought he knew of but one case in which Government currency issues were similar in character to those which the hon. gentleman proposed to issue. That was in the Chinese Empire in the ninth century. They used the inside bark of the mulberry tree, which bore the Government stamp, and bore a value in proportion to its size, and it passed as current money in the payment of debts without promise of redemption in anything else upon pain of death. This was an absolute money, fit to be ranked alongside with the absolute money which his hon. friend proposed to make the legal tender of the Dominion. He had in his possession a specimen of absolute money, issued as a specimen of

what fiat money in the United States would in future be if the Greenbackers succeeded, and similar to that which we should have ultimately if the proposition of his hon. friend passed into law. It was a bill for \$1,000, and was inscribed: "Absolute money for the sum of \$1,000, redeemable nowhere, in nothing, and by nobody. The law directs that this money shall circulate freely. When this note has been spent, another may be had upon application at the United States Treasury. Brick Pomeroy, Treasurer; B. F. Butler, General Distributer. Full tender for debts, public and private. Death to any man who refuses to give us more credit." The note was of "B" series, No. 59,843,702,086,231,987. On the back of the note he found inscribed: "Civilisation demands paper currency, representing no artificial value.—Francis W. Hughes." This was just the thing—"represents no value whatever." Again, "This is 'honest money,' and will make everybody honest, as no one will counterfeit it, rob, or kill for it." "When the Government has completed its work of issuing one of these notes to each individual in the nation, every person will be worth \$1,000." "This note is to be received at its face for all debts, public or private. To prevent disputes between buyers and sellers as to the amount of this money necessary to purchase any article of commerce, value and prices, in all cases, are to be fixed by the purchaser." Another inscription on the bill was, "Gold is a coward." "H. B. Wright—This money is not afraid of anybody." These were some of the characteristics that would be possessed by the absolute money, which his hon. friend from South Norfolk proposed to furnish to this country. It might be an interesting enquiry to ask how the hon. gentleman intended to provide for the payment of the principal and interest of the public debt of the country. In the United States, the Government, foreseeing that they had debts to provide for, made one exception in which greenbacks would not be received. They were not receivable for duties. Gold alone was received in payment of duties. This provision was made in order to enable the country to pay the interest on their debt, and the principal of the bonds due in gold. There was no such

safeguard provided in these resolutions. No provision was made for the payment of the interest on our indebtedness, amounting to about \$7,000,000 per annum, and, under these circumstances, it would be impossible for the Government to provide for the honest discharge of its obligations. His hon. friend, in the fifth resolution, provided "that, hereafter, every contract or agreement to pay gold, within the Dominion, shall be illegal, and shall not be enforceable by law." The hon. gentleman had mistaken his powers, even had he the power to enact laws for the Dominion. A long time ago a British king, flattered by his courtiers, imagined that he could sit upon the sea shore and stay the tide at will. He did so, but the billows of the mighty deep continued to advance. They were not informed that the laws of nature had been set aside by the enactment of Canute. The tide came in, and so rapidly that the king had to save himself from a watery grave by an ignoble flight. And so it was with his hon. friend from South Norfolk. He might enact this law, and make transactions in gold illegal, but gold was a measure of value throughout the world, and had been recognised as money throughout all ages and nations, and the hon. gentleman would be impotent to exclude the influence and destroy the functions of gold. The hon. gentleman, in the fourth resolution, proposed to establish a subsidiary coinage of silver. Now a subsidiary coinage might be kept in circulation for one or two years, but the moment the issues of this legal tender money depreciated below the value of silver as measured by gold, the silver would disappear from circulation. This was in accordance with the principles of what was known as Gresham's law, which was simply that a more valuable money would not circulate with an inferior or less valuable money, but would be hoarded and disappear from circulation. This had been the case in the United States. There, when greenbacks reached a moderate discount, silver disappeared before provision had been made for fractional currency. Provision had been made in the sixth resolution for the funding of this absolute money in bonds or in land scrip, the bonds to be paid in legal tender money when due, or to be funded in land scrip, on which in-

terest would be paid at the rate of six per cent. Now, with reference to the bonds, if it were stipulated that they were payable in gold, there might then be a prospect of funding a considerable portion of this money in bonds, but no man would think of funding legal tender money on legal tender bonds, which possessed exactly the same value as legal tender money, because those who had surpluses to invest would be astute enough to know, not only the probable utter worthlessness of the money, but of the bonds also, and, as no sane man hoarded depreciating currency, neither would anyone buy bonds payable at a future date in such currency for investment. In regard to the provision for funding in land scrip, if they calculated the emigration to the North-West at 50,000 annually, that would represent 10,000 families. These 10,000 families might each, on an average, require 100 acres of land, and that would represent an annual sale of 1,000,000 acres of land. Now, if the legal tender money was absorbed in land scrip, at a rate not exceeding 1,000,000 acres of land a year, provided that amount of land was annually settled, and the sale of land scrip did not exceed that amount, their land scrip would not depreciate rapidly, and the provision for funding currency in land scrip might afford some slight check upon the depreciation of the currency, but the instant the amount of scrip issued exceeded the demand for land, depreciation would commence, and its extent would be in proportion to the excess of supply over demand. He had had some experience in American land scrip. He was aware that the United States, in issuing land warrants for their soldiers, threw a large amount of land scrip of that character on the market, and land warrants, calling for 160 acres, had, within his recollection, been sold for \$100 within recent years, although the land, if sold in the ordinary course of business, would have brought \$200 per 160 acres. Almost all the American States had issued land scrip for the purpose of endowing colleges and other institutions, redeemable in the lands of the State, wherever such lands were situated, and these issues had always been at a heavy discount, which had sometimes been as great as fifty per cent. Such would be the character of

land scrip issued by the Government. If issued in a larger amount than the wants of the settlers demanded, as would certainly be the case, it would be the most worthless security of any in the whole class. He would now call attention to some of the general and the certain results of inconvertible paper money issues. There was a rule to which coin always conformed; it was issued, or hoarded, according to demand. Convertible paper money conformed to the same rule. It was issued, or hoarded, according to demand. To-day the banks of the Dominion had \$19,000,000 in circulation. The probability was that, in the busy season of the coming year, that amount would be swelled to \$25,000,000, and, as soon as the demand fell off, the amount would be diminished. But this was not the characteristic of irredeemable paper money. It was not issued according to demand, but was forced into circulation in excess of the requirements of commerce, and became depreciated in value. It might be argued that paper money could be issued without evil result if its circulation did not exceed the requirements of trade; but that was a question so delicate that it was most dangerous to trust it to the haphazard direction of legislation. It was a question that ought never to be entrusted to a legislative body, and that never had been entrusted to one without serious or ruinous consequences, resulting as would unquestionably be the case in this instance, were the policy of the hon. gentleman adopted. He would suppose that this Government adopted the scheme of his hon. friend, and issued such an amount of money as he might advise. Following that very speedily, if the scheme, foreshadowed in this resolution, were adopted, would be depreciation in value. Depreciation in value meant loss of purchasing power. That would affect the Government in this way: The taxes received by the Government would lose their purchasing power in proportion to the depreciation, and to that extent the Government would be under the necessity of making a further issue; then another pressure would come—a pressure that had always been an important factor in affairs of this kind. The debtors would bring pres-

sure on the Government, and demand fresh issues, in order that their debts might be more easily paid. He did not deny that one of the first results of large issues of inconvertible money would be a deceitful glow of apparent prosperity. Prices would apparently rise. Old debts would be easily paid with money constantly receding in value from the point at which it stood when the debt was contracted. Legitimate trade would speedily become fitful and spasmodic. A marked tendency of a desire to become rich without labour would manifest itself, and luxury and extravagance would follow. Next, they would have stock gambling, and, as an attendant to this state of things invariably, corruption of legislative bodies and public morals followed, which worked greater injuries to the State than the depreciation of values. After this system of the issue of irredeemable money had been in operation for a while, one of most marked speculative movements would be found to be in clothing, food and the necessaries of life. These articles would rise in value, measured by the paper money, more rapidly than any others. While this process would be going on, attempts to increase compensation of labour would be resisted; and it would be found invariably that the wages paid to the labourer in irredeemable money eras did not advance in the same ratio as did the prices of the necessaries the labourer must have. The consequence was that, while the commodities which the labourer must purchase would advance perhaps 100 per cent., his wages would scarcely advance 50 or 60 per cent. The rich man, however, who had the capital, and could forecast the operation of this system, inevitably became richer, so that the tendency of the system in all cases was to add to the burdens of the poor man and swell the gains of the rich man. As this money became more abundant, and consequently more worthless, those who had fixed incomes suffered severely. The widow and the orphan, with a pittance barely sufficient to sustain life under ordinary circumstances, would be reduced to beggary. One could imagine the consternation that would arise among the gentlemen belonging to the Civil Service of this country if this system were introduced,

which would result in giving a nominal dollar the purchasing power of, perhaps, 25c., or 50c. If the policy of the hon. gentleman from South Norfolk were adopted, he would venture to predict that in five years members of Parliament coming to attend the Session would barely be enabled to pay their board bill with their sessional allowance of \$1,000. Whoever might fill the position of Speaker would, perhaps, be able upon his salary to pay his board bill and give two entertainments in the Session. Another feature also attendant on this system was that prices were not only enhanced by depreciation, but by fluctuation. He had seen the operation of this law in the United States for years. A man buying a line of goods for which he gave his note, or even cash, and which he expected to sell at some future time, was compelled to add to his profits a margin to cover the probable fluctuation of prices, in consequence of the fluctuation of the premium upon gold, and to his certain knowledge the consumers of the United States had for twelve years paid on an average from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. more than they would have paid under the ordinary course of things, as a premium to cover the fluctuations in the prices of goods consequent upon the fluctuations in gold during the time that intervened between their purchases and their sales. As this process of depreciation, which set in with the inauguration of the irredeemable money, proceeded, the creditor continued to be robbed, because the money he received in payment of debt was certain to be of smaller value than when the money was loaned or the article representing it sold. But if, after reaching a certain point, contraction was inaugurated for the purpose of touching solid ground again, then the condition of things would be reversed, and, instead of the creditor being robbed, the debtor was put through that process. That had been the state of matters in the United States ever since the inauguration of a system looking towards resumption. From that moment, greenbacks approached par, and consequently every time a debtor paid a debt he paid it in a currency worth more than when the debt was contracted. It was estimated that more than half of the bankruptcies that had occurred in the

United States since that period were owing to that gradual process of shrinking. When speculating upon the probable result of any scheme, they might argue upon the theory as long as they liked, but it was always well if they had practical illustrations in point, to pay some attention to these. In considering this question, which was evidently going to become an important question in this country, they would do well to heed the practical illustrations resulting from the issue of irredeemable paper money, in various countries and at various times. He had referred to the mulberry bark money of China, issued in the ninth century, and found in circulation in the empire in 1160 by Marco Polo, circulated under pain of death, and which afterwards became entirely worthless. Several of the American colonies, before the revolution, tried that policy. In Connecticut, in 1740, \$1 silver was worth \$4 legal tender of that colony. In nine years later \$1 silver was worth \$8 in currency, so great had the depreciation become. Rhode Island issued paper money for the express purpose of promoting manufactures and advancing commerce. In 1763 \$1 of silver money in Rhode Island was worth \$7 legal tender, and six years after it was worth \$27, and shortly after the legal tender was abolished. Massachusetts first issued paper currency in 1690. In 1706 exchange upon London was 135; in 1749 it was 1,100. Massachusetts, about that time, received £138,000 sterling, as her share of the ransom of Louisburgh, and, with Yankee 'cuteness, she devoted that money to the redemption of legal tender in the proportion of 1 to 11, and enjoyed afterwards an enviable distinction for prosperity, in consequence of adhering to the specie standard, being in future years known as the "Silver Colony." In 1740 the paper currency of North Carolina was so depreciated that \$14 was equal to only \$1 in silver, and the same year it required \$8 of the currency of South Carolina to purchase \$1 in silver. One of the best illustrations furnished upon this continent of the natural result of this system was that furnished by the continental money of the American colonies during the revolution. Its first issue, which was payable in Spanish mill dollars, was made in 1775; eighteen months

afterwards, it stood at a discount of fifty per cent. In 1780, the depreciation had become so great that Congress felt it was necessary to make some readjustment, and they agreed to pay three and one-third cents on the dollar in promises-to-pay, and they funded their continental money in certificates, \$1 in certificates representing \$30 of continental currency. Very soon \$1 in silver equalled \$5 in certificates, or \$320 in currency. Shortly after, this money became so abundant that \$1 in silver was worth \$1,000 in continental money, and very speedily the entire system was abolished by total loss. What were the circumstances attendant upon the return to a metallic basis in the American colonies? Property was sold under execution without satisfaction of claims, and so serious were the derangements and general distress that many States passed stay laws. Massachusetts, being determined to reach a sound basis as soon as possible, refused to pass a stay law, and an insurrection broke out in consequence, which was with difficulty suppressed. The evil results of this issuing of irredeemable money were so palpable that, when the Constitution was adopted, a few years afterwards, it contained an explicit clause forbidding the States from emitting letters of credit or enacting tender laws, and it was believed the intention of the founders of that Constitution was to apply that clause to the United States. The United States Supreme Court decided that that clause did apply to the United States, but that decision was afterwards reversed by a shameful juggle, which want of time prevented an explanation of. If they turned to England, they found that the suspension of specie payments occurred there in 1797. It produced serious financial derangements, but it differed from the system of his hon. friend, in the fact that the notes of the Bank of England were never made legal tender. There was no over-issue; the bank always professed to be able, ultimately, and most of the time professed to be immediately, ready to resume specie payment, and resumption was effected in 1821. The highest rate of premium in England was about 30 per cent. during the period of that suspension. One of the most instructive illustrations of the folly of irredeemable

currency issue was furnished by France. France, in 1716, had the good fortune to have among the gentlemen who came to Paris for the purpose of pushing their fortune, a Scotchman, by the name of George Law. He talked very much as the hon. member for South Norfolk did, in listening to whom one would almost fancy he heard George Law in Paris addressing the French Council, and telling them that this idea of basing issues upon gold was a fundamental error; that one acre of land was as well worth £20, and was as good a basis for £20 in money as £20 in gold was. Law succeeded in inducing the French to believe in this theory. He established a bank in 1716, which was soon made the Royal Bank. Its issues were guaranteed by the State, and rested for security on the value of State property. This bank issued 3,019,000,000 francs in notes. The scheme ran its course in four years, after a period of wild speculation, the Mississippi scheme being a craze of the day, and in 1720 the notes of the Royal Bank of France were worth no more than waste paper, and George Law was a fugitive from justice. Time passed on; in 1789 the revolution came, and it was again proposed to issue paper money. But it was resisted in the French Assembly; they pointed to the experience of France in 1720; they said: Do not again introduce a system fraught with ruin, such as France suffered from then. Others said: Forewarned, forearmed, we know the result of over-issue in the days of George Law; such a mistake can never be made again. Church estates were confiscated, and assignats were issued, based upon the value of the church property. The first issue was 400,000,000 francs, made in the spring of 1789. The next issue, late in 1789, was 800,000,000 francs. Then great excitement prevailed in Paris. It was urged that progress towards repudiation, loss and ruin was rapid, and that such a result would certainly be reached. Then the French Assembly solemnly enacted that the total issue of assignats should not exceed 1,600,000,000 francs. The third issue was made in January, 1790, of 600,000,000 francs, which made a total of 1,800,000,000 francs, 200,000,000 francs in excess of the maximum limit fixed by the French Assembly. And

then what occurred? Why, capital withdrew from active employment, labour was in demand only where labour had to be had, business dwindled down to only what was necessary for actual living from hand to mouth. Commerce was dead, and betting had taken its place. In February, 1792, 3,400 million francs of assignats had been issued, and then the money had become so worthless that the Government could scarcely be carried on in consequence of the resignation of officials. That result had been reached, that result would be reached here, if this scheme were adopted, when their salaries would not keep the wolf from the door, in consequence of the depreciation of the currency. The Assembly felt it was necessary to do something—just as his hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) had in that resolution he had foreshadowed—stating that it should be illegal to do business in future in gold. The first step was to pass a law providing that no food or wine or any other article or necessary of life should be sold above a certain price in assignats, under severe penalty. Next, a law was passed prohibiting the purchase of specie, and the penalty for that heinous offence was six years in irons. Next, a law was passed prohibiting the sale of assignats for less than their face value, and the penalty for the offence was twenty years in chains. There was a party then in France, who held that France was for Frenchmen, and that no French capital should be invested abroad, and a law was passed visiting the penalty of death upon any Frenchman who invested his means in a foreign land. Event followed event in rapid succession, and in 1795, 238 assignats in paper were worth twenty-four in silver; in 1795 the depreciation had so far increased that 5,337 assignats in paper were worth twenty-four in silver and, a short time afterwards, 100 assignats were worth five sous. Then the French Assembly felt called upon to go into bankruptcy, and offered to pay 3¼c. on the dollar in promises. The plan adopted was to convert the assignats into mandats, one mandat representing thirty of the original issue. Speedily these mandats were worth only one-thousandth of their par value, at which rate the original assignat was worth $\frac{1}{30000}$ of par value, and very soon after this the

whole fabric crumbled to ruin and was wiped out by repudiation. Then, what followed? The Assembly passed an edict allowing transactions in any money, and, when that was passed, hoards of gold and silver were brought out, the anxiety to possess real money was so great that goods and wares were sold at a low rate. Exchange turned in favour of France, from that day. During all the wars of Napoleon, France conducted her vast military operations, and made her enormous military expenditures, on a metallic basis, as might be done in any country. That experience would last France, it was safe to say, for centuries to come. Twice, indeed, since then, the Bank of France had suspended specie payments,—in 1848 and 1870,—but at no time, during either suspension, had the premium upon gold exceeded 3 per cent. Suspension was, in each case, a precautionary and temporary measure only. Faith in speedy resumption was, in each case, unwavering. The position of the Bank of France, in each instance, was a strong one, and during its latest suspension, it had accumulated the greatest hoard of gold of which history gave any account, amounting, if his memory served him, to \$350,000,000. Time would not permit him to dwell in detail upon the experience of Russia, where, in 1834, the paper rouble was funded in silver, in proportion of $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 1; the experience of Austria, where the premium on silver in 1810 was 1,200 per cent., and where the Government funded its original issue of florins in a new issue of 5 to 1. Had he time, he might refer to Turkey, with a medley of debased coins and irredeemable notes, almost worthless; the sickest thing about the sick man of Europe was his sick finances, made sick mainly in consequence of irredeemable paper money. He might refer to the South American States, where all degrees of discount had been reached, being, in some cases, 400 of paper to 1 of silver. He might refer to the Confederate States where, before the fall of Richmond, \$100 of Confederate money was worth \$1 of silver. He might refer to Spain and Italy, he might refer even to the little negro kingdom of Hayti, while they had the hon. gentleman's panacea for commercial ills, and where it took \$100 in legal tender to buy a breakfast. They had a very interesting

MR. CHARLTON.

illustration of the evils of irredeemable paper money in recent times in the nation to the south of us. At no time did that nation profess to issue an absolute money; at no time did it profess, or intend, to pay anything but gold for its bonds, principal and interest. At all times that nation affirmed that the money issued as a legal tender should be redeemed in gold, and the people of the United States had faith that that promise would be redeemed. Notwithstanding that greenbacks were at one time worth but 34c. on the dollar in gold; notwithstanding that the United States had suffered enormous loss from the prevalence of this system in the country; to-day it owed \$1,000,000,000 more than it would have owed had its currency been kept on a specie basis. That \$1,000,000,000 represented a loss to the tax-payers of the United States, which had been produced by the suspension of specie payment, but it was only a tithe of the loss that had been inflicted on that country during the last 15 years, in consequence of the evils of an irredeemable paper currency. What had been the verdict of the American people? That country had had sad experience since 1862, of the blessings, or the curses, of an irredeemable paper currency. And what had been the action of that people? Had they retained it as a blessing? No; the United States, after an ample trial of an irredeemable paper currency, had returned to specie payment. He knew his hon. friend from South Norfolk would deny it: it would militate somewhat against his arguments if he were to acknowledge it. The American Government did, about three years ago, enact that, on the 1st day of January, 1879, they would return to specie payment. They proceeded to accumulate funds sufficient for that purpose, and on the 1st day of January they did resume, and every day since that time whoever might want gold on any United States promise to pay could have it on application to the Treasury of the United States. It was a fact that the United States had resumed specie payment. He knew his hon. friend from South Norfolk held that the supply of gold was inadequate for the purpose. There were, he believed, about 25,000 people in the city of Ottawa, and it was

a well-known fact that every man, woman or child of them was liable to die to-night, but it was not necessary to keep 25,000 coffins on hand, because it was almost certain they would not all die at once. So it was with the reserve of specie kept on hand by the United States and in Canada. All the bills in Canada, or in the United States, were liable to be presented at once for specie payment, just as all these people in Ottawa were liable to die at once, but the one event was just as likely to happen as the other. It had been ascertained from long experience and satisfactory data what reserve it was necessary to maintain to meet the probable demand for specie, and that proportion was maintained in the United States and Canada. The fact that the United States returned to specie payment furnished us with proof that they, at least, after a full and fair trial, could not see the blessings of this system that his hon. friend from South Norfolk imagined would come to Canada. Should we be blind to the teachings of experience? In all the States he had pointed out there was not one in the long weary list that could not tell of the misery, suffering, loss and ruin that were the results of such fallacious theories as those advocated by his hon. friend. He hoped it would be long before any considerable portion of the Canadian people would listen to such fallacious arguments with regard to the paper currency system of this country. He begged to move, seconded by Mr. Trow, that the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that the resolution under consideration be referred to the Committee of the Whole House this day six months.

Mr. BOULTBEE said he did not think the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk had treated the mover of the resolutions in exactly the way he should have done, and he had treated this very grave subject with more levity than was becoming. Some of his illustrations and figures were, to say the least, very unhappy ones. For instance, he showed his hat as an illustration of value. He (Mr. Boulton) took it, without having seen it closely, to be a second-hand one. Now, a second-hand hat was not a good example of a value. If a man were

driven to desperate extremity under a burning sun he might not give much for the hon. gentleman's hat. He (Mr. Boulton) questioned whether it would be of any greater value than an American \$1,000 bill. That might purchase his hat, or the hat the bill. The hon. gentleman in opening had shown that he still felt rather melancholy with regard to the tariff, as he characterised it as revolutionary. He had yet to learn that, when we had a 17½ per cent. tariff, adding 2½ per cent. more was a revolutionary proceeding. It had been found necessary to raise the tariff in order to meet the deficiency in the revenue caused by the hon. gentleman and his friends. Surely there could be nothing revolutionary in that. There could be nothing wrong in taking our national revenues to pay our national debt. The whole tone of the hon. gentleman's argument was based on the assumption that this Government, and the Government to which he had alluded, wished to issue, or would issue, under a scheme like this, an improper amount of currency. But it surely might be thought proper for a Government, in its own interest and to develop its own industries, to issue a certain amount of notes based on the property of the nation. If a Government wished to carry out certain great works, why could it not issue its own notes in payment of those works, and have those works at its back, as well as the resources of the country, to give them credit? He took it that there was no need that that currency, if issued in a proper amount, should depreciate. This currency of China, to which the hon. gentleman alluded, though it was composed of bark, or any other material, if it was based on the resources of the country, and only used for certain purposes, so that its revenue might meet the interest, and finally the principal, was just as good as any other currency. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk had manifested an extreme affection for gold, holding an idea very general in the world, that gold had some intrinsic value beyond anything else. In point of fact, however, gold had no intrinsic value, but the fancy that it had had grown up among people, because it had been for a long time accepted as the national standard of exchange. Hence it had come to have a fictitious value. He

could not go as far as the hon. gentleman's resolutions.

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

After Recess.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 99) For the relief of Eliza Maria Campbell.—(Mr. Macdougall.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 28.]

(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

THIRD READING.

Bill read the third time, on a division, and passed.

MARINE ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS ACT REPEAL BILL.—[BILL 44.]

(Mr. McCarthy.)

THIRD READING.

Order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill read.

MR. HOLTON said that, since this Bill was up, they had had two or three precedents for a reference of Public Bills to the Standing Committees. He thought this Bill ought to be referred to the Railway Committee, for it affected private rights, by the repeal of a law that touched private rights. Public Bills did not necessarily go there, but it was the usage in the case of Bills respecting railways, canals, or telegraphs that they were sent to that Committee, where enquiry could be made as to their effect on private rights. Though this was a Public Bill, it was promoted by private parties as much as if a Private Bill. He could imagine no reasonable objection to its reference to that Committee, where evidence and all parties could be heard. The Act of four or five years ago which this Bill attacked was so referred.

MR. MCCARTHY said he rose to a point of order. The order was that the House do go into Committee, therefore,

MR. BOULTBEE

the hon. gentleman's suggestion was not in order.

MR. HOLTON said that he had only to move in amendment that, instead of the Speaker leaving the Chair, the Bill be referred to the Railway Committee, to be perfectly in order.

MR. MCCARTHY said that, according to May, it was quite a different thing to move that amendment now, because the House was already directed, after a second reading of the Bill, to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider it. The hon. gentleman at the second reading could have moved its reference to a Committee, but could not now.

MR. HOLTON said that, on a point of order, it would be perfectly in order for him to move that this order be discharged, and that the said Bill be referred to the Railway Committee. Any order on the paper could be discharged on a motion in any way known to Parliamentary usage. As to the merits of the question, the hon. gentleman would find it difficult to allege any reason why the Bill should not be referred.

MR. SPEAKER said that he did not see any objection to the discharge of an Order of the House in this way which was very often done in the Canadian as well as in the English House of Commons. May, on this point, said :

"When it has not been determined, until after the second reading, to commit a Bill to a Select Committee, the Order, or Order of the Day, as the case may be, for the Committee of the whole House, is read and discharged, and the Bill is committed to a Select Committee; or, when the question is proposed for the House to resolve itself into Committee, or for the Speaker leaving the chair, an amendment may be made to commit the Bill to a Select Committee."

MR. MCCARTHY said the matter was discussed the other night, and he did not apprehend that it would have been raised again. The Bill, which was read a second time, was for the absolute repeal of an Act, saving any rights that had been acquired under it, and he was at a loss to understand why it should be referred. The House had affirmed, on the second reading, that it was right the Bill attacked should be repealed. He did not

know that the Bill interfered with any private right, but the Bill on the Statute-book did so improperly and injuriously, which was the reason he wanted it repealed. The object of the hon. gentleman was to kill the Bill, as there would not be time for its return from the Committee this Session. For that reason, if for no other, he objected to its reference to Committee, and pressed his motion.

MR. MACKENZIE said that no private rights were interfered with by the Bill the hon. gentleman sought to repeal. On the other hand, it had created rights, and some, perhaps, which the hon. gentleman might not be aware of. One company, at least, had been chartered by Parliament since that Act had been passed. A reference to a Standing Committee was to ascertain whether any such rights did exist, and what prejudicial effect the repeal of this Act would have on any existing organisations. The course now taken was very extraordinary: The very company that had been here urging legislation to protect them against the Anglo-American Company, had now an agent here practically promoting its interests, though it had been inimical to Canadian interests. The object of the Bill which it was desired to repeal was to provide for the management of the companies in the same way as the Act of 1851 provided for the management of telegraph lines on land. Three-fourths of the clauses of the Bill were of public importance, though they did not affect private interests any more than the establishment of certain rules and conditions as to the transmission of messages. But the remaining sections of the Bill, after providing for the management of such company in a general way, did affect existing companies, being intended to prevent the monopoly by the Anglo-American Company of the submarine telegraph between Great Britain and this country, and, at the same time, to provide a means whereby companies organising under our law might obtain certain rights and privileges. There could be no question that, if the repeal of the Statute affected private rights, those affected should have an opportunity of appearing before a Committee to establish them, and, if that was the case, he

believed it was absolutely necessary, as a matter of order, that such a Bill as this should go to the Standing Committee on Railways and Telegraphs, and any Bill which contained such provisions must necessarily go to the Committee appointed for the purpose of investigating such claims.

MR. HOLTON said this was precisely such a Bill as ought to be enquired into by the Standing Committee. It might affect private individuals, and it did appear to him to be a Bill repealing provisions directly affecting private interests. They could get no information in the House, and the House could not hear the promoters of the Bill, unless they were brought to the Bar of the House. The information that could be got in Committee, he need not tell his right hon. friend, could not be obtained in the House. Some information ought to be obtained as to whether the parties who promoted the original Act, were the parties who now promoted its repeal. They were the same parties in name, but the House ought to know if they were so in fact.

MR. MCCARTHY said they were the same parties in name who were now promoting this Bill, but not the same parties in fact. The old Direct Cable Company had gone into liquidation, and this company, which was now formed, had taken its place.

MR. HOLTON said this was a case that called for searching enquiry into the reason of the proceeding they were about to take. The statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that his (Mr. Holton's) obvious desire was to kill the Bill, was untrue, and, moreover, it was absurd, because the Bill could be taken to the Railway Committee, and then, coming back to the House with the sanction of a majority of the Committee, it could go through the House without any further debate. It would be treated as all Bills coming from that Committee were treated.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he was surprised to hear his hon. friend opposite allege that this Telegraph Bill was not a Public Bill, but that it was a Bill introduced for the purpose of accomplish-

ing private objects. Though he was not in the House at the time the previous measure became law, he understood it was for the purpose of promoting the interests of a private and rival company. He had the honour of being retained in that case, and he must say that in all his experience he did not remember a case of a Bill being introduced into Parliament which proposed to interfere to so enormous an extent with the private rights of existing companies. In that particular case, what had been the proposition? It was to compel the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, which had expended £7,000,000 sterling in their operations, which lay at the bottom of the ocean, to give up the privileges which they enjoyed under a contract with another country—to give up a portion of their rights and privileges to a rival company. That was what this Parliament had lent itself to. Looking at this Bill as it now stood, he had no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the honest thing for this Parliament to do was to repeal the former Act at the earliest moment, and in the most summary manner. He did not see any object in sending it to a Committee of the House, unless there were private rights, which had grown up under the operation of the previous measure. If there were any such rights, they should be protected. But surely if such rights had existed, the House would have heard something of them. Petitions would have been received, asking that this Bill be not repealed. There had been ample time for that purpose.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the actual expenditure of the Company referred to did not represent half of £7,000,000 sterling. The stock had been watered for the purpose of reducing the apparent dividend. He recollected that, while the dividends were stated in the Committee in 1875 at only 8 or 10 per cent., it was proved that the dividends amounted to nearly 20 per cent. on the actual expenditure. The Bill protected private interests which then existed and which now existed. He denied that the Direct Cable Company was in liquidation, as stated by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). They could not go into

MR. MACDOUGALL.

liquidation under existing circumstances. But the repeal of this enactment would allow them to do anything they pleased, and that was the object the hon. gentleman must have in view in repealing the Act. This Bill was not a Government Bill in the first instance, but the Government gave it their support so as to have clauses added to it, purely of a public character, providing for the management of telegraph companies, and these the hon. gentleman, in his haste, would blot from the Statute-book. At least two-thirds of this proposed Bill were of a satisfactory character to every person, but the hon. gentleman, in his hurry to get the Act repealed, would destroy the provisions for the management of such companies. He was surprised that the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government would support such a species of destructive legislation as this, instead of having legislation of a constructive, building-up character. He had no doubt in his mind that this Bill, if passed, would interfere with interests which existed at this moment, and the hon. gentleman was bound to let it go to Committee to have evidence taken to ascertain to what extent private rights were interfered with, also, to ascertain to what extent public interests, if any, were interfered with.

MR. ANGLIN said, as he understood the object of this Bill, it was to restore a monopoly. The time had arrived when an end should be put to monopolies of this sort. But they were now dealing with a Bill that declared that such monopolies ought to be maintained. It was a very serious measure, and he thought they should proceed, at all events, with due deliberation. He had never before heard it whispered that the Direct Cable Company was in liquidation. He was told, some time ago, that they were in difficulties, and they knew that for some time their cable had ceased to work. The hon. member for Lambton asserted that it was not in liquidation. He thought they had seen notices published in the newspapers which would seem to indicate that the company was still in active operation. It was asserted that they now enjoyed rights created under the Bill now on the Statute-book, and he

did not think they should sweep these away without being fully satisfied of the justice of such a proceeding. He was of opinion that they ought, as was proposed, to refer the Bill to a Committee, in order that the statements made by some hon. gentlemen, and which were contradicted almost as soon as made, might be investigated. He considered that there was a grave responsibility resting upon the Government in this case, and that the measure, if passed, should be passed as a Government measure. He believed the Government, in the former case, acted quite properly in taking the measure into their own hands. It might, of course, be said that every hon. member had a right to introduce a measure of this kind if he chose, but, while they had the existing Parliamentary system, the Government could not divest themselves of the responsibility for a measure of this kind, which undertook to restore a monopoly which a former Parliament considered it a duty to destroy.

Mr. COURSOL said the hon. member for Chateauguay had asked that this Bill should be referred to a Committee, and he (Mr. Coursol) believed, as a general rule, so far as he could judge since the beginning of the Session, that this had been done. For instance, the Bill making the 1st of July a holiday, and the Brokers' Bill, and one or two more, were referred to a Committee. But, before voting on this question, he would like to ask the hon. the leader of the Opposition, whether there had been any petition from the Anglo-American Company in regard to the measure. The Bill had been before the House since the 13th of February last, and he was not aware that any petition had been sent in against the proposed legislation.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported, read the third time, on a division, and passed.

PUBLIC BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:

Bill (No. 32) To amend an Act to provide for more effectual enquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at the Elections of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Ives.)

Bill (No. 70) To remove doubts as to the true intent and meaning of certain provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(Mr. McCuaig.)

Bill (No. 77) To make the first day of July a Public Holiday, by the name of Dominion Day.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

INSOLVENCY LAWS REPEAL BILL.

[BILL 15.]

(Mr. Bechard.)

SECOND READING POSTPONED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. BECHARD said it had been agreed that this order should stand over until the Committee appointed to enquire into the subject of insolvency had had an opportunity of reviewing the whole question. That Committee having prepared and reported a measure, he thought he could with propriety now move the second reading of this Bill. He had been urged by several hon. gentlemen to take this step, in order that the House should have an opportunity of giving a square vote upon the question of the repeal of the existing Act.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he would suggest to his hon. friend that he should not press his Bill to-night, but that he should await the discussion on the Bill prepared by the Committee which would probably be moved to-morrow. He could then raise the direct issue as to whether the House desired that the law should be repealed or not, by moving an amendment that the Bill be not read a second time, or that all the clauses except the clause which repealed the present Insolvency Law be left out. It would be unfair to the Committee and the country if, by a direct vote, his hon. friend's Bill were supported, and the consideration of the very important changes in the Committee's Bill were excluded. Even hon. gentlemen who had

strong views in favour of repeal would not desire to exclude consideration of the amendments prepared by the Committee.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said it was in the public interest that both Bills should be discussed conjointly if possible, but he did not wish to see his hon. friend's Bill jeopardised in any manner. There could be no objection to allowing the Bill to stand over until tomorrow if the Minister of Justice would allow it to go in Government orders in his name, as had been done with the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), so that the vote could be taken on it before the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead was gone into.

MR. HOLTON said the matter was very simple. If the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) desired to take the sense of the House upon the proposition that the Insolvency Law should be repealed before entering upon the consideration of the proposed amendments to the law, he could do so by moving that the Bill containing the amendments be not read a second time, but that it was expedient to repeal the Insolvency Act. This would not repeal the law, but would affirm the decision of the House, and be followed, undoubtedly, by a Bill, or he might allow a second reading of the Bill to be taken, and move the repeal on going into Committee. There were many ways in which the hon. member could accomplish his object without absolutely negating, in the first instance, the Bill prepared by the Committee.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the amendments should be discussed before a vote for the repeal of the law was called for.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he had made up his mind that, in the interests of the country, it was desirable to repeal, absolutely and definitively, the existing Insolvency Law, and he desired to have an opportunity to express that opinion in the proper parliamentary form, and he did not see any difficulty in taking the sense of the House upon that question. It was unfortunate this Bill of the Committee had been placed in the name of the Minister of Justice, as that gave it the appearance of a Government Bill, and, when the hon. member for Iberville

moved in amendment to it that it was expedient to repeal the law, that would be a sort of vote of want of confidence in the Government, and, therefore, would not get so many votes as it otherwise would. Therefore, as the first clause of the Bill of the Committee, in the name of the Minister of Justice, proposed itself to repeal the law, his hon. friend might make some progress with the measure by voting for the measure of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard).

MR. HOLTON said the course taken by the Minister of Justice was precisely the one taken by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member in 1869. No one understood this to be a Government measure, and he (Mr. Holton) presumed the Government would divide on it when the vote would be taken. The Committee had devoted a great deal of labour to the preparation of the Bill, and the Government had, as they were bound to do, given those labours the facilities of being considered which could not be given under the ordinary rules of the House. This Bill would have fallen still-born, as they had, practically, but one day in the week now of the two weeks which remained, for private measures, if the Government had not given this facility to the Bill.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had agreed that the Bill should be put on Government Orders for the sole purpose of securing for the House an opportunity to consider it. He did that at the request of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), who was good authority, that he was perfectly right in adopting that course. He would suggest to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) whether that course recommended by the hon. member for Chateauguay would not be entirely satisfactory.

MR. OUIMET said he was ready to vote for the Bill of the hon. gentleman from Iberville, as he had already done in this House. He saw no inconvenience in voting on that Bill now, because, in voting for the repeal of the Insolvent Act, they would be simply affirming the principle of the Bill introduced by the hon. the Minister of Justice, entitled, "An Act to repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875." He did not mean to declare himself, in

advance, opposed to the latter Bill, or any well-considered measure for the liquidation of insolvent estates. This Bill was a very large one, and they might not have time to consider and pass it, before the end of the Session, and for that reason it would be better to vote at once for the Bill of the hon. gentleman from Iberville. If the Private Bill was not carried, the Government Bill could be delayed, and thus the present Insolvent Act could remain for another year. He thought the country desired to see that Act repealed. Some measure might be necessary for some Provinces, whose Common Law did not provide for winding up insolvent estates; and, though it was not necessary in the Province of Quebec, where the Common Law was sufficient for the purpose, the Quebec members had no objection to come to their assistance, but they did not want the Insolvent Act, as it now stood, to remain on the Statute-book. Therefore, the sooner they voted for its repeal, the better and the safer.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that he was willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from South Huron, if it was acceptable to the hon. gentleman from Iberville, which was to allow the Bill submitted by the Committee to go to its second reading at the earliest opportunity, and, if the opinion of the House should be adverse to the continuance of the Insolvency Act in any form, then the hon. gentleman should have the earliest opportunity of submitting his Bill to the House.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said what they desired was to have a vote on the repeal of the Insolvency Law before they voted on the other Bill.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he thought that was what, in fairness to the country, should be avoided. He thought there was a strong conviction in the country, that an Insolvent Law, in some form, was desirable, and he believed that the form most generally desired was that which the Committee had given to their Bill. It would be putting himself and other members of the House in a false position, to vote squarely upon the repeal of the present law, when they had prepared, and were ready to submit to the

consideration of the House, a substitute which they thought would be acceptable to the House and the country. If the House, in discussing this Bill, should make it manifest that a repeal of the present law was desirable, then his hon. friend from Iberville should have an opportunity of submitting his Bill to the House, and of taking a square vote upon it.

MR. BÉCHARD said the agreement might be satisfactory to those who were not in favour of the unconditional repeal of the law, because, if the Bill of the Minister of Justice was carried, the House would be prevented from voting squarely on the question of repeal this Session. He was quite disposed to accept any arrangement which would secure to those in favour of an unconditional repeal an opportunity of giving such a vote. He would accept the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Justice, if the Government would allow his (Mr. Béchard's) Bill to go on the Orders of the Day immediately before that of the hon. gentleman.

MR. COLBY said he thought there could be but one desire on the part of all fair-minded members of this House—and in a question of such importance all ought to be fair-minded—and that was to arrive at an expression of the real feeling of the House. Now, that would not be done upon the vote proposed by the hon. member for Iberville, if that was taken to-night, because the issue then would be between the existing Insolvency Act and its repeal, pure and simple. But that was not all that was involved in this case. A Committee of this House had addressed themselves industriously and faithfully to the endeavour to do away with many, if not all, of the imperfections and abuses of the present Act which had been complained of. He thought it was not fair that a Bill to repeal the present Act, pure and simple, should precede the explanations and discussions of the propositions submitted by the Committee. When the House was seized of the whole matter, then it would be in a position to deal with it as might be deemed best. He thought his hon. friend from Iberville should be content with the assurance of the hon. the Minister of Justice, that,

after an expression of the House had been obtained, if that expression was in favour of the repeal of the Insolvency Act, and adverse to the propositions of the Committee, then every facility should be given him to carry his Bill for the repeal of the Act. He had no doubt that, if the hon. gentleman from Iberville consented to hold his Bill in abeyance until after the House had pronounced on the propositions of the Committee, he would find some supporters to his Bill at that stage who could not support it now, and, possibly, himself (Mr. Colby) among the number.

MR. HESSON said he came here with his mind made up that, if a Bill to repeal the Insolvent Act came before the House, he should vote for it. He now found before the House a Bill of that nature, and a Bill presented by a Committee who had been inquiring whether it was possible to make some provision for winding up insolvent debtors' estates. Now, he did not desire to see the country deprived altogether of some provision such as that, and, from what he had seen of the Bill of the Committee, and from the care they had taken in framing the several clauses, he was disposed to think it deserved the careful consideration of this House. He thought the hon. gentleman from Iberville had better accept the proposition of the hon. the Minister of Justice, as he believed the Bill of the Committee would meet the wishes of the House and the country generally. As for the details of the Bill, some of them might be found objectionable, and he himself did not like the proposition to establish Insolvent Courts in some of the cities of the country. The objectionable clauses could be eliminated from the Bill when referred to its proper Committee.

MR. TILLEY said it was of no small importance that they should have a full discussion on the Bill, as submitted by the Committee, who had carefully looked into the whole subject, and prepared what they considered important improvements on the existing Insolvency Act. If they disposed of the question without taking that Bill up, they would do so prematurely, and perhaps without having the information before them it was desirable they should have. For his own part, he was ready to assent to any proposition

MR. COLBY.

that would enable them to consider the Bill reported by the Committee, and, failing that, to take up, immediately after, the proposition of his hon. friend from Iberville. They could then all approach the subject in a better position to decide on the merits of the case. He was satisfied the Government would afford every facility in their power to the hon. member to introduce his Bill after the Bill submitted by the Committee.

MR. MACKENZIE: I suppose the Minister of Justice will proceed with the Bill to-morrow.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): It is high up on the Orders. It is our desire to take the Bill up to-morrow. After that is disposed of, then my hon. friend will have an opportunity of bringing his Bill forward.

MR. BÉCHARD said he would allow his Bill to stand.

Order for second reading *postponed*.

DEPENDANTS' COSTS IN CROWN SUITS
BILL.—[BILL 17.]

(Mr. MacDonnell.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for second reading *read*.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had intimated the other day that the Government had some objection to this Bill. He might be mistaken, but he was under the impression that the hon. gentleman had consented to go on with it.

MR. MACDONNELL said he did not intend to give the hon. the Minister of Justice to understand that he would withdraw the Bill. He should move the second reading.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he regretted the hon. gentleman should think it necessary to press the Bill. In any case it was desirable to explain the Bill to the House.

MR. MACDONNELL said that, a few evenings ago, in the absence of the Minister of Justice, he explained the object of this Bill, which was to provide that in any action brought in any of the Superior Courts of the different Provinces, or

cases in which such Courts had concurrent jurisdiction with the Exchequer Court of the Dominion, at the suit of the Crown, the defendant in such cases should be paid his costs if successful. There was no reason in such an action, brought at the suit of the Crown for the recovery of a penalty or other consideration in which the name of the Crown was used for the people of the Dominion, why the party prosecuted should be disallowed his costs and required to pay them out of his own pocket, while, in any action brought by a single individual against another, the party recovering was entitled to the costs as against the other suitor. He could not see on what principle it could be held just, that while a private individual was responsible for the costs in any suit commenced by him, the people of Canada, taken in the aggregate, were to be considered as paupers, and not called on to pay costs. In 1876 the injustice was so apparent that, in the Act passed in that year to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act, the following clause on the subject was enacted :

"The Judges of the Supreme Court, or any five of them, may, under the 79th section of the said Act, from time to time make rules for awarding and regulating costs in each of the said Courts, in favour of and against the Crown as well as the subject."

The practice had been to give costs to the subject in cases where he proceeded against the Crown, where the Crown failed. It was unjust and inconsistent that, while a party sued in the Exchequer Court of the Dominion might recover his costs against the Crown a party, if an action was commenced in one of the Superior Courts of any of the Provinces was denied his costs, although the cause of action was the same. The present Bill was intended to give to the Courts of the various Provinces having concurrent jurisdiction with the Exchequer Court, concurrent jurisdiction also as to costs in actions brought before them, as he had already said.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this Bill affected the Royal prerogative, and the assent of the Crown must be given to it. He was not prepared to give that assent. The second clause would establish a charge on the public revenue against the people, and, as the

assent of the Crown had not been given to the Bill, it could not be proceeded with.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that over and above the objection mentioned by the right hon leader of the Government, the hon. mover of the Bill sought to base the relief he asked on the character of the Exchequer Court, and its supposed resemblance to the higher Provincial courts. But, in the Exchequer Court, all cases were tried before the Judges, while, in the Provincial Courts having concurrent jurisdiction, those cases were all tried before juries. That made a very serious difference with respect to the possible result of suits pending. On that ground more especially, he did not feel it desirable or expedient that the Bill, in its present form, should pass at that moment.

MR. MACDONNELL said he was very much surprised at the objections to this Bill. It was introduced in the early part of the Session, and, in courtesy to the leader of the Government, he consulted with him in respect to it, when he directed him to the Minister of Justice. He then conferred with the Minister of Justice about it, and he gave his word that the assent of the Crown to this Bill would be forthcoming. He (Mr. MacDonnell) showed him a draft of the Bill, which he said was a proper one, and he had, at the hon. gentleman's suggestion, expunged a line of it. He had been led from day to day from the beginning of the Session to believe that the Government would consent to the Bill, which should be considered an open question, and bring down the assent of the Crown. The Minister of Justice knew that he (Mr. MacDonnell) could have moved for an address of the House, asking for such assent, and he should have done so had he believed that the Government would not have secured it as promised. The House would see that no objection was made to the Bill on its merits. The objection that the assent of the Crown was required was captious. Why the Government should have taken the course they did, after his courteous conduct towards them, he could not understand. The Bill commended itself to every member imbued with a sense of

justice, its principles being now law as regarded the Exchequer Court. The argument of the Minister of Justice was really in favour of the Bill; for it was known that decisions by juries were more equitable than decisions of Judges, simply because juries did not decide on any legal quibble, whereas justice often miscarried before Judges on some technical objection. Were they to be told that a decision in one of the Common Law Courts, presided over by one of their Common Law Judges, was not to be treated as equitable and sound, because a jury formed the constituent part of the Court? This was something new, and was a most flimsy objection. The Minister of Justice and his leader had both misled him in this matter, and that, he did not hesitate to say, deliberately, and he would have moved for an address of the House for the Royal consent, had he not been given to understand, up to this date, that it would be forthcoming through the Government. But he was not so certain, after all, that this Bill infringed any rights or prerogatives of the Crown. It only provided that any costs taxed should be paid out of the Consolidated Fund by the Receiver-General, and he did not think that it trenched upon the rights of the Crown. There was another reason why the Bill should be read a second time; the House had agreed with its principle, and it might be advanced to the third reading without the Royal consent. The Minister of Justice and the Premier, if anxious to do justice in this matter, might allow the second reading, after which they could procure the consent of His Excellency.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou), said he regretted very much that any misunderstanding should have arisen between the hon. member for Inverness and himself, with regard to the Bill. But he thought he could promise him that hereafter there would be no opportunity for such misunderstandings.

MR. MACDONNELL: I will take good care there shall not.

MR. McDONALD said that the hon. gentleman was generally correct in his account of what took place in his interviews with him in regard to the Bill. But he (Mr. McDonald) was not aware

MR. MACDONNELL

that he had spoken to the leader of the Government on the subject. The hon. gentleman had shown him the Bill as originally prepared, and he had told the hon. gentleman that the Bill was entirely unsuited to the object in view, and that if he desired to succeed he must reconstruct it entirely; also, that he (Mr. McDonald) would take an early opportunity of submitting the Bill to the leader of the Government, and ascertain whether he thought it expedient that he should give his assent to it. It was quite true that he had not had the opportunity of obtaining the right hon. gentleman's views till recently. About a week ago, the member for Inverness came across the floor, when he told him that the Premier thought the Bill not advisable, and that, therefore, he could not assent to it. He thought, therefore, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacDonnell) ought, in candour, to have stated those facts, if he felt aggrieved. He did not say that he had misstated the facts intentionally, but he had not set them forth as fully as he ought to have done. He had no reason to complain of any action by him, in regard to the Bill. He knew that he (Mr. McDonald) had stated personally that he thought it desirable, if practicable, in the public interest, that the same course should be pursued with reference to costs in the Courts below as in the Exchequer Court, and also his grounds for thinking that the Bill could not pass. He did not care to bandy words with the hon. gentleman, having only risen to express his regret that his desire to be civil to him, and to afford him any facilities he could in the matter of his Bill, should have afforded him the opportunity of making the remarks they had heard.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that he thought his hon. friend from Inverness had fair and reasonable grounds for complaint. He had introduced his Bill on the 8th of March. On several occasions since then he was prepared to move the second reading, and had more than once been asked by the leader of the Government and the Minister of Justice to allow it to stand over, without giving him any notice that the Bill would be opposed on the merely

technical ground raised by the First Minister. It appeared to him (Mr. Cameron) that the Bill ought to pass, and the consent of the Crown ought to be given. The Minister of Justice had not advanced, and, in fact, could not advance an argument against the passage of the Bill now. It appeared an extraordinary anomaly that the Crown could bring an action against the subject, an action without the shadow of a foundation, put him to enormous costs, and that the subject should have no remedy against the Crown to recover the costs of such an abortive action. Surely that state of things should not exist. This was a Bill the Minister of Justice ought to have dealt with himself, and, if not himself, he should have afforded his hon. friend the member for Inverness every facility for the passage of the Bill.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that he would not argue now whether the Bill was fair and reasonable or not. One thing was clear, the principle that the Crown did not pay costs had always been insisted on. It was part of the Royal prerogative. In other words, it was one of the checks against the Public Treasury being robbed, and although the practice had been continued for many centuries in England, there had been no legislation compelling the Crown to pay costs. He regretted very much, like the Minister of Justice, that any misapprehension had arisen in this matter. The hon. member (Mr. MacDonnell) said that before he introduced his Bill he had spoken to him about it. Now all the hon. gentleman said was that he had introduced, or prepared, a Bill.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

CAPT. LAVOIE OF THE RIMOUSKI.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Fiset's motion, for a statement showing the orders given to Capt. Pierre Lavoie, during the time he had charge of the steamer *Rimouski*.

MR. Fiset said he had reason to believe that Capt. Lavoie was discharged for political reasons. It had been pretended that he had disobeyed the orders

of his superiors; but he thought, if that was the reason for which the hon. the Minister of Public Works had discharged him, the hon. gentleman must have been in error, or, perhaps, had been deceived by other parties. In March last he (Mr. Fiset) had taken occasion to remark that Capt. Lavoie had obtained, on the 17th of February last, a letter, declaring that he had always faithfully performed his duty up to that time. He had also produced a letter from Mr. Brydges, stating that up to that time Capt. Lavoie had not received orders from any Department of the Government, but only from himself, and that he had always obeyed those orders. In further support of his innocence of having disobeyed orders, Capt. Lavoie had made a solemn declaration, which he (Mr. Fiset) read to the House. He wished to see the papers in the case, in order to establish whether the charge of disobedience was well founded, and whether Capt. Lavoie had ever received orders from either the Department of Public Works, or that of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. TUPPER said he should be sorry if the hon. gentleman withdrew his motion, after what he had just said, because he was anxious to bring down the papers in order to show that Capt. Lavoie had not carried out the instructions given him. He objected to the motion chiefly because of the statement it contained, that Capt. Lavoie had been dismissed. He was informed that Capt. Lavoie was only engaged for the season; he was paid off at the close of the season and his connection with the Department ceased altogether thereafter. When it became necessary to re-engage parties for the next season, Capt. Lavoie was informed that his services would not be required again. He (Mr. Tupper) on enquiring the reason why he was not re-engaged was told that Capt. Lavoie had been instructed that he was not to purchase anything for the service, but to make requisition therefor, and that he had subsequently incurred debts without requisition. This having occurred more than once, it was determined not to re-engage him. He had no objection to the papers being brought down.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not know what fault had been found with

Capt. Lavoie; he might have been properly dismissed, but dismissed he was. It would not do to say he was not in the employment of the Government because he was idle in the winter time. It had always been customary with merchant vessels, as with Government vessels, that the captain should remain in charge of the vessel during the winter, although navigation could not be carried on. The captains of Government steamers had been continually in service, and were paid a certain rate per month. This gentleman undoubtedly had a right to consider himself still in the employ of the Government. It had been a universal practice to continue the captains in charge the next season.

MR. TUPPER said that was precisely where a difference of opinion might arise. Lavoie was his own master, he was ready to go to any part of the world, the Government had no claim on his services, nor was he under any obligation to serve them if called on. No doubt he would have been re-employed if it had not been found that he failed in obeying instructions.

Motion agreed to.

USURY PROHIBITION BILL.—[BILL 35.]

(*Mr. Méthot.*)

SECOND READING PROPOSED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MÉTHOT said that, on rising to move the second reading of this Bill, he desired to draw the attention of the House to the necessity of passing a law to prevent the numerous abuses committed by usurers throughout the whole Dominion. The object of this Bill, as its title indicated, was to suppress usury, by fixing the legal rate of interest in Canada at 6 per cent., and conventional interest at 8 per cent. In order that the law should be put in force, and that it should not become a dead letter, this Bill prescribed a penalty against those who should break the law, by obliging them to refund all interest on sums of money thus obtained. This Bill, that did not affect, in any way, contracts made and entered into before the putting in force of the present Act, applied to all loans

and contracts for the use of a sum of money. Such were the provisions of the Bill. When it was sought to modify an existing law, it was but in accordance with common sense to examine, from every possible standpoint, all the defects of the old law, as well as the advantages of the new one. To that end it was well to look into the past, and not to undervalue the experience of centuries. On opening history, which should be the guide of the Legislature, it would be found that among old nations efforts had been constantly made to suppress usury, that had always been looked upon as most hurtful and unfavourable to the welfare of the State. All nations, both ancient and modern, had had but one way of regarding usury, they had all looked upon it as a public calamity and a crime. The Jews, the Romans, the French, and even the Canadians, had legislated, from time to time, in the most severe manner, against usury and usurers. But it was not necessary to go abroad in order to find examples of severe legislation against usury. In 1873, had not this House deliberately passed a law prohibiting usury in one of the Provinces of this Dominion? Chapter 71 of the Federal Statute 36 Victoria, contained a law fixing the rate of interest and putting a stop to usury in the Province of Nova Scotia, and since that time no complaints from that Province had been heard. He wished to know why a law that was good for one Province should not be good for the rest of the Dominion. Was not the feeling in Nova Scotia the same as the feeling that was manifesting itself every day in other parts of Canada? Let enquiry be made of all the farmers of the different Provinces of the Dominion, and they would all answer, as one man, that they desired and requested the adoption of a law against usury, that was gnawing at the vitals of this young country, that was destroying commerce, and that was one of the causes of the numerous failures that the country had to deplore. This unlimited liberty, enjoyed by money-lenders, was, moreover, one of the main causes of emigration, and was, consequently, a great obstacle to the prosperity of the agricultural classes of this country. If usury was favourable to a majority of the population, one would be able to explain why this House should

MR. MACKENZIE.

remain deaf to the voice of the people asking for the passing of laws against usury and the fixing of reasonable rates of interest. But everyone was aware that the present state of things was favourable to a small number of speculators who profited thereby in order to grow rapidly rich upon the work of the poor man. Was it not especially the agricultural classes that were taken in and made the victims of these selfish men, who had neither bowels nor conscience? Why were so many farmers seen going into exile, emigrating to the United States? Why did so many settlers find themselves obliged to give up the land they had cleared by the sweat of their brow, in order to go and ruin their health, and that of their families, in American manufactures? The reason of this was very simple. It was because, not being able to pay their debts when due, the creditors exacted, as the price of a short delay, an exorbitant interest. It was needless to speak of the bargains, agreements, and high interests resorted to in the country places. It was a well-known thing. Therefore, he would refrain from revealing the hideousness of this cancer, that was eating at the heart of the people. Since this Bill was before the House, he had received from all parts of the country numerous letters of encouragement and congratulation. He trusted that among these letters, coming from all classes of society, he would be allowed to read one. It was as follows:—

“QUEBEC, March 29th, 1879.

“To Mr. MATHOT, M.P., Ottawa,—

“SIR,—Allow me, in the name of a certain number of persons suffering from the high rate of interest exacted by money-lenders, who, while pretending to render service, are practicing usury at the expense of those to whom they lend, allow these victims whose needful condition obliges them to pay these high rates of interests, allow them to congratulate and thank you for the Bill you intend to introduce in order to put an end to the present state of things, for it is a crying shame to see usury practised in such a frightful manner. How great will be the gratitude of those sufferers from the want of conscience of these usurers. May Heaven bless your undertaking, and grant you the favour of succeeding in having your just law adopted. We, the victims, we beseech the Divine Providence for the success of your Bill, and we, moreover, pray Heaven to reward you for your good intentions, in coming to the help of many victims, who will never cease to offer up prayers for your happiness and pros-

perity, you, whose good-will prompts you to lend a helping hand to those who suffer.

“A victim, who cannot make himself known, but who sends you the expression of gratitude of a number of sufferers.”

Was not this letter written by an unknown person of Quebec; was it not the outpouring of the victim's heart, and did it not show to what an extent the usurer oppressed and tyrannised over the unfortunate borrower, whom he held so tightly in his clutches, that the wretched man dare not sign his name? Thus, if he moved the second reading of the Bill, it was because he was firmly persuaded that by restraining the liberty granted to the money-lenders, Parliament would be favouring the interests of the great majority of the inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada, and doing away with the disastrous effects that usury never failed to produce on the agricultural classes, on commerce and industry. It would be especially favourable to the farmer, in whose name he was speaking, whose revenues were not, and never would be, proportioned to the exorbitant exactions of the usurer. Indeed, the cultivation of land never yielded on an average more than six per cent., and if, as it often happened, a farmer was unlucky enough to require suddenly \$100, he was obliged to pay from 20 to 25 per cent. This money was lent to him for a month or two. Afterwards, if the money-lender saw that the farmer was pinched, he would exact a renewal with from 25 to 50 per cent. Was not that the surest means of driving the agricultural population from Canada, and of making a desert of the country? On the contrary, if hon. members wished to encourage agriculture and colonisation, they should take away from the usurer this tyrannical liberty, by depriving him of all hope of realising large profits surely and in a short space of time, thereby inducing him to withdraw his money from speculation and shaving, and to invest it, at reasonable rates, in real estate. And what would be the result of this? Capitalists investing their money in agricultural pursuits, agriculture would again be prosperous, property would be doubled in value, the disheartened settler would take courage, and not only would emigration diminish, but Canada would behold, with joy her children, who were now the servants of

the American people, wending their way back to their country, in order to cultivate and render fertile the wild lands of this Dominion. He would now consider the objections that might be raised against the passing of this Act. The first would probably be that this Act was useless, that it would be easy to evade it, by lending at the legal rate, and by afterwards selling to the borrower an article at double its value. But this objection fell to the ground, for there was a clause in the Bill, by which these shameless money-lenders could be put under oath when sued for infringement of the present Act. The second objection that might be made to this Bill was that it hampered money transactions, and that it would be hurtful to borrowers. He would answer that, in this as in other things, the people wanted protection, and they were right, for since the repeal of the laws against usury they could no longer borrow money without paying exorbitant rates of interest. The third objection was that money was an article of merchandise like anything else. He said that it was not that, for money did not deteriorate or wear out like other goods, and if its value changed in an almost imperceptible manner, it always remained the basis of the value of all other objects of commerce. Moreover, money was always current. A man who owed £1,000 was not uneasy if he had £1,000 in his pocket to pay what he owed, whilst he might be ruined if he was asked to pay this sum, and had to meet it, in only real estate or goods, even were they worth twice or three times the amount. For all these reasons, and for many others that it would take too long to enumerate, he was fully confident that this Bill would be supported by a majority in the House; and by adopting it Parliament would be protecting agriculture, giving new life to industry, favouring commerce, and yielding to the wishes of the people. In a word, they would be adopting a measure that would give general satisfaction.

MR. TILLEY said the Bill proposed by his hon. friend was a very important one, the principle of which was very energetically discussed in the first Parliament. Few questions had created such

MR. METHOT.

excitement and called forth such diversity of opinion as the one involved in the Bill of his hon. friend. He thought, however, it would be unwise to disturb existing legislation on the subject—at all events, it would require more time than the House had now at its disposal. Seeing the advanced stage of the Session, he suggested that his hon. friend should withdraw the Bill.

MR. PLUMB said there had always been a very strong opinion on the subject of the usury laws. Perhaps the strongest legislation on the subject was found on the Statute-books of some of the American States, each of which had the right to regulate its internal affairs and pass its own laws in that regard. In New York State, for example, there was a law making it highly penal to charge higher than 7 per cent. No doubt, some Canadian institutions had taken advantage of their powers and charged a higher rate than was apparent, and a strong opinion prevailed in the community that there should be some restriction to prevent grasping lenders from taking advantage of needy borrowers. At this stage of the Session, however, it was impossible to obtain expression of opinion through the Dominion, and he, therefore, moved in amendment that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

MR. MACKENZIE said he felt disposed to support the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister had said that this would disturb existing legislation. He congratulated the hon. gentleman on the resumption of a Conservative policy. But he must not forget that the tendency of the whole work of the Government this Session had been to disturb all existing legislation. In fact, there was very little of Conservatism left with hon. gentlemen opposite. As they had come to the conclusion now not to further disturb existing legislation, as the line must be drawn somewhere, he would support them.

Question put and amendment (Mr. Plumb) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS :
Messrs.

Allison	Kirkpatrick
Arkell	Kranz
Bain	Lane
Bergin	Laurier
Bill	Little
Borden	Longley [P.E.I.]
Boulton	Macdonald (Kings')
Brecken	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Brooks	McDonald (C. Breton)
Brown	McDonald (Pictou)
Bunster	MacDonell
Bunting	Mackenzie
Burnham	McCarthy
Burpee (Sunbury)	McInnes
Cameron (C. Huron)	McIsaac
Cameron (N. Victoria)	McKay
Cartwright	McLennan
Casey	McQuade
Charlton	McRory
Christie	Mills
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Muttart
Connell	Ogden
Costigan	Oliver
Currier	Paterson (S. Brant)
Dawson	Patterson (Essex)
DeCosmos	Pickard
Doull	Platt
Drew	Plumb
Dubuc	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Elliott	Poupore
Farrow	Richey
Ferguson	Robinson
Fitzsimmons	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Fleming	Ryan (Marquette)
Galbraith	Ryan (Montreal Cpn.)
Gault	Scrifer
Gillies	Shaw
Gunn	Snowball
Haddow	Sproule
Hay	Stephenson
Hesson	Thompson (Cariboo)
Holton	Tilley
Huntington	Tupper
Ives	Wallace (W. York)
Jones	Weldon
Kaulback	White (Cardwell)
Killam	White (N. Renfrew)
Kilvert	Williams.—97.
King	

NAYS :
Messrs.

Anglin	Coursol
Bannerman	Cuthbert
Béchar	Daoust
Benoit	Desaulniers
Bergeron	Desjardins
Bolduc	Domville
Bourassa	Dugas
Burk	Dumont
Caron	Fiset
Casgrain	Fulton
Chandler	Geoffrion
Simon	Gigault
Cockburn (W. Northbld)	Gill
Coughlin	Gillmor
Coupal	Girouard (J. Cartier)

Grandbois	Oliver,
Hackett	Orton
Houde	Ouimet
Hurteau	Perreault
Keeler	Pinsonneault
Landry	Pope (Compton),
Lantier	Rinfret
LaRue	Rogers
McDonald (Vict. N. S.)	Ross (Dundas)
Macmillan	Rouleau
McCallum	Routhier
McCuag	Smith (Westmoreland)
McDougall	Thompson (Haddim'nd)
McLeod	Trow
Malouin	Vallée
Méthot	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Mongenais	White (E. Hastings)
Montplaisir	Wright
Mousseau	Yeo.—68.

Bill *ordered* to be read the second time this day six months.

House adjourned at

Ten minutes after

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 29th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first and second times :—

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Act incorporating the Detroit Tunnel Company.—(Mr Kilvert.)

CANADA AND DETROIT RIVER BRIDGE COMPANY INCORPORATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Kilvert.)

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

Mr. KILVERT introduced a Bill (No. 101) To amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Detroit River Bridge Company.

Bill read the first time.

Mr. KILVERT moved the second reading of the Bill.

In reply to Mr. PATTERSON (Essex),

Mr. KILVERT said there was no change of the location settled in the

charter; this proposed an extension of time.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was necessary to obtain the consent of the American people, and that had been obtained and the difficulty had been removed. This was a work of immense importance to one of our lines of railway to enable it to carry Western traffic. He hoped the Bill would be read a second time to-day.

MR. McCALLUM said it was a serious matter to say that a bridge should be built over the Detroit River. During the season of navigation a vessel passed every three minutes, night and day. He objected to the Bill being read now, except according to the rules of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE suggested that the Bill should be read to-day, if it was to go to the Railway Committee on Thursday. It was one of those Bills to which they ought to afford every reasonable facility.

MR. TUPPER said the introducer of this Bill stated that it was simply to extend the time for carrying out a policy already on the Statute-book. That placed it in an entirely different position from the introduction of a measure providing for something new. His hon. friend knew that in the Railway Committee there would be every opportunity of examining the Bill to see if anything new was introduced. Seeing that they were in the last days of the Session, and that business was pressing, he trusted his hon. friend would consent to the second reading. The House was never regarded as being committed to the principle of a Bill by allowing it to go to a Committee.

MR. HOLTON said he was in sympathy with the hon. member for Monck in this matter. While disposed to give every possible facility for the consideration of these Bills, the urgency of which he quite understood, he felt considerable reluctance to vote for the second reading of a Bill which was not yet before them. He thought it would be establishing a dangerous practice. He was the more inclined to take that view because no time would be lost by allowing this Bill to stand for the second reading to-mor-

MR. KILVERT.

row, as its twin Bill did at this moment. His own impression was clear that they still had an hour on Wednesday for Private Bills—that after half-past seven. At all events, the Government could easily solve any doubt there might be on that point by allowing it to be so considered. He was sure that, with the strong desire on all sides to accelerate the close of this Session, the Government must see that there could be no possible objection to the second reading of these Bills being called to-morrow at half-past seven, and thus obviate a very unsound practice of reading a Bill the second time before it was in the hands of members.

MR. McCALLUM said the reason he objected to this Bill was that there were large interests involved, and, if it went to a second reading to-day, not being printed or in the hands of members, how could those in the country, interested, know anything about the Bill? The ship-owners of this country, and those engaged in commerce, should have an opportunity of being heard in reference to it. He looked at the scheme of bridging the Detroit River as one calculated to block that river entirely. He did not oppose it on personal grounds, but solely on public grounds. How were they going to notify the country if they brought in Bills and passed them before the members knew what they were? He did not wish to obstruct legislation, but he considered that if he could do anything to prevent a measure of this kind being put through the House, it was his duty to do so.

MR. PLUMB said it was well to impress on the House the fallacy of the proposition that ordering Bills to a second reading was endorsing their principle. No doubt it would obstruct all legislation if such an opinion should obtain in the House of Commons. Everyone who knew anything about railways, must understand that large expenditures of money had been prevented by the diminution of traffic, and no company had suffered more in that way than the one which now asked for its approval. The Railway Committee was composed of a majority of the members of this House, and he thought that any examination into the merits of the Bill might be very safely entrusted to that Committee.

MR. MCCALLUM said if this Bill was to go before the Railway Committee on Thursday, how were they going to get those opposed to it to come here and give their evidence on the other side? If he waived his right in this matter, it would be on the ground that he threw all responsibility upon the Government, trusting that they would see that no obstruction was laid across the Detroit River.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) said, as he understood the present Bill, it was merely to prolong the duration of existing charters. Under existing charters, all plans affecting the bridging of the Detroit River had to be approved by the Dominion Government and that of the United States. Under these circumstances, he thought they would be justified in allowing the measure to go to the Railway Committee, reserving the right to take such action as they thought proper in the interest of their constituents.

Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY ACT, 1868, AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 59.]

(Mr. Tupper.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for second reading read.

MR. TUPPER said he would ask leave of the House to withdraw this Bill. There were other amendments to the Act that were required, and they were so numerous that he had introduced an Act for the purpose of consolidating the Railway Act, which would embrace these two amendments.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was this objection—that it opened up a field of discussion on the whole law. It would, of course, have to go before the Railway Committee, and there everyone would be bringing in amendments. He thought it was inexpedient to consolidate the law in the last days of the Session, and would prefer that the hon. gentleman should adhere to his amendment for this Session.

MR. TUPPER said he did not think it would at all embarrass dealing with any of these proposed amendments. It would be quite impossible, perhaps, to attempt

a review of the general Railway Act, but the Act would stand in the same position after these amendments were introduced, with the exception that they would not be spread over a great variety of Acts. But a step would be taken towards a review of the Act, at a time when they would have more leisure to deal with it.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would involve a reconstruction of the Bill from the time it had been introduced to the present time, embodying, in the respective sections, whatever amendments had been made. He was afraid the hon. gentleman had undertaken an amount of labour in that respect they could hardly overtake.

MR. TUPPER said, when the hon. leader of the Opposition saw the Bill, he would find it was not open to the objections he supposed. It was merely bringing all the present legislation into one Act, and marking the few new clauses in brackets.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 74.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that the Bill had been in the hands of the members of the House for some time, and, as it concerned more particularly the legal gentlemen in the House, he would only say now, that it did not, in any way, affect the principle of the Act, but referred to one or two clauses especially—clause 11 and clause 17 of the original Act—which defined the occasions in which appeals should lie from the several subordinate Courts in the Provinces to the Supreme Court. All the clauses, with one or two exceptions, were definitive, and stated with more particularity the cases in which appeals should lie. He might say that the Judges of the Supreme Court had had an opportunity of examining them, and had concurred in them generally, as well as the leading members of the profession from the several Provinces in this House. There was one clause which provided for a difficulty

such as occurred in the absence of the late Chief Justice, providing for the administration of the oath of office in certain cases by the senior Puisne Judge in the absence of the Chief Justice. The Bill, as first introduced, provided for only two terms, leaving it for the Supreme Court, or the Chief Justice, to appoint, when thought necessary, a third term. But leading members of the Ontario bar had represented that the uncertainty as to when the third term might be held would prove an inconvenience, and, to meet that difficulty, he had inserted a clause fixing the third term for the month of October.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said he did not propose to discuss the Bill at present; but he might say that the memorandum which the Minister of Justice had said he had sent to members, in connection with it, he, for one, had not received.

MR. McDONALD (Picton) said that he had sent the memorandum this morning, and would not move for the consideration of the Bill in Committee to-day since the memorandum had not been received. When they would have received it to-morrow he would move the House into Committee.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that, without approving of all the changes in the Bill, he believed that most were in the right direction. One change he thought the Minister of Justice ought to have given his reason for, and explained how it was to be carried into actual effect: The clause with regard to appeals from judgments upon preliminary objections to Election Petitions. The Minister of Justice had said nothing on that subject, though the change appeared the most important and radical of all. He (Mr. Cameron) thought this change also in the right direction. The only thing he complained of was that the hon. gentleman had not explained more fully the meaning of the provision, and how he proposed to carry it into effect. He understood him to say that the two sections of the Supreme Court Act that the Bill proposed to deal with were 11 and 17; and, if he (Mr. Cameron) recollected aright, section 17 provided for general appeals on general questions. Surely he

did not intend applying the provisions of section 17 to sub-section "m" of section 1 of this Bill. The provisions of section 17 were wholly inapplicable to the proposed amendment. Section 17 of the Supreme Court Act applied to general appeals from the judgments of the Courts below to Judges of the Supreme Court. He apprehended it was rather meant to make this an amendment to section 48 of the Supreme Court Act which had reference to special election appeals. The section itself was an extraordinary one, and very peculiarly worded, and he was quite sure it would have to be recast before it could be made workable. Other provisions of the Act would also be found objectionable. Was it proposed that sub-section "a" of this Bill should apply to all orders that were made by Judges in the Court of Chancery, whether final or interlocutory? If so, he entirely objected to any amendment of the right to appeal in any such cases. He also objected to the right to appeal reserved in sub-section "b," in matters within the discretion of the Judge in Equity matters. To allow appeals in the classes of cases referred in these two sub-sections, would cause endless delays, add largely to the cost of litigation, and would, in many other respects, be exceedingly objectionable, and he hoped the Minister of Justice would strike out these objectionable clauses from his Bill. He (Mr. Cameron) did not object to the appeal in preliminary objections in election cases, but to the mode in which the Minister of Justice proposed to deal with the question, and the defective machinery provided for carrying the proposal into effect. He said that there should be an appeal from the judgment, rule or order of any Court or Judge, on any preliminary objection to an election petition. The clause further provided that there should be an appeal from a judgment or decision that was final and conclusive. How did the hon. gentlemen propose an appeal from a judgment that was final and conclusive? Moreover, how did he propose to bring the appeal before the Supreme Court at all, when there was no machinery provided for carrying the appeal into effect? This was not an amendment either to section 17, which provided for general cases, or to section 48, which provided for special appeals in

MR. McDONALD.

election cases. Neither the machinery provided for by section 48, nor section 17, could be applied to this provision in the hon. gentleman's Bill, nor under these sections could he bring such cases before the Supreme Court. He apprehended that what the Minister of Justice really proposed to do was to amend section 48 of the Supreme Court Act relating to special election appeals, and to enable complainants to appeal from the judgment of the Judges on preliminary objections to the Supreme Court, and to utilise the machinery provided in section 48 for that purpose. If that was what he meant, the whole clause must be recast, and section 48 of the Supreme Court Act must be amended. Section 10 of the Controverted Elections Act, which made the decision of a Judge of the Court on these preliminary objections final and conclusive, must also be amended, so as to enable parties to appeal to the Supreme Court, not after judgment had been given on the whole case, and the costs in the whole contest incurred, but after judgment had been rendered on preliminary objections before the merits of the case had been entered on at all, and in that case the merits of these preliminary objections could be disposed of in the most expeditious and least expensive way. If that was what the hon. gentleman meant, he was entirely with him. He could not assent to a proposition that a litigant should be bound by the judgment of a single Judge, in disposing of preliminary objections, and have no appeal to the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court. Everybody knew the great importance that was attached to many of these preliminary objections to election petitions. Where the power of Parliament to pass the Controverted Elections Act, and the power of the Local Courts to try cases under that Act were questioned, those doubts and difficulties should be set at rest with the least possible delay. He (Mr. Cameron) observed that the Bill did not say when the appeal to the Supreme Court on preliminary objections should take place—whether within the thirty days covered by section 17, or the period covered by section 48 of the Supreme Court Act, whether the appeal might be made at any time before the case was finally disposed of on the merits,

whether in such the appeal was limited or unlimited in point of time, and whether subject to the condition comprised by section 48, or wholly unconditional. If the latter was the hon. gentleman's view, he entirely agreed with him. The appeal should be subject to the conditions provided by section 48 only. He thought that, in dealing with these preliminary objections, especially when they involved questions of the first importance, such as the power of Parliament, and the jurisdiction of the Courts, and when we had the extraordinary anomaly of the Judges of the different Provincial Courts giving diametrically opposite rulings, on precisely the same legal propositions, and the seats of members of Parliament were affected by such contradictive rulings, the Minister of Justice would be only dealing fairly and properly with a question of such grave importance, by allowing it to go to the Supreme Court for final adjudication in all cases now pending and thus, at an early day, some uniformity of decision in these disputed legal questions might be obtained by which the Provincial Courts would thereafter be guided. Then one member would not be able to retain his seat by a decision given by one Judge, while another member took his because another Judge took an entirely different view of the law. He apprehended that was what the hon. gentleman meant by the peculiar wording of sub-section "m," that the appeal should cover the cases now pending, and should be unconditional, except as to the terms provided for by section 48 of the Supreme Court Act, and that thus an end should be put to the anomaly in the law that now existed, and that affected many of the seats of the members of this House. The Bill, as a whole, he thought, was a step in the right direction. No doubt in Committee it would be amended in several important particulars, including sub-sections "a," "b," and "m," in which the Minister of Justice could rely on his assistance to inspect the measure. With the changes and amendments he suggested, he had no doubt the Bill would be an improvement on the present law.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that it was quite possible the Bill was capable

of improvement, and he was very glad to have the assurance of his hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) that he would help in Committee to make it as perfect as possible. He was right in supposing that he did not draft the Bill himself; it was drafted by a much abler mind than his, by a man who, at any rate on some questions to which the Bill related, stood pre-eminent as an authority wherever known, so he was quite sure that the hon. gentleman would discuss those clauses with the same respect as he (Mr. McDonald) did. He thought the hon. member, however, a little hypercritical, and that a discussion of the Bill would be more practical, and, perhaps, more beneficial in Committee. With regard to his criticism as to the portion of the Bill relating to appeals from Election Courts, he (Mr. McDonald) did not see the difficulty mentioned with respect to the time. The general clause of section 48 prescribed the mode of appeal in election cases from the Election Courts to the Supreme Courts. This Bill did not interfere with the clause regulating the appeal, but simply gave the appeal to the Supreme Court in another branch of enquiry in these cases. He did not anticipate any other opinion from his hon. friend opposite and other members, than that this provision would be found very desirable indeed. Though the phraseology might not be as clear as desirable, he thought it expressed the view they all desired to enforce. An appeal should lie to the Supreme Court from any judgment, rule, order, or decision defined in the Bill. That was not an appeal from a final decision, but from any rule that might have effect of terminating the inquiry. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) was right in saying that he desired to give an appeal from an Election Court to the Supreme Court on preliminary objections raised during the trial of a case, which would have the effect of a final decision.

SIR A. J. SMITH: These preliminary objections, I understand, come before the trial is entered upon.

MR. McDONALD (Picton) said yes, before the trial on the merits of the petition was entered on. He referred to the technical objections taken before

MR. McDONALD.

entering upon the trial on its merits, and that suspended everything until the order was determined. For instance, a case happened the other day in the Province to which his hon. friend opposite (Sir A. J. Smith) belonged, in which the question of jurisdiction arose. He submitted whether it was not better, where there were preliminary objections, that they should be determined one way or the other, before the immense expense of the petition, on its merits, was gone into; and he thought it better that the dissatisfied party should have the opportunity of getting the opinion of the highest Court of Appeal at the earliest possible moment. With these observations he trusted the House would consent to the second reading of the Bill.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the second clause of the Bill required reconstructing. In New Brunswick they had experienced the difficulty of having no appeal from the decision of the Court on a preliminary objection. This he regarded as objectionable. His hon. friend had thought it necessary to prescribe the mode of procedure in regard to appeal. That he (Sir A. J. Smith) did not think necessary, because the Judges had power to make regulations in regard to appeal, so as to give effect to the Act. He regarded the provision in subsection "f" for appeal, direct to the Supreme Court, and ignoring the intermediate Courts of Appeal as anomalous.

MR. McDONALD (Picton) said that applied to Ontario and Quebec. In Ontario, for instance, it would undoubtedly be a hardship if the litigant did not possess that privilege. There was no objection to this from the gentlemen from Ontario.

MR. MILLS said he supposed the object was to cover cases where the rule might be already settled in the Provincial Court of Appeal, when the rule might never have been settled by the Supreme Court of the Dominion, in which case he supposed the litigant was allowed to appeal to the Supreme Court in the first place.

MR. MCCARTHY said he did not agree with the view of the hon. the Minister of Justice in regard to sub-clause "n." The ordinary preliminary

objection was of a formal character, and related merely to the status of the petitioner, of his right to be a petitioner. They knew very well that in election cases it would be sometimes a great objection to have an appeal which would entail a delay of two or three months. That clause, he thought, ought to be amended. He agreed that, if, by the judgment on a preliminary objection, the petitioner was disposed of, there should be a right of appeal. He thought, in the long run, more substantial justice would in this manner be had. He sympathised with his hon. friend from Westmoreland in regard to sub-section "f." He was of opinion they laboured under a great disadvantage in the number of Courts litigants had to pass through. He considered with his hon. friend that the power of appeal direct from the Court of first instance to the Supreme Court should be one that either party might exercise at his option. If a poor man knew his case was going to be appealed, he ought to have the means of bringing the case to an issue at once, at the least possible expense.

Mr. MOUSSEAU said he strongly opposed the second reading of the Bill for the same reasons which he advanced in 1875. They preferred that the appeals in regard to civil matters should be decided by the Privy Council of England, because there they could argue their cases in their own language. They could not do the same in the Supreme Court. He did not want to make any aspersions upon the character of the Judges of the Supreme Court. If they had English cases bearing upon English law, they were perfectly satisfied to submit them to the Supreme Court, but they could not conceal the fact that there were only two Judges on the bench of the Supreme Court who understood the French language and laws. The other four knew very little of the French language and law. That was the only reason why he protested against the enlargement of the powers of appeal. He next came to a clause which gave appeals in cases where there were none before. He protested against this. In their Province they had too many Judges and too many jurisdictions, and

it seems as though Parliament had been only here working to ruin suitors and give fees and fortunes to lawyers.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said that this clause would be considered in Committee, and most probably taken out.

Mr. MOUSSEAU said clause "h" provided :

"That no appeal shall be allowed from any judgment rendered in the Province of Quebec in any action, suit, cause, matter or other judicial proceeding wherein the matter in controversy does not amount to the sum or value of two thousand dollars, unless such matter, if less than that amount, involves the question of the validity of an Act of the Parliament of Canada, or of an Ordinance or Act of any of the Councils or Legislative bodies of any of the Territories or Districts of Canada, or relates to any fee of office, duty, rent, revenue, or any sum of money payable to Her Majesty, or to any title to lands or tenements, annual rents, or such like matters or things where the rights in future might be bound."

Did his hon. friend the Minister of Justice intend to withdraw that clause also ?

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said he would discuss it with his hon. friend presently.

Mr. MOUSSEAU said clause "i" said :

"Provided, however, that an appeal shall, by leave of the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Quebec, lie to the Supreme Court from the final judgment of the said Court of Queen's Bench in any action, suit, cause, matter or other judicial proceeding originally instituted in the Superior Court, although the sum or value in dispute may not amount to two thousand dollars, and although the judgment may not involve any of the questions or relate to any of the matters or things in the next preceding subsection mentioned."

That provided that a man who had a suit which amounted to, say \$100, he would have to go first to the Superior Court, then to the Court of Review, the Court of Queen's Bench, then to the Supreme Court. Well, it would be very funny, if it were not monstrous and outrageous, to know what such a trial was going to cost. As he understood the clause, and it was the construction put upon it by many of his friends, supposing a man took a case involving the sum of \$100 into the Superior Court, even supposing there was no evidence to be taken in *enquête*, where, as everybody knew, the proceedings involved

very heavy costs, there would still be the lawyers' and prothonotaries' fees, which would come to at least \$72. Now, supposing he went to the Court of Review, the costs on all sides would come to at least \$60. Then, should the case go to the Court of Queen's Bench, appeal side, it would cost at least \$300. Then, by this clause, it could again go to the Supreme Court, and it would cost an additional \$400. Altogether, in the suit to recover \$100, there would be the small legal protective tax of \$832. In his opinion there was too much jurisdiction, and there ought to be a stop to it. They had passed laws to protect every man in the country. There was protection to the flour dealer, the coal dealer, the merchant, and to all kinds of manufacturers, and it seemed to him time to protect the suitor, and the best protection to him was to reduce the number of Courts to which his suit might be referred.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that, in answer to the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), he would just say that it was quite possible he (Mr. McDonald) had, to some extent, misapprehended the requirements and interests of the Province of Quebec, in the formation of this Act, and its relation to the former Act of which this was an amendment; but, when he stated to his hon. friend the object of the several clauses to which he (Mr. Mousseau) referred, and the object he had in view in inserting them, he would be able to correct him if he had erred. He had preserved direct appeal from the ordinary Courts of jurisdiction of Quebec to the Supreme Court, and he took it for granted it would meet with approval. Section 5 was the first one the hon. gentleman objected to. It was as follows:—

“An appeal shall lie to the said Supreme Court from the judgment of the Court of Review for the Province of Quebec in any action, suit, cause, matter or other judicial proceeding originally instituted in the Superior Court in which an appeal would lie from the judgment of the said Court of Review to Her Majesty in Her Privy Council.”

Now, if he understood matters correctly, there was, in the Province of Quebec, a Superior Court and a Court of Queen's Bench. In the Superior Court, when a case was brought before the Judge of first instance in that Court, there was an

MR. MOUSSEAU.

appeal from his judgment to the Superior Court sitting in what was called a Court of Review. At the present time, he had been told, it was held in the Supreme Court of Canada that, under the wording of the Act giving the right of appeal as heretofore, there was no appeal to the Supreme Court from the judgment of the Court of Review, and that the only appeal from the Court of Review was to the Privy Council. The object of this clause, of which his hon. friend complained, was to give the power of appeal from that Court of Review to the Supreme Court of Canada. His sole object in framing this clause was to give the right of appeal as above stated. Perhaps he did not apprehend the feeling of the members from the Province of Quebec, but he thought it desirable to give the right of appeal, where appeal was necessary, to the Supreme Court, instead of, as at present, litigants having to be put to the expense and trouble of going to the Privy Council. He had in his hand a memorandum which had been handed to him—and his hon. friend could see whether he was correct—saying that section “h,” which he had objected to, was taken from the Civil Code of Procedure of Quebec, article 1178. It did not give the right of appeal to the Supreme Court, if the case in dispute involved less than \$2,000. He thought he had fitted the measure to the requirements of the Province of Quebec in that particular, but, of course, when the House went into Committee, his hon. friend (Mr. Mousseau) might be able to show the House that certain features of the Bill could be struck out. Section “i” gave litigants in the Province of Quebec full liberty of appeal from the Superior Court of Quebec, when, in the opinion of the Judges of that Court, it was desirable that appeal should be granted, although the amount involved should be under \$2,000. There was, he understood, no appeal in the Province of Quebec from the Court of Review to the Court of Queen's Bench.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. McDONALD said then he had been misinformed. It appeared to him that these three clauses did not retract the liberty of litigants, but rather

increased their right of appeal. It was his desire, and, the desire of the Government, to make this Bill meet the requirements of each and all the Provinces, and as the requirements of each Province were better known by the gentlemen representing that Province, he would be glad to meet their views as far as possible.

MR. LANDRY said the hon. gentleman from Bagot had pointed out certain objectionable features in this proposed legislation. He, along with the members generally of the Province of Quebec, concurred in the views expressed by that hon. gentleman. If this legislation was adopted, it would be unfavourably received in the Province of Quebec. He was pleased to see that the Government had decided to expunge from the Act whatever might affect injuriously the Province of Quebec, but he thought the Government would do still better to expunge the whole Act.

MR. OUMET said he was one who, in 1875, fought hard in opposition to the Bill constituting the Supreme Court. He still held the same opinion, and, if he could possibly deprive the Supreme Court of the appeal jurisdiction in civil matters, more especially as regarded Quebec, he would do so at once. He was aware, however, that such a measure could not be carried in this House. But as it was now proposed to amend the Supreme Court Act, he would venture to make some suggestions. It had been well stated that we had two many Appeal Courts. One appeal lay from the Superior Court to the Court of Review, from the Court of Review to the Court of Queen's Bench, and from that to the Supreme Court here, and in some cases from this Court to the Privy Council. Suitors were all of the opinion that it would be a great benefit to the public if some of these appeals were abolished. Suppose they took all the Final Appeal Courts from the Provinces and made a great Appeal Court at Ottawa, to which would be brought all appeals from the different Provinces; suppose that, instead of having these Supreme Court Judges, they should have fifteen Judges from the several Provinces, of whom, Quebec, for instance, should furnish five; they would

then have a Court to which they could bring their appeals with greater confidence than at present, and bring them directly from Courts of first instance, without passing uselessly throughout the other Courts. They all know that the common law differed in the different Provinces; the civil law in Quebec differed a great deal from the laws of the other Provinces. If they had such a large Court as he suggested, they would have thereby a large legal centre, and by the daily intercourse of the Judges they would become, in a few years, conversant with the laws of all the other Provinces. One result of this would, perhaps, be that these Judges, being thus acquainted with the laws in all the Provinces, might be able to fuse them into one system for the whole Dominion. Some persons might say of him, perhaps, that he seemed ready to give up the French law, but he thought they had nothing to fear in Quebec from a comparison of their French laws with the common law prevailing in the other Provinces. Indeed, he believed that the result of such comparison would sooner lead the other Provinces to prefer the French law, with some amendments, to their own, and he had heard a similar opinion attributed to a distinguished member of this House. This great advantage likely to be gained, that was, a unification of all the laws in the Dominion, would do much towards bringing about the result to which all patriots aimed — the consolidation of our heterogeneous elements into one Canadian nationality, governed by the same laws in civil as well as criminal matters. These suggestions might appear premature and presumptuous, but he thought after all we must come to that. Everyone felt that we had too many Courts at present, and if we were going to have a Supreme Court, let us make it useful to the public in general, and useful to the working of our institutions.

MR. DAWSON said he did not rise to take any part in the discussion, but merely to say that he repudiated the idea of having voted for the abolition of the Supreme Court in voting for the introduction of the Bill of the hon. member for East Northumberland, which, in fact, he had not seen; nor did

he wish to throw any reflection on the Supreme Court. He believed the Supreme Court was in every way deserving of the confidence of this House and of the country.

Bill read the second time.

TRADE MARKS AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS BILL.—[BILL 82.]

(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

THIRD READING.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

INSOLVENT ACTS REPEAL BILL.

[BILL 85.]

(Mr. Colby.)

SECOND READING NEGATIVED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. COLBY said that, as chairman of the Committee appointed some time ago by the House to consider the question of Insolvency, it, perhaps, properly devolved upon him to state the views at which the Committee had arrived with regard to the subject, and the recommendations which they had seen fit to make. He trusted the observations which he might feel himself called upon to make would be received by this House with the attention which the importance of the subject deserved, and in a spirit of candour. There was, perhaps, no subject which at the present time was a source of greater anxiety than this Bill. He would not go into the details of the Bill proposed by the Committee. The hon. gentlemen from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), St. John (Mr. Weldon), and South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), whose experience in the practical working of the Insolvency Law was greater than his own, and who were more familiar with the details of the Bill, would have an opportunity of speaking on these points. He would confine himself to the principle of the Bill. He might say, at the outset, that the Committee, at their first meeting, found themselves very much divided in sentiment, as were this House and the country, with regard to the expediency of continuing

MR. DAWSON.

the Insolvency Act, or repealing it pure and simple, and, at an early meeting of the Committee, when the sense was taken upon the question, eight members voted for the repeal of the Act, while nine members voted for a modification of it. He mentioned this in order that his hon. friends, who were in favour of its repeal, might see that the entire question had been considered by a Committee composed largely of gentlemen whose views coincided with their own, and they might be prepared, perhaps, to receive with greater favour the recommendations which a Committee so composed might have felt called upon to make. After the Committee at large had determined to prepare amendments to the Act, they appointed a sub-Committee, and it became the duty of the sub-Committee, at the very outset, to seriously consider the evils of the Insolvency Act, which, in the interests of the public, it was desirable to remove. Now, he did not assume to speak for the whole Committee, but, in giving expression to his own views, he believed he would also fairly represent the prevailing sentiment among the members of the Committee. Representations had been made from one end of the country to the other, through the press, on the floor of Parliament, from various sources, to the effect that the present Insolvency Act had given rise to great evils. The Committee felt bound to ascertain the nature of those evils, with a view of providing the proper remedy. They found the complaints against the Act were that it had given rise to great recklessness in trade, to great extravagance in living among the trading classes, to great dishonesty. Deputations which had appeared before them had set forth that the effect of this Act had been, not to stimulate men in difficulties to endeavour to extricate themselves from their difficulties, but acted as an inducement to them to place themselves under its operation, because a man in difficulties would see he was a fool, or if he did not, others would make him see it, to spend the best years of his life in endeavouring to extricate himself from his troubles, when he could do so by the easy process of starting anew in life, free from the load of debt, and, by a favourable compromise with his creditors, save out of the wreck of his

estate a very considerable sum, with which to start business again. He (Mr. Colby) had no hesitation in saying that if the only method of getting rid of that condition of affairs, was the repeal of the Insolvent Act, pure and simple, he would work heartily for its repeal. The evils which existed here also existed in England. In looking over the recent speech of the Lord Chancellor, in looking over the articles in the press and in the reviews, in reading the comments made with regard to the working of the Insolvent Act in England, precisely the same expression of opinion as in this country, concerning the evil effects of the Act, would be found. He would beg to draw the attention of the House to one or two extracts. The *Saturday Review*, with reference to the working of the Act, stated as follows :

"The Chancellor's Bankruptcy Bill may be described as a measure for retaining the present system of dealing with defaulting debtors, but weeding it of its abuses. At present there are two methods in which an insolvent may be treated by his creditors; he may be made a bankrupt, or he may escape the ignominy of bankruptcy by being allowed to compound with his creditors. The latter is the method of treatment which debtors naturally prefer, and which creditors, through supineness, good nature, or a calculation of their interests, are generally willing to sanction. It is around the working of this method that the frightful abuses which now call for the intervention of the Government have gradually sprung up. The chief of these abuses is, that insolvency has lost all its terrors. Many men think no more of not paying their debts than of taking a trip to Brighton. A little friendly manoeuvring is exercised in their behalf by persons who have made this curious art their profession, and they are completely whitewashed. They are at once released from the effects of the past without any inquiry into their conduct, and a future exactly like the past is immediately opened to them. Through the facilities thus opened to dishonest or reckless trading the national loss, through bad debts, has risen to the startling amount of eighteen millions per annum."

[That was through the facility with which these arrangements were made. In the *Fortnightly Review* he found, at the summing up of a long and able article on the question, the following :—

"The facility of getting rid of liabilities, however contracted, is rapidly demoralising all branches of trade, from the highest to the lowest. Men waste their own means, large and small, and waste the means of their rela-

tives, friends and creditors in starting enterprises of which they have no real knowledge. They carry them on recklessly; they live profusely; they reduce to beggary honest and hard-working competitors in the same line of trade; and for the very sufficient reason that the magnificent insolvent, with a complacent reliance on the easy process of liquidation, to be conducted practically under his own guidance, can and does go on for years, so conducting his business that losses have no terror for him. Under such a state of things it is idle to talk of economic laws of supply and demand. Those laws suppose honest trading, and a wholesome horror of the disgrace of bankruptcy. We have had hundreds of examples lately, and on the largest scale, that the vicious weakness and laxity of the Bankruptcy laws are rapidly expelling the honesty and putting an end to the sentiment of disgrace. For this end, a swift and certain remedy must be found; and a remedy which ought to be all the more swift and certain, because, properly carried out, it will not add one single farthing to the expenses of the Public Treasury."

In the United States the same evil had been complained of. In a letter which was addressed by Mr. Claffin, one of the largest merchants in New York, to a gentleman in this city, and which was read before the Dominion Board of Trade, he found these remarks :—

"However the general features of the Bankrupt Act may commend themselves to philanthropists and political speculators, we have found that whenever a composition is guaranteed to a debtor by law, it has operated to the disadvantage of all honest traders. How is it possible for a merchant of moderate capital to pay 100c. in the dollar of his obligations when his neighbour is compelled to pay only 20c., or even a more nominal consideration, by the virtue of the provisions of a bankrupt law. In the United States bankruptcy had degenerated into a trade and a profession, and a man who was successful in this department received from our degenerated public sentiment only applause and credit for his successful performance. A little while longer and all trade would have been prostrated under the operation of such a law."

In Canada, in England, and in the United States; the same condition of affairs, the same injurious effect had resulted from the Insolvency Act in each country. What was that injurious effect? It would be well to analyse it, to see where the difficulty was, and apply the remedy. The difficulty lay in the facility with which the insolvent could make his composition, arrange with his creditors, and get his discharge. Now, if that dangerous facility were removed,

if it were made impossible for a man to get his discharge under any such circumstances, to buy back his assets under any condition whatever, the evil would be removed just as effectually as if the law were repealed altogether. The Committee had struck the axe at the root of that evil by making it impossible for a creditor and debtor to enter into this composition arrangement, which, of itself, seemed reasonable enough in theory, but which had been productive of such enormous evils. There was nothing more humane in theory than the idea that, if a man surrendered his property to his creditors, he should have absolution and start free in life again. The idea of protecting the honest and unfortunate debtor was a humane and a proper idea, but in England, in the United States, and in Canada, where endeavours had been made to protect the honest and unfortunate trader, the door had been, unfortunately, opened to fraud, demoralisation, recklessness and evils so numerous that it became necessary, in the public interest, that these facilities should be done away with. The Committee had, consequently, in their Bill, made it impossible for an insolvent to make this composition and arrangement with his creditors, by which he would buy back his estate. They had made it impossible for him to obtain his discharge, as a matter of right, under any circumstances whatever, from the obligations he had voluntarily assumed. He could only obtain it by the concurrence, the free action of his creditors, and in attaining that concurrence his relatives were not permitted to take part and vote. They had not said it was necessary he should have the assent of every individual creditor upon his list, because experience had shown that, while such a condition as that existed, some creditor, for the sake of being paid in full, would stand out and insist that he should be paid in full before such an arrangement could be entered into. Consequently the Committee had made this provision, which might be relaxed or made more stringent. When the Bill was discussed in Committee, if the House thought any alteration necessary: that, in order to obtain a discharge under any circumstances whatever, it was necessary for the insolvent to obtain the assent of

four-fifths in number of his creditors, representing four-fifths in value of the entire indebtedness against him, his relatives not being included in the number. All experience had shown that the man who was really honest and unfortunate, who could show a good honest record, and who, by some unforeseen calamity, by some providential infliction, had fallen into adversity, would, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, obtain a free discharge from his creditors; but experience had also shown that some creditor, knowing that such would be the tendency of the others, would, in order to improve his own position, say to the debtor: You cannot carry out that arrangement unless I am paid in full. Consequently, the Committee had not made it necessary that the assent of every individual creditor should be obtained before a discharge could be granted. It had been the honest endeavour of the Committee to meet the evils of this Act in this way, to put an end to every inducement which would prompt a man to put himself under the operation of the Insolvent Act, so that, henceforth, men in difficulty, instead of flying to the Insolvent Act for refuge, would flee from it, would have nothing to gain under it, and, instead of surrendering in a cowardly, timid, or dishonest manner, to the debts that were upon them, would strive manfully to keep themselves out of the operation of the Act. Now, he submitted to those who asked for a repeal of the Act, pure and simple, whether, if that were accomplished, their views were not fully met. Year after year he had deemed it his duty to advocate the repeal of the Insolvency Act, and had pointed out these very results as results that were certain to follow, when times of depression came on, as they had unfortunately come. But he had, invariably, gone further, and held that while these evils should be removed, a law was needed for the fair distribution of assets, but that was a matter to which he would presently allude. The Committee believed that, in striking out the clauses providing for the composition and discharge, those providing for a judicial discharge, and those providing for the sale of an estate *en bloc*, they had struck at the root of the evils complained of.

SIR A. J. SMITH : You have abolished official assignees.

MR. COLBY said the Committee had abolished them, and that fact would, he believed, be hailed with pleasure by all in this country. He was aware that among the numerous class of official assignees in this country, there were many most estimable men, many honest, competent men, who did their duty in a most satisfactory manner; but there were also, in that numerous class, men who had brought discredit upon the name of official assignee. There were in this class men who, having the opportunity of taking possession of the estate and books of a debtor, could, by collusion with a friendly insolvent, or by inducements held out to the creditors, provide themselves with proxies and cause themselves to be appointed permanent assignees, and wind up the estates in their own interest. In order to do that, estates had been very badly depreciated. But among the worst evils of this system of official assignees was the fact that it created a class of men who were making money out of insolvents' estates, whose interest it was that every man should go into insolvency, and who were responsible, to a very large extent, for the great rush which had been made into insolvency in times past. Now, the Bill had abolished composition, judicial discharge, official assignees, and contemplated another improvement. It limited the proxy system in this way. It obliged every creditor, living within the jurisdiction where the insolvent estate was to attend the meeting personally, or be represented there by his book-keeper or agent, and no one, in such case, could hold a proxy for another, except he were a creditor, and no creditor could hold but one proxy; so that this Bill practically did away with this manipulating an estate by means of proxies, and made the creditor himself attentive to his own business. There had been too great neglect by the creditors themselves. There was no doubt the Insolvency Law would have worked very much better had the creditors given that attention to their own affairs which they should have done, but, when difficulties arose, when they saw a thing was going to the bad, there was something repulsive in the

idea. They wanted to wipe the thing out. They did not care to attend meetings; they wanted to wipe it off their books as soon as possible, and in that way neglected their interests. Of course, this Bill did not deprive the creditors in England, or in jurisdictions other than the one in which the insolvent failed, from being represented by proxy. They hoped that the creditor would be induced to give more of his personal attention to the affairs of the insolvent than he had hitherto given, and that beneficial results would ensue from this. Thus, by those three methods—of limiting the system, by abolishing the official assignee, and doing away with composition and discharge, and judicial discharge, they believed they would strike at the root at almost all the evils—he might say all the evils that had ever been complained of in the House and country in regard to the Insolvent Act. In place of the official assignee, they had provided for a guardian of the estate, who would take possession of it as a sheriff did, and hold it during the time the creditors were being convened, but no longer. This guardian received a very moderate fee. \$5 for every seizure, and a moderate allowance for the custody of the estate. His bill for an estate of \$5,000 would not exceed \$30. Otherwise, he could make no costs against the estate, nor be eligible to become a permanent trustee of it, and he could have no object in endeavouring to influence parties to obtain it. The creditors, represented by their agents, were at perfect liberty to select, for the winding up of the estate, such men as they deemed in their interest advisable, except him who had been its legal guardian. They had felt called upon to make that great change. They had made another very important change—important, he was sure, in the estimation of some members of the House; while the non-trader did not come under the operation of the Act, was not affected by it in one way, they had stipulated he should not be affected in the other way; so that in the case of the farmer or non-trader creditor, should a discharge be given the debtor by four-fifths in number and value of the trading creditors, it did not cut off the debt or claim of the farmer or non-trader, who could come in for a divi-

dend like all other claimants, and hold over the balance of his claim against the debtor. So that the discharge, difficult as it was to obtain, was not one that cut off the claim of the non-trader. Those were the essential features of the changes, and they were such as should commend themselves especially to members, who, like himself, had been for years endeavouring to obtain the abrogation of the Insolvent Act. His views with regard to the question were the same as in 1870, 1871 and 1872. When in 1872 he introduced a Bill to abolish the Act, which passed this House, he begged to call the attention of his hon. friends who then voted with him for the repeal of the Insolvent Act to this fact: while he pointed out the same class of evils then existing, as to-day, he stated in the same breath, that it was necessary in his judgment, in the interest of the Dominion, that there should be a uniform law throughout the Dominion; that they should not be thrown back on their Provincial laws; that the general law should be based on the equitable principle of the law of Quebec, giving a fair distribution of the proceeds of a bankrupt's estate among the creditors. Now, he called attention to this fact, when this Committee considered the petitions before the House for the repeal of the Act, there was but one in the whole long list which asked for its repeal, pure and simple. They had petitions from Halifax and various parts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, from Montreal, Toronto and various parts of Ontario and Quebec, all suggesting that they should repeal the old Act, but should also pass another Act which would do away with preferential assignments. That was precisely what the Committee had done; they had repealed the Act so far as the abolition of those objectionable features was concerned, and simply proposed the passing of another Act which should give a uniform law throughout the Dominion. Was it not desirable to have a uniform law for the collection of commercial debts? When they considered the vast increase in inter-Provincial trade, and the manifold relations between the merchants of one Province and the people of another, was it not desirable that there should be uniformity of law, so that the merchants and manufacturers in Ontario and Quebec,

MR. COLBY.

sending goods to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, should know what was the law for the collection of debts in those Provinces. This feature of uniformity in the law was a great advantage in itself, provided the law was good. It would be superior to the old system of diverse laws in the different Provinces—a perplexing patchwork—the laws of each Province differing from those of the others. People would be under the necessity of learning them all in order to know what their remedies were. He would go a step further and say that there should be a law providing for a speedy and summary way of taking possession of the debts and estate of the insolvent. It should not be necessary that every creditor should rush into Court and institute his separate action against an insolvent debtor. There should not be a multiplicity of actions in order that each creditor should get his rights. Such a condition would be unsatisfactory in the extreme. It involved a multiplicity of actions, which the spirit of all laws very properly abhors. Instead of that, the law which they proposed made one action suffice. If a man was in a state of difficulty, and unable to pay his debts, one proceeding or attachment would take his entire estate. Instead of having 30 or 40 actions in the hands of as many lawyers, perhaps, to wind up an estate, with immense law costs, one attachment would put the estate into the custody of the creditors, and secure it till it was disposed of. The Bill of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) revived the old Provincial laws, pure and simple. He would thus revive in the other Provinces a principle of law which the people of the Province of Quebec abhorred—the system of preferential assignments and snap judgments, first come, first served—now that hon. gentleman and his hon. friends from Quebec were taught to loathe that system. They believed that a man's estate should be fairly and equitably divided among all his creditors. Now, his hon. friends from Quebec, who should vote for the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville, would maintain the law of preferential assignments and kindred evils. They would fly in the face of that system, which they, in Quebec, had

been educated to believe was most excellent and beneficent—the best that existed on the continent of America, and which was based on pure equity. If the estate could not pay all demands, it should pay according to the amount of each claim fairly and honourably as far as it went. That was the proposition which the Bill affirmed. The proposition of the hon. member for Iberville affirmed, was the revival of the system of law in the other Provinces, which they would not tolerate for a moment in Quebec. Another thing the Bill proposed, not attainable under local laws, which made an Act of this kind necessary—the creditors of a man in difficulties might take possession of his books, examine him as to the condition of affairs, and find out who were his debtors who might be pursued. Under the old Provincial laws, creditors had to go on a voyage of discovery, having no means of taking possession of the books, or finding out the insolvent's debtors, or who had got most of his goods within a short time. But under the proposed law they would take possession of the books, examine the debtor, and obtain disclosures with regard to the position of his affairs. They would compel him to disclose if his property was concealed, and reveal to his debtors. What was done with the proposed Bill was simply this: they had attempted to remove the evil while endeavouring to preserve certain features which were beneficial and believed worthy of preservation in the interest of the trading community. In one sense it might be said not to be an Insolvent Act. It was just enough of an Insolvent Act to be brought within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. It would enable the creditor to take possession of an insolvent estate by one action instead of a multitude. He asked if this was not a laudable purpose. They had stripped the old Act of its evils as thoroughly as if they had repealed it, and had furnished the commercial community with what they did desire—a law by which the creditors might possess themselves of an insolvent's estate and fairly divide among themselves its proceeds. Hon. members could not find a single expression of opinion from the mercantile bodies, or from merchants anywhere in Canada, which went in any other direction. The

Dominion Board of Trade had expressed itself in favor of preserving the clauses of the old Act, which the Committee had retained. The Boards of Trade of the great cities had pronounced themselves in the same sense—that they wished to remove the evils of the Act, but also to provide for a fair distribution of an insolvent's assets. He would pass from that to another matter. Some hon. members said that this was a bulky Bill, which they could not get through this Session, and that they might as well continue the old Act. He believed however, the Bill fell 40 clauses short of the old Act. The sub-Committee had before them a Bill introduced by himself, and drawn up by a leading barrister of Montreal, one of the most competent men in Canada, Mr. Ritchie, and they had before them a Bill drawn by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) but they had put them both aside, and why? Not that they did not consider them without merit, for he believed the Bill he had introduced, ably as it was explained by Mr. Ritchie, commended itself to the favourable considerations of its members, and he believed that the Bill of the member for Jacques Cartier, had many excellent features, but they thought it better to retain, for the present, an imperfect Act, with clauses with which the trading community were familiar, with which the gentlemen of the Bar were familiar, and which had been adjudicated upon, than to an try attentive or experimental Act that, however carefully drawn, might be defective in particulars, and would be new in its provisions. They could not but perceive that it was impossible, with a limited time at the command of the sub-Committee, to elaborate an entirely new system. Consequently, they had decided to retain the old Act as amended. It would have been very pleasing, no doubt, to the members of the Committee to have had their names associated with a new Insolvent Act if it had worked all right. But if it had been found that the law, the first time it went to the Court, had failed in its operation, they should not have felt so happy. Hon. members need not be intimidated by the length of the Bill. The new clauses were printed in italics, and the clauses expunged described. If any hon. member would put

himself to the extraordinary exertion of turning over the leaves of the Bill, he would find very few clauses printed in italics, and but a very few clauses the House would have to consider if it went into Committee on the Bill.

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

After Recess.

MR. COLBY said it was his intention to have closed his remarks at six o'clock, and he would have done so but for some enquiries that had been made from him during the recess, in regard to the provisions of the Bill. An hon. member referred to his (Mr. Colby's) observation, that in doing away with composition and discharge they had struck at the root of the evil, and had said: "But you have not done it—you have not abolished composition and discharge." He (Mr. Colby) proposed to refer to the matter for a few moments. They had repealed those clauses which entitled the insolvent to a judicial discharge as a matter of right. Hon. gentlemen would agree with him in this: that if a debtor under this Bill could obtain a discharge, it was as a matter of grace by the nearly unanimous consent of his creditors, and not at all as a matter of right. But they had done what he did not specially dwell upon in his former remarks. They had abolished what were known as composition arrangements, by which the debtor could purchase back his estate and start again in business, paying to his creditors a certain percentage of his indebtedness. Sales *en bloc* were also impossible, or they intended that they should be so, if not they would make them so in Committee, when they had the opportunity of going into Committee. One of the most serious evils in the practical working of the Insolvency Act, was the facility with which debtors could get their estates back again. He would read an extract which would illustrate this better than he would, perhaps, be able to demonstrate it by language. It was an actual, and not an exaggerated, instance, and he therefore desired to direct the attention of the House to it, as a representative case :—

MR. COLBY.

LIABILITIES.

Ordinary		
Claims.....	\$16,071	12
Privileged:		
Rent....	\$619	75
Taxes....	48	75
Salaries..	191	76
		<u>860 26</u>
		\$16,931 38

ASSETS.

Stock.....	\$12,805	47
Fixtures.....	1,497	00
Book Debts:		
Good.....	2,093	96
Doubtful.	\$766	95
Valued at		
50c on \$.....	383	47
Bad.	1,885	60
Bills Receivable.....		5 00
		<u>16,784 96</u>

Deficiency 146 48

"A composition of forty cents on the dollar, at four, eight, and twelve months, was carried, and the insolvent's affairs then stood thus :

Assets.....	\$16,784	96
Liabilities :		
Composition Notes..	\$6,428	44
Privileged Claims...	860	26
Assignee's Account..	250	00
		<u>7,538 70</u>
Surplus.....	9,246	26

"The insolvent thus obtained, as the consequence of his failure, a surplus which he could not possibly have accumulated by less than eight years of successful trade, backed by patient and continued thrift. The very broad hint given to his neighbours in trade requires no further mention, and the effect of such cases, constantly occurring, upon the morals of the trade generally, may as easily be imagined as described."

Now that was the class of case, and that was the evil which they sought to avoid. That man made a composition of 40c., and by that means saved \$9,000 out of his own bankrupt estate. He undertook to make the payments at four, eight, and twelve months, and, in order to realise his payments, he was obliged to do it out of his estate by underselling the solvent trader. This condition of the law tended to demoralise the whole community, and it had the effect of breaking down the solvent trader who was endeavouring, in an honest and faithful manner, to keep his head above water and pay his debts. Under this Bill, it was impossible for the debtor to buy back his estate, nor could

he purchase it through a third person. Sales *en bloc* had been effectually prevented. The Committee had been guided, in making these provisions, by the disastrous experience of years back, and by the opinions of intelligent merchants and men who had watched commercial matters carefully. They had guarded every point which had caused demoralisation and injury to the honest trader. Under the composition arrangement, the insolvent went to his creditor, and said: "My assets are nominally so much," and he made a proposition which by no means represented the value of the estate. The creditor said: "It is better to have something now, than an indefinite amount by-and-by," and if the estate showed 80 per cent., the creditor took 30 per cent. for the sake of getting the matter closed out. The Committee had had this matter under consideration. They had weighed all these points carefully, anxiously, and earnestly, and had endeavoured, in every possible way, to guard against all these abuses. Another hon. member had referred to the clause which provided for a Judge in bankruptcy at Montreal. He would, with the permission of the House, explain the views of the Committee upon that point. The original draft of the Bill provided for Judges at the chief courts of trade, and it provided also for the imposition of a tax of one half of one per cent. on the estates administered within the jurisdiction of the Judge. But a feeling grew up that this was creating new judgeships, affording additional patronage, and making the Bankruptcy Law a permanent tax on estates that should not be so taxed. In deference to that sentiment the Committee modified their proposition, and instead of laying a tax on the estate, the Judge was to be paid like other Judges, and to be limited to the city of Montreal. He wished to say how that hon. gentlemen need not oppose the second reading of the Bill on account of that provision. That was one of the minor details, and, in Committee of the Whole, it would be the privilege of the House to take it out entirely if they considered a Judge was not required in bankruptcy in Montreal, or enlarge it, if they thought it necessary that there should also be Judges in bankruptcy in

Toronto, Halifax, St. John, or any other business centre. There was one other matter which he would refer to. It was very evident that many members from the rural districts had come to this House with the intention of voting for the repeal of the Insolvency Act. Many members had, very likely, declared to their constituents that such was their intention. He himself was a representative of a rural district, and it was his intention to have voted for the repeal of the Insolvency Act, and he believed he might say, on behalf of the hon. gentleman who would second this proposition, that it was his intention, also, to have voted for its repeal. But the aspect of the matter had entirely changed. The farmers felt that they had a great grievance. They saw traders taking advantage of the Insolvency Act when they were in difficulties, and when in similar straits they (the farmers) had no such privilege. But the Committee had changed this by their Bill. It was no object to any trader or non-trader to put himself under the operation of the Bill as it now stood. More than that, however, they had provided that the farm in common with other creditors, would come in for a fair share of the distribution of the effects, but that he should not be affected by any discharge given to the debtor. He held the balance of his claim in its entirety. He appealed to members from the rural districts, and he did so with a great deal of confidence, because he was one of their number, not to favour a repeal of the Insolvent Act, pure and simple, but to allow the commercial community some means of taking possession of, and distributing, insolvent estates. If the commercial community wanted such an Act, why should we withhold it from them. If the great commercial centres of the Dominion required an Act by which they could take possession of the estate of an insolvent, and wind it up in a manner pleasing to themselves, why should the representatives of the rural districts say "You shall not have it." As an evidence that the commercial community desired it, he would read several telegrams. The hon. gentleman then read telegrams from the Board of Trade of Quebec, Hamilton and Toronto.

In these they had the views of Quebec, Toronto and Hamilton. The petitions which came before the House from Truro, Halifax and other parts of Nova Scotia, asked for a suspension or repeal of the present Act, and the substitution in its place of an Act for the prevention of preferential assignments. Then they had Montreal, Sherbrooke, St. Hyacinthe, Brockville, Quebec, and Hamilton, asking for a repeal of the Act, on the ground that its continuance was an evil, and that it might be replaced by an Act protecting alike both the debtor and creditor without affording facilities for fraudulent transactions, or preferring one creditor before another. They had, from every commercial centre in this Dominion, an indication of the same sentiment. He ventured to say that if a division on this question should take place in the House, they would find the older members who had debated the question, and who had been familiar with it for years, and the members from the cities would be in favour of the modifications proposed by the Committee. He would give the House the substance of two letters he had received from a Montreal merchant. On the 25th of March he wrote to him as Chairman of the Committee, asking him to do all in his power to repeal the Insolvent Act, which had done so much evil in the country, and pointing out the demoralisation and injurious consequences that had resulted through it to legitimate trade. On the 14th of April, the same gentleman wrote that he had seen the propositions of the Committee, and that he desired to withdraw his former letter, that the Bill proposed to the House met his views and met the views of every merchant with whom he had conversed in the city. From this cumulative evidence, from the petitions coming from Boards of Trade and from every commercial centre in the Dominion, there was one universal expression—the denunciation of the abuses and evils of the present Act, and a desire that it should be replaced by another, that would provide for a fair distribution of assets, and do away with preferential assignments. Why should they, representing the rural constituencies, gainsay the wishes of the commercial men, and say they should not have a law which they

conceived to be in their interest? Why should they, who had been hitherto in favour of the repeal of the whole Act, not be willing to content themselves with the retention of those features which enabled a creditor to take possession speedily and summarily of an estate, and wind up its affairs? He thought they were living at a very critical period; in times of extreme depression; in times when many a merchant had sleepless nights, as he considered the state of his ledger and his obligations. He thought they were living at a time when they could not afford to risk new experiments. It might be hazardous to rush from the one extreme of an Insolvency Act, that the trading community were familiar with, to the opposite extreme, the entire repeal of the Act. He believed the middle course was the safe one—the course which repealed the evils of the Act, and retained its benefits. He did not believe it was opportune, judicious, or business-like, to act precipitately in this matter, and to throw the whole business of this country into chaos. Suppose the law was instantly changed, and merchants thrown back on the old Provincial laws, see how unsettled a condition of affairs would exist; how excited men would become under the new trouble that would be thrown upon them in being obliged to seek new remedies—new measures for the protection of their interest—in places where they did not understand the law. He believed the sound judgment and fair consideration of the interests of this country, would teach the better sense of this House that the prudent course was the middle course, and not the extreme one. That was the basis of what the Committee proposed to-day: to protect the commercial community, to relieve the non-trading community from the operation of the laws, and when an estate was taken possession of, to enable a fair distribution to be made.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) said, in every country the subject of insolvency and bankruptcy had always been considered as one surrounded by serious difficulties. Everywhere, especially in countries not governed by the maxims of the Roman or Civil law, it had been difficult to frame laws equally just and fair to the creditor and the

debtor. In England, the task had been found exceedingly complicated, and almost impossible of being accomplished. While in Scotland, France, Germany, and Italy, where the principles of the Roman law prevailed, laws for the settlement of insolvent estates had for years, almost centuries, been accepted as settled institutions. England, the United States and Canada, were still in search of such laws, and seemed to be as far as ever from coming to a satisfactory conclusion. In Scotland, for instance, there had been no important legislation on the subject since 1839, when an Act to amend the laws of Scotland, relating to bankruptcy, was adopted. It was not altogether a new Act. It was chiefly confined to the sequestration of estates of bankrupts, and had ever since been in force, with few changes of minor importance. In France the origin of bankrupt laws can be traced to 1673, as forming part of the celebrated ordinance of that year of Louis XIV., and ever since they have only been twice reconsidered—first in 1808, at the time of the promulgation of the Code of Commerce; and, secondly, in 1838, when the law, as now in force, was enacted. In England, on the contrary, not to go back beyond the present reign, we find that no less than three distinct Bankrupt Acts have been tried—one in 1849, another in 1861, a third one in 1869; and the people of Great Britain are not yet satisfied. The Act of 1869 is pronounced to be far worse than the former Acts, and a general cry is heard from all parts of the Kingdom, demanding its repeal. A portion of the mercantile community were so disgusted with the present state of things, that the repeal of all insolvent laws, pure and simple, was even thought of in that great commercial country. The London *Spectator*, of the 1st February, 1879, says:—“We are glad that the great bankers and merchants in the city of London are, as the important memorial addressed to Lord Beaconsfield shows, giving their minds to the subject of the scandalous working of the Bankruptcy Act of 1869. When fifty of the leading banking and mercantile firms in the city put any complaint respecting commercial law into shape—when such weighty firms as Barings; Barclay, Bevan & Co.; Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co.; Hoare & Co.;

Smith, Payne & Smiths, and the London and Westminster Bank, append their names to an address, praying an amendment of any law affecting them, no Government can disregard the matter. *

* * * Not the least remarkable feature of the memorial is that it is a virtual recantation. Before the Act of 1869 came into operation—certainly before Lord Westbury's measure of 1861 was passed—nine out of ten men of business would have said:—The best Bankruptcy Law would be practically no Bankruptcy Law. Leave creditors alone to settle with their debtors as they see fit. Let there be no interference on the part of official assignees, with the accompanying official harpies, and the assets of bankrupts will be divided promptly, cheaply, and fairly. Contrast the slow and expensive operation of the old Court of Review, and that in Basinghall street, with their multitude of highly-paid officials (serenely indifferent to the miserable creditors) with the cheap procedure in Scotland, where the creditors arrange matters for themselves, and where the work of distribution is done better, as well as more cheaply, than here. Only let the creditors do the work which the Courts do, and all will be well. * *

The memorialists see plainly enough that matters are very wrong. It can, indeed, be hardly denied by anyone who looks into the comptroller's annual reports, that the present Bankruptcy Law is almost as injurious to honest trading as if there were in the city of London an Alsatia, in which the Queen's writs or warrants did not run, and to which thieves might retire in safety.” However, the *Spectator*, like the *Times*, in fact the whole English press, and the largest portion of the English people, demand a Bankrupt Law. The Lord Chancellor had gone to work, and had just submitted to Parliament, a new Bankruptcy Bill, which would probably receive its approbation; although fears were entertained by many that this new piece of legislation would be too lenient and permissive, in fact, as is alleged, “a mere patching of an old rotten garment.” “A harder Bankruptcy Law,” says an able writer in the April number of *Fraser*, “would tell greatly in favour of the honest insolvent, who is at present confounded with the rogue, and it would also serve as a check

on reckless trading." In the United States, the first Bankruptcy Law was passed in 1800, and was expressly limited to the period of five years, but was repealed before the expiration of that period, on the 19th December, 1803. The second Act was passed in 1841, and repealed by an Act which took effect in 1843. The third and last Act had been the Bankruptcy Act of 1867, which was repealed in 1878. It was well-known that those Acts were framed mainly for the benefit of the debtors. They were passed to meet special emergencies, such as the disasters of the unprecedented Civil War of 1861-65; and it was not surprising to hear that the abolition of those laws had had a good effect upon the trade and commerce of our neighbours. We must finally bear in mind that most of the States have State Insolvency Laws, which provided for the distribution of insolvent estates equally between the creditors. In fact, the States of Massachusetts, New Jersey, and other States of the Union, have Insolvency Laws almost as voluminous as the law now under consideration in this Parliament. With regard to our own country, general Bankrupt Laws were introduced for the first time in 1839, and repealed in 1843, when a temporary Act, based upon the same principles, favourable to the debtor, was enacted and continued to 1849, when it ceased to operate. In 1863, Hon. Mr. Abbott, then a member of the Canadian Cabinet, introduced a new Insolvency Act, which was passed the following year, under the name of the Insolvent Act of 1864. The author announced that he intended to have a law "creating a summary mode of realising and distributing the estates of insolvents, and of affording relief from liability to debtors, making a full disclosure and delivery of their estates to the creditors." It was, however, an undisputed fact—and the features and practical result of the Bill proved that it was intended to work against the creditor—that it was framed to meet the then prevailing feeling of the community, which was then suffering from the great commercial crisis of 1857, and was altogether in favour of the unfortunate insolvents. He (Mr. Girouard) then took the liberty to review and criticise this new law. He said, quoting from his "Review of the Insolvent Act of 1864:"

MR. GIROUARD.

—"Since the first of September, it has been in force as law, to the great satisfaction of insolvents, who cannot fail to invoke its protection, and have already, to the number of hundreds, made their announcements to the country, but, at the same time, to the great dissatisfaction of a large number of merchants, who do not find in it the guarantee which was promised, or the simple, short, clear and easily understood dispositions which they ought to understand, and be able to apply without possessing the skill of its author, a man well-known to all as thoroughly conversant with the practical affairs of commerce, and with the laws relating thereto. * * * *"

What is to be expected from a law which, from the first to the thirteenth clause, and from the first to the hundred and thirty-first paragraph, favours almost always the insolvent, and not the creditor? When we glance at the provisions of the Act, the mode, voluntary as well as compulsory, of winding up the affairs of the insolvent; when it is observed that the bankrupt has himself the control of the important delays of the announcement of his failure, and the divesting himself of his estate; that he can still, with impunity, defeat the law and defraud his creditors, obtain, in spite of the latter, a judicial discharge; when it is clear that the hope of such discharge will be for the debtor a powerful motive to induce him to diminish his assets, and afterwards to declare himself in a state of bankruptcy, in order to come out of it enriched with the spoils of the mass; when, we say, we consider all these complications and formalities, which here, as always, serve the debtor and not the creditor; when we remember, in fine, all these delays and costs of liquidation, without forgetting the expenses of the insolvent in obtaining his discharge, and attending the meetings of creditors, for the arrangement of his own affairs, it is easy to see, we say again, that the fact, the evidence of which we invoked, is but the rigorous consequence of the law, the inevitable result of the provisions of the Act. Finally, we think we do not stretch the truth in affirming that a large number of merchants, if not the greater number, would be satisfied with few amendments, and simple additions, to the existing laws, for the sole purpose of defining and pun-

ishing fraud, and giving to the *cession de biens* its proper and necessary effects. Let the Legislature, by rigorous enactments, endeavour to banish fraud; and, in order to do so, let it introduce the presumptions of fraud consecrated by the codes of the commercial nations of Europe; let it require from each trader, the keeping of regular books of account, and authorise the seizure of the same; let it strike without mercy at *séparations de biens* and fraudulent commercial partnerships—the two great plagues of our trade;—let it force the *marchande publique* to carry on business under her own name, and not under that of her husband; let it limit the right of conservatory process of the non-paid vendor, above all, let every fraud be considered a crime, and punished as such, at least to the full extent of modern legislation—all so many rules, perfectly distinct and independent of all systems of bankruptcy; and, it will be seen, that to arrive at the most equitable and easy arrangement of the affairs of the insolvent, it will remain only to define the rules of making a *cession de biens*, voluntary or forced, and the effects thereof, by the creation of the office of assignee, and in giving to a certain number of the creditors, say the majority in number and in value, the power to control the minority and to grant, amongst other things, the discharge to the insolvent." In 1869 and 1875, the Insolvent Acts were reconsidered, and supposed to have been entirely remodelled, but the principle remained the same. The debtor was favoured to the detriment of the creditor, who then found himself in the presence of a new enemy, far more formidable than the insolvent, the Government official assignee. The result had been that for years past the cry had been general, from one end of the Dominion to the other, that the existing laws should be repealed. The feeling now was quite the reverse of what it was in 1864. It was exclusively in favour of the creditor, and the debtor must be left to his fate. Petition after petition has been sent to this Parliament, praying for the repeal of the Insolvent Act of 1875. Boards of Trade have unanimously condemned the working of the present system, and all demanded radical changes to it. However, he believed public opinion was not misunderstood, but on the

contrary, acted upon, by presenting to the country a Bill which, repealing the existing laws, at the same time, provided for the winding up of insolvent estates. The Bill drafted by the Committee commended itself, in his humble opinion, to the favourable consideration of the members of this House, to both the repealers, pure and simple, and the champions of Insolvency Law and insolvency principles, as it provided both for the distribution of assets and the discharge of the insolvent in a fair and equitable manner. At the beginning of the Session he had the honour of introducing a Bill which was intended, in some respects, to improve the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec in insolvency matters, to extend its provisions to the whole Dominion, and thus do away with the great evils which Ontario and other Provinces would have to contend against under the English common law system, such as preferential assignments and priority by judgment. The hon. members from the Provinces governed by the English jurisprudence should not be astonished at his attempt. The Civil Code of Lower Canada was based upon the well settled and most admirable principles of the Roman law which Lord Mansfield embodied, more or less, in the commercial law of England, and which more and more, every day, found its way into her Equity Courts—not those inhuman Roman principles which permitted the rigid creditor to cut into pieces the body of his debtor, and sometimes allowed the former to sell the latter, and send his wife and children to perpetual foreign slavery. No; he meant those benevolent laws introduced by the Christian Emperors, and remodelled by the modern commercial nations of Europe, which enacted that the estates of insolvent debtors should be for the common benefit of their creditors, and provided that an unfortunate and honest trader, who delivered all he possessed for the benefit of all his creditors, should be secure from being dragged to jail. He alluded to those Roman laws which permitted a certain majority of the creditors alone, and not a Court of Justice, to grant a discharge to an insolvent. He found these principles in the law proposed by the Committee; he discovered the features of the Quebec Civil Code in it; he noticed that its deficiencies and

wants had been met and remedied ; he finally saw the great evils of the English common law provided against ; and, although at first he did not anticipate that such a law as that now under consideration could be agreed upon, and in consequence, at the beginning of the proceedings of the Committee, voted for the repeal of the Insolvent Act, pure and simple, he at last, and he hoped not too late, but not without some hesitation, gave his support to the Bill. For the benefit of those who were still in favour of repeal, pure and simple, he would call attention to a few of the consequences of such repeal. According to the laws of most of the Provinces of the Dominion, preferential assignments and priority by judgment could be obtained from insolvent debtors. In Quebec, the principle was the very reverse of that. The moment a debtor became insolvent, the whole of his estate belonged to all his creditors equally. Thus, if the Insolvent Acts were repealed, there would remain preferential assignments and priority by judgments ; and not only the interests of Ontario and of the other Provinces which were governed by the principles of the English common law, but also of the Province of Quebec, would, to a great extent, suffer. Montreal dealt largely with the Ontario and the Maritime Provinces, and before the Act of 1864 it was not uncommon, and was sometimes considered a smart thing, for a debtor in any of the other Provinces to make a preferential assignment in favour of a trader residing in that Province, with a view of cheating the Montreal creditor. It was, therefore, important to the Province of Quebec that the evils, which existed before the Insolvency Law was introduced in 1864, should not be renewed. The people of the Province of Quebec who had the benefit of a special common law, based on equity and justice, would find in this Bill the provisions of their own common law. It was true, they had the right of attachment allowed by the code of civil procedure, which permitted creditors to take possession of the estate of an insolvent ; but that was only when the insolvent was secreting his property, or was about to abscond, or when a demand of assignment had been made upon him. There was no machinery provided by law to contest this de-

mand of assignment, and the consequence was that the debtor was, in this respect at least, in a worse position than under the Insolvency Law, when he was permitted to show that such a demand was not just. Under the common law, the books of a trader could not be seized ; and a trader becoming insolvent could dispose of a portion of his estate, get the promissory notes of the party who purchased the same, put them in his pocket, or otherwise dispose of them, and there was no possible means of forcing that debtor to give up that portion of his estate. Not only that, but the creditors were not even in a position to examine the insolvent as to the state of his affairs. In Ontario and New Brunswick, the law was not so defective in that respect, as it was possible to bring an insolvent debtor before the Judge, and there obtain a full investigation. But in Quebec, there was no machinery provided by the common law to obtain such a result. It would also be remembered that the law of partnership was, before the introduction of the Insolvency Law, the source of a great deal of dishonesty. A trader, anxious to get through his troubles, used to take a friend of his into partnership, which, under the common law, could only be dissolved by lapse of time ; and the insolvent always took good care to provide for a considerable length of time—from eight to ten years. Consequently, when the insolvent trader was put into insolvency, or rather when the creditors took possession of his estate, they found that the debtor was carrying on another business under a different name, and that they were altogether at his mercy. Since the Insolvent Act had been introduced, a fraud of that kind could not be perpetrated. Notwithstanding the Insolvent Laws of 1864, 1869, and 1875, merchants in trouble have been known to transfer their estates to their wives' names. In the Bill of the Committee there was a provision against this fraudulent proceeding. It would also be remembered that, under the common law, very great difficulty resulted from the fact that it required the unanimous consent of every creditor, however small he might have been, to get the discharge of an insolvent. It was almost impossible to obtain a settlement of an estate without giving some preference to

several creditors. Under this Bill, a majority in number and value could dispose of an estate, but could not make a sale *en bloc* of the whole estate, both real and personal, although such estate could be disposed of in lots. A discharge could also be granted by a certain majority of creditors. Those under \$100 were not to be consulted, and the giving or accepting of anything like a preference was prohibited under severe penalties. Not only these defects of the common law, but also all the objectionable features of the Insolvency Act of 1875, and of the Insolvency Laws introduced since 1864, had been greatly, if not entirely, removed by this Bill. Official assignees were abolished altogether. He need not say for what reason. The feeling was general that one of the principal reasons why the Insolvency Laws would not work satisfactorily, was the number and conduct of official assignees, especially since they had been appointed by the Government. Section 22 stated, "The Governor-in-Council may appoint in the several Provinces in Canada, one or more guardians, in and for every county, city and town; and, except in the larger centres of trade, the Sheriff of any county or district may be appointed; but no guardian, nor any partner of, associate, agent, employé, or clerk, or relation, or connection, of the guardian, within the degree of cousin german of any guardian, nor any barrister, advocate, solicitor, or attorney, shall be elected or appointed trustee to any estate in insolvency under this Act; nor shall any guardian, his partner, associate, agent, clerk, relation or connection, as aforesaid be employed by the trustee in any other manner, directly or indirectly, in the winding up of the estate; and any guardian, directly or indirectly, soliciting or inducing any creditor to take proceedings to place any estate in the hands of such guardian under this Act, shall not be entitled to any fees or remuneration from such estate, and shall also be incapable of acting thereafter in the office of guardian." It was well known that official assignees had been in the habit of soliciting creditors to take proceedings to put solvent traders into liquidation, sometimes offering great inducements with a view of being entrusted with the winding up of the estate.

Under this clause that practice would be altogether impossible. Whether we were to have the repeal of the Insolvency Law, pure or simple, or any law at all, it was perfectly well known that the estate of insolvents must be wound up by some officer or trustee. Under the common law, and before the Insolvent Act was enacted, the creditors used to meet, and, if they could agree unanimously, an assignee was appointed. This Bill kept as close as possible to that principle of the common law, by providing in section 24, that the trustee shall be appointed by the creditors at their first meeting, and if at the first meeting the creditors did not proceed to make such appointment, on the petition of any creditor the Judge sitting in insolvency should select the assignee or trustee. In order to prevent any understanding or conspiracy between the guardian and his assistants or clerks, which would tend to bring back the estate to the guardian directly or indirectly, there was a provision in section 24 to the effect that the trustee so appointed by the creditor should have no right to employ the guardian, his partner or employé, in the winding up of the estate. Under the present law, some official assignees had been known to fight for months against creditors who had appointed other assignees in their stead. Under section 25, on the production of the appointment of a trustee, the guardian would be bound to give up the estate to him without any question or excuse whatever, not even upon the ground that his bill of expenses had not been settled, saving his remedy against the creditors for the settlement of the same. Another evil which existed under the present system resulted from the use of proxies. Some assignees had made it their business to get hold of insolvent estates, in order to do which they sometimes offered some consideration to creditors to obtain their proxies. By section 90, it is provided that no proxy should be used to a certain extent in the appointment of a trustee or an assignee. Only one proxy could be given and that must be addressed to a creditor, and that creditor could only hold one proxy, so that it would be impossible for trustees or assignees to solicit the winding up of estates. The remuneration of trustees had also been regulated. In an estate

realising \$10,000 the whole amount of the expenses and commission due to the trustee would be \$170, and, under section 37, there was a penalty for overcharging. Another improvement had been made in the examination of insolvents. According to some of the decisions rendered in the Province of Quebec, an insolvent might claim the privilege of refusing to answer any question of a nature to criminate himself. There was a provision in section 21 of the Bill which provided that the insolvent, or any other person under examination should be obliged to answer without being able to claim any immunity. This provision was similar to that in the Election Law, and the answers could not be used against the witness in any criminal case except for perjury. An important feature of this Bill was that composition and discharge had been abolished, and discharge had to be granted, not by the Court, as it had been under former Acts, but by four-fifths of the creditors in number and value only, and in that proportion relatives and non-traders were not to be computed; in fact, the proportion required was almost equivalent to unanimous consent. One of the principle reasons why he (Mr. Girouard) supported the Bill was that it entirely exempted non-traders and their claims from the operation of insolvency laws. Then as to composition and discharge, he would refer to the article from *Fraser*, already referred to, to show that in England, where the Act of 1869 was introduced with a view of introducing a mode of arranging by composition, which was called the Scotch system, it had been found that the system was altogether unsatisfactory and the cause of great abuses. It was there now suggested that deeds of arrangement or composition should be discouraged, partly by increasing the amount of dividend at which the Court should grant such composition, thus being ten shillings in a pound. They had had experience in that sort of discouragement in this country. In 1876, the Insolvent Act was amended by providing that no composition should be granted unless the estate paid 33c. on the dollar. In 1878 this amount was raised, if his recollection was correct, to 50c. on the dollar, and still the community was no better satisfied to-day than it was under the Act of 1869. For

these reasons the Committee was of opinion that composition and discharge should be altogether done away with. Of course it would be possible to obtain a deed of composition and discharge at common law by obtaining the unanimous consent of the creditors, but it would be impossible to obtain it under the Act. A discharge being granted by four-fifths of the creditors in number and value, the debtor had a right then to apply for a confirmation, and if he did not a creditor might apply to set aside the discharge, and all the grounds which had been provided by the Insolvent Acts of 1864, 1869 and 1875 could be set up against the petition for confirmation or the annulment of the discharge. He could easily understand that having no deed of composition and discharge the framers of the Bill were under the necessity of providing that there should be no sale *en bloc* of the estate, because otherwise the insolvent would be in a position to obtain a discharge from four-fifths in number and value, and would induce some of his friends to tender for the estate and obtain indirectly what he could not get directly. He would also call the attention of the members from the Province of Quebec to some very great improvements which had been introduced to the sale of real estate in that Province. By clause 73 it was provided that the assignee or trustee might be authorised by the creditors or the inspectors to sell by private sale the estate subject to mortgages to one of the mortgaged creditors and without incurring the expense of a sheriff or an assignee's sale. It was also provided in section 85 that the sheriff's sale of real estate already commenced should be proceeded with during the insolvency of the defendant, and the proceeds should then be distributed according to the ordinary rules of the procedure, and the balance, if any, remitted to the trustee. It was also provided in section 62 that mortgages must be mentioned in the assignee's notice of sale in order to place the creditors in a position to know exactly the standing of hypothecated creditors and the value of the property seized to the general estate. By section 63 the expenses connected with the sale of real estate would be materially decreased; no charge would be made in connection with the sale of real estate in Quebec except

the necessary charges ; no commission was allowed to the assignee. Under the present law, it was not provided that the assignee's sale should be registered like sheriff's sale under the codes of Quebec. The provisions of the existing insolvent laws for the punishment of fraud and fraudulent practices were preserved. Finally, one of the last provisions was that there should be a Judge in insolvency, as explained by the mover of this Bill. In England, in the memorial presented by the leading merchants to which he had already referred, they advocate the appointment of a mercantile lawyer for the Court, and this was supposed to be absolutely necessary for the working of the Act. It had been found, in Montreal, almost impossible to work the Insolvent Law without having a Judge sitting in insolvency. Insolvency matters interfered always more or less with the ordinary administration of justice. The duties of Judges of that district were very onerous, and it was provided by section 133 that a Judge in insolvency should be appointed for the city of Montreal. Before concluding, he would refer to the clauses which he considered unconstitutional. One of them was the English law of stoppage *in transitu* introduced into the Province of Quebec. He referred also to clause 110, having reference to registration of the marriage contract, a contract altogether civil, and, in his opinion, without the jurisdiction of this Parliament. He would, however, mention that similar clauses were to be found in the Acts of 1864, 1869, and 1875. He was not aware that the question had been decided by any Court of justice, although he believed there was a dictum of Chief Justice Ritchie when sitting in New Brunswick, to the effect that the Dominion Parliament had jurisdiction in insolvency and bankruptcy, and all matters essentially connected therewith. He could not see why the Insolvent Law could not be perfect without curtailing the privilege accorded by the civil laws of the Province in favour of clerks and landlords, and especially without revoking the stipulations made with regard to marriage contracts and leases. He could also understand that a bankruptcy law might be complete without introducing into Quebec the law of England with re-

gard to stoppage *in transitu*. However, those clauses had been allowed to stand as law for the last fifteen years, and, therefore, he would not offer any amendment. He might say, in conclusion, that it seemed to him that it would be going to extremes to ask for the repeal of the Act, pure and simple. In France, where they had the same common laws as in Quebec, for the last three centuries, they had always had insolvent laws. It was true that the insolvent laws in France, Belgium and Germany, as well as in Scotland, were short, for the reason that the provisions of the common law were providing in a great measure for the settlement of insolvent estates, and had not to be repeated in their bankruptcy laws. He (Mr. Girouard) found that in the Bill before the House, the principles of the common law of Quebec were so amended as to meet the requirements of the mercantile community of the Dominion ; and even if he had doubts as to whether the repeal, pure and simple, would better suit Quebec or not, he would give the benefit of that doubt to the other Provinces. In considering a question of such general importance, the interests of the majority must be consulted. He would, therefore, second the second reading of this Bill ; but if the House was opposed to its becoming law, rather than have the existing law, he would vote for its repeal, pure and simple.

MR. BÉCHARD said he should not attempt to follow the hon. members who had preceded him in the able speeches they had pronounced. Not being a lawyer, he might, perhaps, find it a hard task to discuss properly the details of this Bill, and he would leave it to the hon. gentlemen belonging to the legal profession ; but it was agreed that in discussing this Bill, an opportunity should be given to take the sense of the House upon the question of the repeal, pure and simple, of the Act, and it was for that purpose that he rose. It had been stated by his hon. friend from Stanstead, that the principal merits of this Bill consisted in the fact that it did away with the official assignees, and with the easy way by which debtors obtained their discharge under the operation of the existing law. With regard to official assignees, he saw they were replaced by another set of men

who were called guardians, and God only knew what those guardians, with all their inventive ingenuity, would find they could do under the operation of this Bill should it become law. When the Act of 1875 was passed, no one foresaw the abuses which resulted from the actions of some of the official assignees, about whom so many complaints had been made throughout the country. He thought the same might be said of these guardians. The Committee had removed the facility with which debtors obtained their discharge under the existing law. True, a great many abuses had been developed in that respect, and, perhaps, this Bill was an improvement upon the existing law, but he was afraid that, in their anxiety to remove those evils, the members of the Committee had gone to the opposite extreme. They had given extraordinary powers to creditors to throw debtors into insolvency; and this power was a very dangerous one. By this Bill a man could be put into insolvency for \$200; a merchant in a rural district, who through some accident had been somewhat delayed in meeting his payments, could be put into insolvency, and ruined by the cupidity of a rapacious creditor. Such cases would often occur, no doubt, particularly in a time of depression, such as we now suffered from, when confidence in the ability of debtors to meet their liabilities was shaken. He thought this power was a very dangerous one, and placed the debtors absolutely at the mercy of their creditors. When the Insolvency Act was passed in 1875, he heard it frequently stated upon the floor of the House by gentlemen who were in favour of that Act, that the principal reason for which an insolvency law was necessary was, that it afforded relief to the unfortunate and honest debtor. By this Bill the honest and unfortunate debtor found it very difficult to get his discharge; in fact, no debtor could receive a complete discharge from his liabilities.

MR. COLBY: I would ask my hon. friend what his position would be under the repeal of the Act, pure and simple?

MR. BÉCHARD said he would tell his hon. friend. He did not mean to be understood as thinking the debtor should not get any discharge, except with the assent of every one of his creditors; but that,

so long as no debtor could obtain his discharge under the operation of an Insolvent Law, there was no reason why such a law should exist, and they had no need of such a law. He believed that the creditors and debtors should be left alone to settle their affairs, according to the principles of the common law; and that, whenever this House attempted, by exceptional legislation, as an Insolvent Law, to set aside the application of the sound principles of the common law, nothing wholesome could result, but only evil. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) had made several good points against the existence of any insolvency law; he had said that, in France, they had had an insolvent law existing for two centuries, and that the French legislation had amended it but once or twice during that long period. The reason for this was obvious—in France, the commercial morality was so good as to render an Insolvent Law unnecessary. If commercial morals were as good in this country, doubtless they might not amend the Insolvent Law oftener than the French legislators. Let them do away with Insolvent Laws, and in four or five years the commercial morals of the people would be so good as to obviate the necessity for them. He moved in amendment.

“That the said Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved that, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Insolvent Act of 1875, and all amendments thereto, should be unconditionally repealed.”

MR. COLBY said that he had no disposition to take the point of order. He would prefer not to do it, but it struck him the motion was out of order, as it proposed exactly what the Bill did, the repeal of the Insolvent Act.

MR. SPEAKER ruled that the amendment was in order.

MR. LANE said that he fully agreed with the remarks of the mover of the amendment, that the promoters of this Bill, in their anxiety to conciliate the outcry against insolvent measures, had overlooked the interest of the debtor entirely. He thought that there always ought to be an Insolvent Law upon the Statute-book, provided the law answered the purpose for which it was intended.

MR. BÉCHARD.

The principal object of such a law was permission to an honest debtor to get rid of his debts on giving up his property by virtue of the Act. He did not think under the clause providing that the debtor must secure the consent of four-fifths in number and value of his creditors, to his discharge, that in one case out of a hundred he could procure it. Some creditor would insist on having his pound of flesh; and one creditor, under this law, might be sufficient to prevent a discharge. The Act was formed on the principle that it would be better to hang ten innocent men than that one guilty should escape. That was not the principle of British law. He would prefer the repeal of the Insolvent Act to a Bill with that clause unamended, as it was a one-sided measure. The present Act providing that a debtor must secure the consent of, at least, a majority in number and three-fourths in value of his creditors, before getting his discharge, was severe enough to protect the creditors. Debtors were not altogether to blame for getting into debt, as merchants often forced goods upon them by having their agents on every side-road and concession line in the country. As to the doing away with the assignees, he did not know they had acquired such a bad reputation. They were not different from ordinary mortals, and estates must be placed in somebody's hands. Till they could make people more honest than at present, he did not know that they would improve matters much by changing assignees for guardians, which was simply a change of name. At present, debtors' property was put into the hands of the assignees, in the first place, and by this Bill it would be entrusted to a guardian, who, after the first meeting of the creditors, could be displaced by their vote. By the present law, the creditors could take it out of the hands of the assignee at their first meeting, and entrust it to anybody they pleased. If that was not done, he supposed it was because the assignees gave general satisfaction. If the creditors did not look after their own business, he did not see how they could help them by the change proposed. There had been no improvement in the scale of fees proposed, and he did not think that anyone would take the trouble of looking after the interests

of others for the paltry sum allowed by the Act. Whoever assumes the responsibility must be fairly paid. He thought that the clause requiring the trustee to give security for the forthcoming of the estate, would be found impracticable—that they would find it difficult, if not impossible, to get anyone to assume the responsibility and trouble of getting sureties for the express purpose of winding up only one estate. He did not like the clause with regard to farmers, not seeing why they should not be included in the general clause provided for traders. The Act should give them the same opportunity of getting a discharge as anybody else, and it would save a great deal of trouble to place them in that position. A difficulty would arise in determining who were traders, and whose debts should be protected under this Bill. He thought it would be wiser for them to include the farming community under it. Unless the clause requiring the assent of four-fifths in number and value of the creditors to a discharge was altered, he would consider it incumbent on him to vote against the Bill; but, if the proposition in the existing Act was adopted, he would support the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew) said that, although he was free to admit that many evils had arisen under the Insolvent Law, he was opposed to its absolute repeal, as he believed that it was necessary that there should be some provision for the equitable distribution of the assets of an insolvent debtor amongst his creditors, and he would, therefore, be compelled to vote against the motion of the hon. member for Iberville. He (Mr. White) was, however, not entirely in accord with all the propositions contained in the Bill submitted by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby). The Bill purported to be framed in the interest of the creditor, and yet it provided that the creditors should not dispose of insolvent estates in such a manner as they deemed best in their own interests. Was this House to declare that creditors should not have the power to sell estates *en bloc*, or to effect a composition with the insolvent, if they thought proper? The proposition submitted in the Bill, instead of doing what its friends

desired, would have an opposite effect. There were other objectionable features also. He thought the appointment of a Judge in Insolvency was unnecessary. They had enough Judges in the country already, to deal with those questions; and certainly it was not to be presumed, if this law had any effect at all, that the number of insolvents would be increased. If not, why establish an additional tribunal? Whilst he felt those objections to the Bill, he would very much prefer that it became law to the sweeping away of the Insolvent Act.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he agreed substantially with the remarks of the hon. member for North Renfrew. Having had some experience of the Insolvency Law in Ontario, he was not prepared to assent to the total repeal of the law, which would result in the reintroduction of all the evils they had felt so severely in that Province. Its repeal would result in that unfortunate race of creditors for unjust preferences in the matter of a debtor's estate, which was generally witnessed before the Insolvent Law was introduced, while it entirely depended on who had the sharpest attorney, and the sharpest agent, whether one or another creditor should get most and leave the rest nothing. At the same time, he was not entirely satisfied with the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Stanstead, as the exponent of the views of the Special Committee on the subject. That Bill seemed to him to have been framed in the interest of creditors alone, and he thought that when they were looking at the question of insolvency that they ought to have in mind that there were two classes to be considered—creditors and debtors. In fact, many advocates of the Insolvency Law considered that it was not only right, but proper, that such a measure should be what was generally called a whitewashing measure for the purpose of relieving debtors, and that had been the sole principle in the Insolvent Laws of many of the States of the Union. It had also been the course of legislation in this country when they had an Act that was introduced for no other purpose than that of whitewashing and relieving debtors. While he thought that there should be some provision in-

serted in the Insolvent Act to prevent fraudulent debtors from obtaining their discharge, he maintained that it ought not to be framed entirely in the interest of the creditors, more especially as had been stated by the hon. gentleman who spoke before the hon. member for Renfrew, that the creditors were as much to blame for all the evils they so loudly complained of as were the debtors. If the merchants in the various centres of trade were not so anxious, through their travellers, and in every possible way, to force their goods upon country customers to a greater extent than their means would allow them to legitimately purchase, they would not have so many bankruptcies. He thought the evils arose as much from the creditors as from the debtors. It was unjust to talk about fraudulent debtors without, at the same time, admitting that the evils had been largely brought about by the injudicious forcing of their goods upon young men just starting in business, without the necessary business experience and capital, and who ought never, for one moment, to have been entrusted with their goods. Consequently, he thought, that when they were legislating here, they should not legislate as if the unfortunate creditors were the only class that had to be protected. They should also consider the honest debtor, the man who, by force of circumstances, while honest in his dealings was driven into insolvency. Their rights ought to be considered just as much as the so-called important creditors. In fact, the advocates for the alteration of the law claimed that their creditors were to blame for the maladministration of the law, that the law itself was good enough, but was ineffectual, because the creditors would not look into their own affairs. His hon. friend from Stanstead proposed to compel creditors to look after their own interests. He (Mr. Cameron) did not consider that kind of reasoning logical. Parliament should not be asked to compel the creditor to look after his own interests, which he had hitherto neglected to do. He thought the judicious course in the whole matter would be to defer legislation for the present. The Insolvent Law, as it at present stood, was bad in theory. It was bad in justice, in some respects. It was admitted by the advo-

cates for alteration that it was bad in practice, because those who ought to look after their own affairs would not do so. He was of opinion that no harm would be done if they gave creditors an opportunity of looking after their affairs for another year. He considered that it would be judicious and proper to allow the mercantile community an opportunity to consider the measure before the House, which had only been distributed that very day, and the members of the House of ascertaining the views of their constituents upon it before coming to a deliberate conclusion as to what kind of legislation was in the interest of the country.

MR. BRECKEN said he agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for North Victoria, that it was inexpedient to repeal the Insolvency Law. He (Mr. Brecken) came from a Province that, for many years, had no Bankruptcy Law, and he knew what an unsatisfactory state of affairs resulted from the absence of a law of that kind. The hon. member for North Victoria thought the proposed measure too much in the interest of the creditor. If he (Mr. Brecken) understood the temper of the House on this question, and the public at large, it was that the Insolvent Law had been too much in the interest of the debtor. The practical working of the Insolvent Law had proved that creditors really required something like legislative direction and control. The Bill before the House proposed, in the first instance, to do away with official assignees, which was one of the greatest and most crying evils complained of. Then the mode in which compositions were made under the existing Act was remedied. The contemplated Act proposed that four-fifths in value, and four-fifths of the proved creditors, must agree to a discharge before a debtor could receive his discharge. This was a most important measure, and it would have been better had it been dealt with at an earlier period of the Session. However, he was of opinion that it would be in the interest of the country if the House dealt with the subject, even at this late period of the Session, because there was no doubt that the law, as it existed, was, with the system of official assignees, a crying grievance and a great injury to

the commercial community. The hon. gentleman found fault with the Bill because they were forcing creditors to look after their own interest. He (Mr. Brecken) admitted that it was difficult to reconcile a position of that kind, as it did seem to be an anomaly to direct men to look after their own interest, but the carelessness evinced by creditors necessitated that something should be done. He was of opinion that it would be a deplorable state of things if they should be without any Insolvent Law, as it would open the door to fraud. The Committee thought that the House was in favour of retaining the law with certain amendments which had been made, and he thought that if the law were placed upon the Statute-book that it would be found to be a great improvement on the law at present existing.

MR. WELDON said that, although he was prepared to admit the defects of the present law, he felt that an Insolvent Law was a necessity. They found, in the Mother Country, that the first Bankruptcy Law was introduced in 1571, and from that time to the present, the principle had been steadily adhered to. In 1825, the first attempt was made to consolidate the laws, and, from that time to the present, the subject of remodelling the Bankruptcy Laws had engaged the attention of nearly every Lord Chancellor who had sat upon the woolsack. While able jurists and men of experience had lent their energies to the reform and amendment of the law, not one single voice had been raised for the repeal or abrogation of the law. The great difficulties which had been experienced in England in regard to this matter, had also been felt in the United States, where they had taken the somewhat violent course from time to time of repealing the law. But it must be remembered that under the American Constitution measures relating to bankruptcies and insolvencies were separated. The former came within the jurisdiction of Congress, and the latter within the jurisdiction of the State Legislatures. The reasons which should induce them to repeal the Insolvent Law should be extremely cogent, before they departed from the policy adopted in the Mother Country, the great commercial centre of the

world. Another reason against the repeal of this law, was that it would unsettle the commerce of the country, and render the trade unstable. He might say, with regard to the measure before the House, that the members of the Committee were extremely careful to preserve the language of the old Act, so that the amendments would not interfere with any judicial decisions therein. There was another point they had to consider. The legal legislation which had taken place since 1869. Before that period, there was the Act which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier referred to. The Act of 1869 was a re-enactment of the existing law, and in 1875 the whole Dominion adopted the principles which had been in force in certain Provinces. During that time, local legislation had changed, and as far as the Province which he represented, was concerned, the laws had been materially changed, and to repeal the Insolvency Law, pure and simple, would, he was satisfied, work distress and ruin. He believed he was correct in stating that there was an Attachment Law also in Ontario, and if the Attachment Law in force were not repealed, it would be very disastrous for the Insolvent Law was repealed, as, under that law, every man who was unable to pay a debt, would find his property swept away for the benefit of the creditor. If the amendment of the hon. member for Ibrerville (Mr. Béchard) prevailed, the debtors would not be benefitted and the creditors would not be benefitted, but some shrewd practitioners would receive the benefit. He had heard it urged in Committee that the Insolvent Law allowed very great opportunity to reckless trading, and was a temptation to parties to engage in recklessness in speculations over trade. He quite agreed in the remarks of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Lane) that that was due to the present system of trading in this country. In old times the country trader went to the centres of trade and purchased what he could afford, and what was sufficient for his trade; but now there were travellers throughout the length and breadth of the country, who, with a pertinacity of an insurance agent, persuaded a man by the temptation of

long credit, to buy more goods than his capital or the extent of his trade allowed him to dispose of, and then at the end of the credit the trader found his note dishonoured at one of the banks, goods lying on his shelves depreciated and unsaleable. He believed that the unsatisfactory result of the Bankruptcy Law was owing largely to reckless trading, and to the want of commercial morality, which was not merely extended to this Dominion, but prevailed in the whole of the commercial world. There was another objection to the Bankruptcy Law. It enabled bankrupt stocks to be thrown upon the market, which were purchased at low figures, and the effect was to bring them in competition with the honest trader, who, though he had paid his debts, could not successfully compete with those stocks. The same difficulty had arisen, whether the Bankruptcy Law was in force or not. He found that under sheriffs' sales, etc., which were forced sales, the proceeds only went to one creditor, instead of to the whole. The main features of the changes in this law, as pointed out by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), referred principally to official assignees and composition and discharge. With regard to official assignees, he must confess that when he first entered upon that Committee, he was strongly in favour of the appointment of official assignees, as so far as the Province of New Brunswick, a part of which Province he represented, was concerned. It was a system that had worked well; but it had found, from evidence before the Committee, and from information he had received, that so far as the upper Provinces were concerned, it was a system of fraud, and gave an opportunity to official assignees to make money at the expense of an estate. Now, he found the same objection prevailed in England with regard to public trustees there, as was felt in Canada with regard to official assignees. So far as he (Mr. Weldon) could see, the difficulty, so far as official assignees were concerned, was that, in Ontario and Quebec, an official assignee was placed in such a position that when an estate was thrown into his hands, he could ascertain who the creditors of the insolvent were, and by that means be enabled to secure a majority of

the persons in favour of his managing the estate. That was one of the difficulties that were removed by the present Bill. The trustee into whose hands an estate was thrown, became merely the guardian *pro tem.* of it, and he was ineligible for appointment by the creditors to the office of assignee. If he chose the position of guardian, he could not act as assignee, and therefore the temptation now given an official assignee to endeavour to obtain an estate for the purpose of enriching himself at the expense of the creditors, was done away with. The complaint with regard to creditors being represented by proxy was well founded, and it was a re-echo of the complaint in England, with respect to the supineness of creditors in neglecting to act in their own interests in this direction. He found that almost the same provision in respect to further stringency, was contained in the Bill now before the House, as was to be found in the 17th section of Lord Cairns' Act, and it was in very much the same wording. It was clearly shown that if a creditor did not take sufficient interest to attend personally a meeting for the arraignment of an insolvent, his proxy was only sent there for the purpose of doing injury to the estate for the benefit of some particular creditors. Another point was the deeds of composition and discharge. For many years, before he had a seat in the House, he was strongly of opinion that the provision for liquidation, which allowed an insolvent to obtain deeds of composition and discharge when at a meeting of creditors, and a majority was in favour of it, was a very beneficial one. He knew it had been practised in England, and he had himself advocated it. One argument in favour of it was, that it relieved a man of the stigma of bankruptcy. But moral feeling in this respect had become warped. However, when he saw the statement made by the Lord Chancellor in England, with regard to these liquidations, he stating that they were, in many instances, only made for the purpose of getting property back into the hands of the debtor, and showing figures bearing out his statement, he had come to the conclusion that some stringent measure should be taken to remedy the evil. He felt

that the House was taking a step in the right direction, and he had come to the conclusion that they were doing away with one of the greatest objections to this law. Those were the two strong salient features which made this law different to the law of 1869 and 1875. The difficulty about the late law was that it was too easy, too much in favour of the debtor. Under the law now proposed, it would be far more difficult for the debtor to obtain his discharge. He had known, in his own experience, the difficulty in getting creditors, after they had lost debts, to take action. That, no doubt, was to a great extent due to the fact that traders calculated a certain percentage to cover bad debts, and did not, in a great many cases, wish to go to the trouble of taking extreme measures to force payment. What this Bill proposed was, that the burden of obtaining a discharge should be thrown upon the debtor. If a party went into insolvency, he would be bound to take the steps required to obtain a discharge. He did not doubt that where a man honestly and fairly surrendered his property to his debtors, he would have no difficulty in obtaining a discharge. That there were Shylocks in every age, that they existed now, he had no doubt, but they were few and far between. But generally, when a man was made unfortunate by circumstances beyond his control, and his property had been swept away from him, if he honestly surrendered what was left to his creditors, he would be leniently and fairly dealt with. While, on the other hand, the debtor who attempted to reap benefits out of the estate to the detriment of the creditors, would be unable to obtain a discharge, until he showed a clean sheet, or gave up what the creditors were entitled to. It would not be in the interests of the country that the amendment of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) should be agreed to.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said the position in which the question was now presented to the House, made it necessary that he should explain his position in the vote which he would have to give. He was very strongly opposed to the existing Insolvency Law, and if the question presented to the House was, simply

whether they should continue that law or repeal it, he would have no hesitation in voting in favour of repeal. But that was not the question. He desired very much that there should be some law, for the equitable distribution among creditors of the assets of insolvent estates. The Bill proposed by the member for Stanstead made provision for such distribution. It was the result of the painstaking labours of a Special Committee composed of members of ability and experience, and he thought the interests of the country would be best subserved by placing that Bill upon the Statute-book. Holding these views, he would vote against the amendment of the member for Iberville; but in doing so he wished to be understood as in no way expressing any opinion in favour of the continuance of the present law.

MR. COURSOL said that Parliament had often been reproached for hasty legislation, for having hurried through without proper consideration, at the end of the Session, important measures; and in this instance it was clearly manifest that such hasty legislation would have an injurious effect. The Committee was composed of men of ability, knowledge and experience, who had worked for two or three weeks with a great deal of zeal; and, as the result of their labours, they brought forth this voluminous Bill, which only came down two days ago, and was delivered to the members but yesterday, and had not yet been translated into French. Those hon. gentlemen who had distinguished themselves to-night by their able speeches on behalf of this Bill, deserved a great deal of credit for the labour they had taken, and the ability they had displayed in the preparation of this Bill; but the other hon. members who had not formed part of this Committee had not yet had time to read the Bill properly, and were not prepared to-night to vote that it should pass, as it was one of the most important measures of the Session, one which might make a complete revolution in legislation, which might affect the interests of families. There were several clauses in the Bill which could not be accepted. The official assignees, against whom complaints had been properly made, were

represented by guardians at \$1 per day, and sole guardians at 50c. per day, who were to take charge of property, worth, sometimes, \$100,000. It was impossible for this House to decide so quickly; it should have time to examine the Bill in its details, and the Government should fix a day for its discussion. If a vote were forced to-night, he would feel bound to vote for the repeal of the law at once. If a delay were granted, the measure might be modified to suit the requirements of the country. He would, therefore, move that the debate should be resumed on Friday.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that those in favour of the repeal of the Bill consented that the debate should be adjourned last night, on the distinct understanding that it should go on this evening, and if not finally concluded to-night, it should go on to-morrow. If this debate were now allowed to stand over, as proposed by the hon. member for Montreal, its simple effect would be that the whole of another day would be consumed in discussing this question. He might say, at the outset, that he was in favour of a total, unconditional, absolute repeal of the Insolvent Law, but if that proposition could not be carried, rather than deal, at this late period of the Session, with the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead, with its many radical and revolutionary changes, he would be in favour of allowing the present law to stand for another year. It was impossible, utterly impossible, to deal in anything like a satisfactory manner with the many provisions of the new Bill, within a week of the prorogation of Parliament. The Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead contained 150 clauses, a large number of sub-clauses, and subsections. He had made many and complicated changes in the law, and, at this late period of the Session, it was quite impossible to give such changes the consideration they required. Since the Bill was submitted to Parliament he had tried to master its provisions and understand its clauses, but he could not say that so far he had been completely successful. Were it a question between continuing the old law and adopting this Bill in its present shape, he would vote for the former. There was

not a single clause in the 150 of the new Bill, that would not require a very considerable amount of discussion, many of the clauses would require important changes, and some of them would require to be recast altogether. If the House consented to a second reading of the Bill of the hon. member for Staustead, and entered into Committee of the Whole, a whole week would be spent in discussing it, and making its provisions suitable for the commercial wants of the country, and at this late period of the Session, that was not to be thought of. If the proposition of the hon. member for Iberville was put to the House, and carried through, the question would be disposed of now. The present law would then be repealed, pure and simple, and the country would, for one year at least, escape the evils resulting from a law which had received almost universal condemnation. If, however, a majority of the House was not prepared to support the proposition of the hon. member for Iberville, then the propriety of going on with the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) could be discussed, although, for one, he was opposed to that course. He was entirely opposed to the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead. He would not, at this late period of the Session, enter into a general discussion of the principles on which a Bankrupt Law should be founded. He would shortly call the attention of the House to one or two fallacies in the argument of the hon. gentleman who moved, and those who supported, the Bill. Hon. gentlemen, in discussing this Bill, appeared to think that it entirely abolished the office of official assignee, and that by doing away with official assignees, one of the evils complained of under the old Insolvent Law, was entirely cured by this Bill. But, so far as official assignees were concerned, they were, in the proposed Bill, abolished in name, and in name only; the office was still there, and the official, under another name, still maintained in this Bill—under the name of guardians or trustees—and maintained with all the power and authority vested in them under the old Insolvency Law. Under section 22, the Government reserved to itself the power of appointing, in each county, one or more guardians, and that guardian took possession of the estate of

the insolvent, and dealt with it precisely as did the official assignee under the old law. He was bound to notify the creditors, call a meeting of the creditors, and these creditors could appoint an official assignee, under the name of an official trustee, of their own, as under the old law. In this respect, nominally, there was a change—practically and substantially there was none—for the better. If the system was vicious under the old law, it was equally so under the new. Another proposition, to which the promoters of the Bill appeared to attach importance, was that it did away with judicial discharges, and deeds of composition and discharge. He denied that. If hon. gentlemen would examine the Bill they would find express provision made for deeds of composition and discharge. No doubt greater restrictions were imposed on the debtor, and it required the consent of a larger number of the creditors representing a larger amount, than under the old law, before a discharge could be obtained; but the principle was there all the same, and if the object was to allow no discharge whatever, that object was not secured. On the other hand, the Bill if intended as a general Bankrupt Law, did not cover the principle upon which such laws were based, namely, that if a creditor forced his debtor into bankruptcy, the latter should get his discharge, provided he acted honestly in the conduct of his business and his failure was through no fault of his own. One of the most vicious principles in the old Insolvency Act was the enormous costs connected with the administration of an estate, and the expensive and complicated machinery used in administering the estates. That was not remedied in this Bill, but on the contrary, rather increased and intensified. Under this Bill there would still be the same difficulties to deal with, the writ of attachment, demand by the creditor, petition to set aside the writ of attachment, petition to set aside the demand on the insolvent, the appeal, and the Judge to set aside these proceedings, the appeal to the Court of Appeals, were still continued in, if anything, a more objectionable form than under the old law. Precisely the same complicated and objectionable machinery that formed one of the vicious features of the old Act were

continued under the new. Another objectionable feature in the old Act was said to be cured by this Bill, namely, that a larger portion of the estate of an insolvent would, under this Bill, go into the hands of the creditors; that the process of winding up an estate was lessened; official assignees abolished and discharges done away with, and the expenses comparatively light. He denied this. Practically no changes were made in any of these respects. The expenses were as great and the machinery as complicated as under the old law. With fifteen years' experience of the old law—its waste and expenditure and frauds in practice, which no amendments had been able to cure—he was in favour of the total, absolute, unconditional and immediate repeal of the law. The almost unanimous opinion of the people in the rural districts in this country was in favour of the repeal; and if a vote of the people was taken on the question, a large majority would vote in favour of the repeal of the law. It was an unwise principle to adopt, a principle not in the interest of trade and commerce, that a Bankruptcy Law should be considered as permanent, and should always find a place on the Statutes of the country. The law had been in existence for fifteen years, had never proved a success, had given very general dissatisfaction, and that was the experience of every country where such a law had been tried, and the best they could do would be to abolish the law for two or three years at least. If the circumstances of the country, and the necessities of trade required at the end of that time, a new Insolvent Law, modified and changed with the various features of the present law eliminated, it could then be passed. We were in the habit, and properly so, of drawing our inspiration largely from the Mother Country. From the experience of business men in England in relation to this law and its working, we might learn practical and useful lessons. What did we find there? We found that in almost every Session of the Imperial Parliament, for the last eight or ten years, changes had been made in the Bankruptcy Law, and so far, the changes had utterly failed in giving satisfaction to the mercantile community and to the country. The same state of things ex-

Mr. CAMERON.

isted in the United States, from which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House drew largely their inspiration. The first Bankruptcy Law in the United States was passed in 1800. It continued in force for two and a-half years, and was then repealed. For nearly half a century the United States had no Bankrupt Law. In 1841 the law was re-enacted, and continued for thirteen months only—was again repealed, and again re-enacted thirteen years ago; and so great a general was the dissatisfaction with the law, that Congress, by an almost unanimous vote, repealed the law. Even during the few years the law was in force in that country, several attempts were made to repeal it, all of which were successful in Congress; but the attempts failed in the Senate until last year, when, by an overwhelming vote in Congress, and by a majority in the Senate, the Bankruptcy Law was finally repealed in that country. He was satisfied, from the experience of the past fifteen years, that the great mass of the people of this country were in favour of the repeal of the law. The best thing Parliament could do was to pass the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville, and abolish the law in the meantime; and if they found the necessity of the country required a re-enactment of the Bankruptcy Laws again, Parliament could easily re-enact it, with its provisions modified, and with the defects, which past experience had pointed out, cured. He would, therefore, vote for the proposition of the hon. gentleman from Iberville. As long as there was a Bankrupt Law on the Statute-books, so long would commercial frauds continue. The only way to check and prevent that evil was by a total abolition of the law. He was perfectly satisfied, from the returns brought down to this House in 1875, that a much larger portion of the estate of insolvents went into the hands of the creditors by private arrangement between debtor and creditor, without the intervention of the Bankrupt Laws than under these laws. The same facts were established by returns submitted to the Imperial Parliament. In 1876, the Lord Chancellor of England, in discussing proposed amendments to the Bankruptcy Laws of England, took the same view of it, and submitted to Parliament a return that clearly sus-

tained his contentions. The experience of Canada and of the United States, established the correctness of that supposition, and the minds of the people of Canada were so confirmed in that view that a repeal of the law was urgently demanded. If we were to have a Bankruptcy Law at all, and it was proposed to prevent fraud by the provisions of an Act of Parliament, a different and more stringent law than had yet, in modern days, been submitted to either the Canadian or the Imperial Parliament, would have to be devised. In fact, with respect to commercial frauds, we would have to do as we had already done, with respect to the violation of some of the criminal laws of the land. For an effectual mode of punishment, go back to the days of our forefathers and introduce the whipping posts, and re-enact the law of 170 years ago, which provided that, if a bankrupt fraudulently retained his goods from his creditors, or aided in other respects in a fraudulent manner, he should stand in the pillory for two hours, have his ears nailed to the pillory post and then cut off. For his own part he doubted very much if even these punishments, with the commercial morality that had been fostered and developed by this Act, would check the growing and monstrous evils complained of. He would, therefore, vote for the repeal of the law.

MR. ORTON said he desired to express his gratification at the labours of the Committee who had drawn up this Bill. But while confessing that they had bestowed a great deal of labour upon it, and removed some of the most objectionable features to the present Act, he was not yet prepared to say that this Bill removed all the complaints against the old Act. It appeared to him that it introduced many new objectionable features that the other did not contain. He did not think that the House, at this late period of the Session, could give to this Bill the careful consideration it deserved; and, further than that, he had long felt that the proper thing to do was to repeal the Insolvent Act entirely. The evils which had been caused by this Act were so intolerable, the injustice done to the honest trader was so gross, and the evils which had resulted to the non-trader, had become so great that the feeling in

the country was intensely in favour of the repeal of the Act. He had had the honour of presenting to this House a petition, signed by a large number of traders, in the county he represented; and there was not a single one in that locality of either party who refused to sign a petition, praying for the repeal of the Insolvent Act. That was a correct idea of the almost universal feeling that prevailed in this country. We all knew that, under the operation of the present Act, it was almost impossible for the honest trader to continue in business, and not only so, but it did a great wrong to many a non-trader in our community. The discussion on this Bill showed that there was a strong feeling in this House in favour of the repeal of the Insolvent Act. If that Act was not repealed, the effect would be that many who were now engaged in business would take advantage of it during the coming year, and we should have wholesale failures, throughout the country, and greater wrongs would be done than ever before. He was, therefore, in favour of the total repeal of the Act, and believed this House would not do its duty to the country if it did not vote for repeal.

MR. CASEY said he did not rise to discuss the Bill, for the very good reason that he had not yet become thoroughly acquainted with its provisions. The motion of his hon. friend from Montreal East represented a very general feeling in the House, that it was desirable the Bill should be more thoroughly studied than was possible in the limited time now at their disposal, and that it was desirable also to have the views of their constituents on it. The Bill itself did not introduce a totally new system, nor did it abolish all the evils of the old one, but it did introduce a good deal that was new. The general drift of the Bill, so far as he understood it, was to protect creditors against the carelessness or the dishonesty of their debtors. He felt justified in supporting the proposition of the hon. gentleman from North Victoria, that the consideration of this Bill should be postponed till next Session. If that course were pursued, it could not be said that the labours of the Committee would be wasted, because the Bill would go before the country, and be carefully con-

sidered. But, holding his present views, he should be compelled to vote for the three months' hoist, unless the promoters of the Bill could see their way clear to agree to a postponement. He knew there was a strong feeling in many quarters in favour of total repeal, but he felt himself unable to vote for it. The people in Ontario, unlike those in Quebec, who were happy in the possession of the *Code Civile*, had not the proper machinery for a fair distribution of bankrupt estates, and he would not be justified in voting to deprive them of all means, whatever, for that purpose, until the country had fully tried all expedients for securing a fair distribution of assets. His position, then, was this: He should have to vote against the proposition of the hon. member for Montreal East, as insufficient; he should have to vote against the motion for repeal, because he thought it would not be in the interests of the country to repeal the law altogether; but he was strongly in favour of the postponement of any amendments to the law until next year.

Mr. MACDONNELL said he was opposed to the present Bill, though in favour of an Insolvency Law of some kind, he rather preferred the law as it now stood. The chief feature of the present Bill was that, while it gave the power to creditors to force a debtor into insolvency, it did not provide for the discharge of the debtor, and that was left at the discretion and good will of the creditors. Now, he contended that if power was given creditors to put a debtor into insolvency, that power should be coupled with the condition that the debtor should have his discharge, provided he was not proved to be guilty of fraud or other misconduct. He was amused at the argument of the hon. gentleman from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), who pointed out, as one of the chief objections of the present law, that it gave too great a facility to a debtor to obtain his discharge, as he could obtain it at the end of twelve months, provided there was no sufficient cause shown against it. That hon. gentleman had further stated, in extolling the Bill before the House, that, if a debtor was not guilty of fraud, if it was shown that he had been just and faithful in his dealings, his creditors would be

ready to grant him his discharge. But who was to decide the question of fraud! The Bill provided that four-fifths of the creditors must consent to a discharge, fraud or not. The creditors were no judges of fraud. If there was fraud, it could only be clearly established by judicial enquiry. As far as the debtor was concerned, the Bill did not make proper provisions for his rights and interests. He held that the present Bill introduced a radical change in the Insolvent Law because it gave a tyrannical power to creditors, and left no means whatever to the debtor to get his discharge. No matter how fair a debtor had been in his dealings, he was left entirely at the mercy of his creditors as to whether he should be discharged or not. They had the power of forcing him into insolvency, of violently taking charge of his property, of breaking up all his calculations, and of disposing of all his property. No matter how unfortunate he had been, how energetic he had been, with what enterprise he had conducted his business, if he could not get the consent of four-fifths of his creditors he must remain for ever their victim, incapable of becoming again a useful member of society, or of embarking in any enterprise whatever. He was curious to hear the hon. the Minister of Justice in regard to this Bill, as that gentleman was the introducer of it, and, as far as the House was concerned, the father of it.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he rose to a point of order. The Bill was not printed in French.

Mr. HOLTON said he thought that the hon. gentleman was too late for that objection, which should have been urged when the motion was first made, and not after a debate upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER said that the point was raised too late, the hon. member himself (Mr. Cameron) having spoken on the motion.

Mr. HOLTON said that the effect of the motion of the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) would be to deprive the House of the opportunity of passing an opinion on this measure during the present Session. He thought that it was in the last degree desirable, whether they pro-

Mr. CASEY.

ceeded with the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead or not, but the sense of the House should be taken on the general question, as to the desirableness or not of continuing the Insolvency Law. That expression of opinion could be got on the motion of the hon. member for Iberville. He (Mr. Holton) did not believe that the majority of the House were prepared to affirm either that the old law was so perfect that it might be continued another year, or, on the other hand, that it ought to be repealed, absolutely and unconditionally. He would, therefore, implore the House for a decision on that cardinal point to-night.

MR. COURSOL said that if the motion of the member for Iberville was carried, the Bill would be destroyed; it could not be considered if they adjourned the matter until Monday. If they voted for a repeal now, they would have no Insolvency Law at all. If the sense of the House was for repeal, let it be fairly ascertained.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) said that this was an important measure that ought to be discussed intelligently and deliberately, without hurry. The sooner the Act of 1875 was repealed, the better for the people. If it was demoralising, and encouraging fraud, as the member for Stanstead described it, surely it ought not to remain on the Statute-book. There were several important clauses in the Bill to which he would not be strongly opposed. Therefore, he hoped the suggestion of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), for delay, would be accepted. Let them repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and give the people an opportunity of deciding whether they wanted another Act or not. He believed none would be demanded for years to come.

MR. BÉCHARD said he was desirous to meet the views of the mover and seconder of the motion in amendment, that he thought the adjournment of this debate to Monday next would postpone the settlement of the question too long for a settlement this Session. This would practically violate the agreement made with the Minister of Justice yesterday, who, with the Minister of Finance, agreed, that if he waived his right to moving his Bill, so as to give an

opportunity of discussing the present Bill, he should have the time he wanted, and his Bill made the first Order of the Day for debate. He also understood that the House, while discussing the Bill, should have the opportunity of voting on the principle of the amendment he had submitted, in case of the adoption of which the Government was to give all possible facilities for the passing of his Bill. He would have to vote against the motion of the hon. member for Montreal East, which would postpone the question too long.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he wanted the member for Iberville to rest assured that the agreement he made with him should be religiously observed. He understood the arrangement was that the opinion of the House should be tested on the Bill of the member for Stanstead, when the member for Iberville should have an opportunity of proceeding with his Bill.

MR. COURSOL said he was not aware there had been any such agreement with the Minister of Justice, or the motion of the hon. member for Iberville, for the repeal of the law, would be tested this evening. That being the case, however, he would withdraw his motion.

Motion to adjourn the debate, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

Question put, and amendment (Mr. Béchard) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS :

MESSRS.

Allison	Christie
Bain	Cimon
Béchar	Cockburn (W. Northld.)
Benoit	Coughlin
Bergeron	Coupal
Bergin	Coursol
Bill	Cuthbert
Bolduc	Desjardins
Borden	Domville
Bou-rassa	Drew
Bourbean	Dubuc
Brooks	Dugas
Brown	Dumont
Bunster	Farrow
Burk	Ferguson
Burpee (Sunbury)	Fiset
Cameron (S. Huron)	Fitzsimmons
Caron	Fortin
Casgrain	Fulton
Chandler	Galbraith

Gill	Olivier
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Orton
Grandbois	Ouimet
Huntington	Patterson (Essex)
Ives	Pickard
Jackson	Pinsonneault
Jones	Poupore
Keeler	Rinfret
King	Robertson (Shelburne)
Kranz	Robitaille
Landry	Rogers
Lantier	Ross (Dundas)
LaBue	Rouleau
Little	Routhier
McDonald (C. Breton)	Ryan (Marquette)
Macmillan	Shaw
McCallum	Smith (Westmoreland)
McCuaig	Sproule
McDougall	Tassé
McInnes	Tellier
McKay	Thompson (Carleton)
McQuade	Trow
McRory	Vallée
Malouin	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Massue	Wallace (W. York)
Méthot	White (E. Hastings)
Mousseau	Williams
Muttart	Wright
O'Connor	Yeo.—99.
Oliver	

SAYS:

Messrs.

Anglin	Kilvert
Arkell	Kirkpatrick
Baby	Lane
Bannerman	Laurier
Boultsbee	Longley (P. E. I.)
Bowell	Macdonald (King's)
Brecken	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Burnham	McDonald (Pictou)
Burpee (St. John)	McDonald (Vict., N. S.)
Cameron (N. Victoria)	MacDonnell
Cartwright	Mackenzie
Casey	McCarthy
Charlton	McIsaac
Cockburn (Muskoka)	McLennan
Colby	McLeod
Connell	Merner
Daly	Mills
Dawson	Mongenais
Desaulniers	Ogden
Doull	Paterson (S. Brant)
Elliott	Platt
Fleming	Plumb
Flynn	Pope (Queen's, P. E. I.)
Gault	Robertson (Hamilton)
Geoffrion	Robinson
Gigault	Rochester
Gillies	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Gillmor	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Scriver
Gunn	Snowball
Guthrie	Strange
Hackett	Thompson (Haldimand)
Haddow	Tilley
Hay	Wade
Hesson	Weldon
Holton	White (Cardwell)
Hooper	White (N. Renfrew)
Houde	

INSOLVENCY LAWS REPEAL BILL.

[BILL 15.]

(Mr. Béchard.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said he felt warmly on this matter, and he desired to say a few words before the vote was taken. He had no reason to impugn the motives of hon. gentlemen, or to say that they were not as good judges as to what was best for the country as he himself was, but he was persuaded that, if effect were given to the resolution passed just now, it would produce a most disastrous state of affairs in the country. The passage of this motion for the repeal of the Insolvent Law would result in the destruction of all confidence. He felt he was speaking in the interests of the country. This question was above all party consideration. If he were acting from a party standpoint, he would ask nothing better, in the interests of his party, than that this measure should prevail. But it would produce a most disastrous state of affairs and react on the Government. What would be the effect? The House knew that, under the operation of the present Act, it was not in the interest of the creditor to bear heavily upon the debtor behind in his payments. How many men were there in the country behind in their payments, but who were in a solvent state, who, if given time, would ultimately meet their engagements? But the moment the Insolvent Law was repealed, these men would be crushed down. The consequence would be that, though a creditor might be willing to give time to a debtor, he would reason with himself that he was quite willing to give him time, but Mr. Jones, or Mr. Smith, to whom he was indebted, would not give him time, and necessarily he (the creditor) had to press heavily on his debtor. That would be the effect. There would be universal bankruptcy all over the country. He ventured to predict that, after the repeal of this Bill became law, there would be a crisis in this country of the most serious nature, a crisis that would not be confined to the wholesale and retail traders, for the retail men, forced by the wholesale men, would be compelled to resort to extreme measures

to compel payments from the farmers, the mechanics and the labouring men of the country, who had got into their debt on the understanding that they would have time for payment, but which time could not be allowed them owing to the pressure brought to bear on the retail traders themselves. There would be a strong feeling in the country against the action taken to-night, which it would be very difficult to allay. He would not pretend to say that the House was not justified in giving way to the feeling which appeared to exist in the country in favour of the repeal of the Insolvency Law, but he would say that they, as members of the House, had something more to do than merely to give effect to the wishes of their constituents, expressed, perhaps, without proper thought. There was another responsibility resting upon them. They were supposed to know a little more about some matters than the bulk of their constituents. If there was no other way in which this matter could be set aside, he hoped it might be set aside in the other branch of the Legislature. He thought that the Senate would not sanction this legislation, and the result would be that, instead of giving effect to the amendments proposed by the Committee charged with the preparation of the new Bill, the old law would remain on the Statute-book. In case that should not be the result, he, for one, protested against this legislation, which would produce most disastrous results.

Mr. HOUDE said that, at the beginning of the Session, when it was proposed to appoint a Special Committee to enquire into the working of the Insolvency Law, he stated that, if an improvement could be made in the existing law, he would be in favour of it. That was the reason he had voted, a moment ago, against the amendment of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), in order to allow the Bill presented by his hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) to replace the old law, on which it seemed to him to be an improvement. But, since that Bill had been defeated, he was consistent with his former declarations in voting for the repeal, pure and simple, of the existing law, which he had already condemned as too objectionable in its character, and too disastrous and demor-

alising in its effects, to be retained any longer in the Statute-book.

Mr. COLBY said the views which he entertained, with regard to the evil working of the Insolvent Act, were fully expressed when introducing the amended Act this evening. They were not new views, as they had been often expressed by him before upon the floor of the House. He had laboured conscientiously and industriously to remedy the evils contained in the present Act, and at the same time, to preserve to the commercial community what he believed was needed in their interest. He had failed in that effort, and he had no alternative now, acting on his antecedent and well understood views, except to vote for the repeal of the law.

Mr. BROOKS said he desired to make a few remarks in explanation of the vote he had just given and the vote he intended to give. He thought the discussion, this evening, would convince everyone, that, as shown by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), this was a very difficult matter to deal with, and, if hon. members looked at the legislation on this subject during the past fifteen years, they would see that it had been so considered by the House. He would simply refer to the amendments which had been proposed and passed during that period. This law was first introduced in 1863, and was passed in 1864. He found that amendments were made to the Act in 1869, 1870, 1871, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877. This Parliament had been ten years endeavouring to perfect the law. But what had been the result? The Act had become more and more unpopular every year since it had been first introduced, and there had been greater complaint against it throughout Canada within the last year than there ever had been before. The country had had fifteen years of this Insolvency Law, which had been continually found more and more unsatisfactory. Let them have at least one year's interregnum, during which there would be no law. The House could then see whether the voice of the people demanded such a law. He fully appreciated the remarks of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), whom he (Mr.

Brooks) had followed in reference to this matter, during the time he had been in Parliament, and who, during the whole period he had been in the House, had been a consistent opponent of this Insolvency Law. He fully appreciated what had been done by the Committee which had been appointed by the House in their efforts to frame a new law. He believed that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Stanstead was the best improvement upon the law that had ever been offered to the House in reference to insolvency matters. But he had felt very strongly that the feeling existed in the country, and it was the feeling he always had from the first day the law had been in force, that it was a premium upon dishonest and reckless trading. They were inaugurating a new era—taking a new start in this Dominion. They had, during the present Session, entirely changed the fiscal system of the country, and why not take a fresh start in this matter of insolvency, and reverse the first principle of the law? Why not declare, as he thought they would, that all men in business would have to pay their debts? They all knew that throughout the commercial world there was a great eagerness in this country to become rich, and that, in carrying out that principle, they had found their young men, and the old men, too, recklessly entering into commercial transactions without, in many cases, having either capital or experience, never doubting but that, if they failed to succeed in their business, they would obtain the benefit of the Insolvency Act. The Insolvency Act was first introduced for the benefit of insolvent debtors, but that principle was entirely reversed in the Bill introduced by his hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), which was now framed in the interest of the creditors. He believed that in that Act there were some principles which were entirely contrary to the principles which should be inserted in an Act of this kind. He believed that the Act should apply with equal fairness to both creditor and debtor, and he saw no reason why it should not apply to non-traders as well as traders, to farmers as well as merchants, if they were equally unfortunate to incur liabilities which they could not meet. He did not desire to enlarge upon this

Mr. Brooks.

subject. He had voted in this matter, as he had always voted, conscientiously, believing that it was the interest of the country to repeal this law. He believed that the effect of this Insolvent Act had been most demoralising upon the trading community of the Dominion. He thought the House should have an opportunity of ascertaining whether a change might not be beneficial. He had voted in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), and, logically, he could not but vote for the repeal of the existing laws.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he endorsed the remarks made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), because, as a representative of Ontario, he could not but feel that the effect of the vote that had been passed to-night would be most disastrous upon that Province. He felt it his duty to express that opinion, but whilst doing so he also felt it his duty, as a member of the legal profession, to thank the House for opening the flood-gates of litigation, which would benefit his profession to the detriment of the whole commercial community of Ontario.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said, if his hon. friend the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and his hon. friend behind him (Mr. Cameron) spoke for Ontario, he thought it was desirable some other members for Ontario should express their opinions before a vote was taken. He did not believe that either of these gentlemen interpreted the public sentiment of that Province upon this question. If any one fact in this case was clear to his mind, it was that the experience of the great mass of the people, commercial as well as professional, showed that in its working the present Insolvent Law was of no practical benefit to creditors—that insolvent estates were usually swallowed up by expenses before dividends were realised. He did not see any grounds for the prediction of the hon. member for Brant, that the repeal of this law would be most disastrous in its effects. Creditors got very little now, and the lawyers got very little; but the official assignees, and other people concerned in the administration of the law, carried off the principal portion of the

spoils; so that, probably, when the contracts of traders were restored to their normal place in the commercial law of the country, traders being allowed to make their own bargains, and pay their debts as they best could—the country would be just as well off, the trading class would be in quite as good a position as before, and the effect would be that this extensive credit system, which had carried the present depression in trade, would be abolished. He (Mr. Macdougall) had great respect for public opinion and for the sentiment which he found pervading a great representative body like this. He did not believe that the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Paterson) truly represented public opinion, nor that he would change the current of feeling in this House, when he prophesied such disastrous results from its action to-night. He (Mr. Macdougall) fancied the House knew very well its duty to the public. The hon. gentleman ventured to lecture the House for undertaking to repeal this Act, on the ground that they were legislating hastily and rashly. This question had been thoroughly discussed throughout the country, on the platform and through the press. It had been before the House at various times, and every hon. member must, long ago, have made up his mind in respect to it. The hon. gentleman intimated that, in another place,—after this House had exercised its authority and power as representatives of the people on a question affecting the people,—the deliberate decision of this assembly would be overruled. He trusted that suggestion would not prevail. He hoped that a majority of those who had a voice in this matter in another place would not be persuaded to set themselves in opposition to the opinion expressed by this House. He believed that public opinion was unfavourable to the Acts upon which they had just recorded their judgment; and, therefore, he felt assured that the other branch of the Legislature would concur in the decision which this body, by a decisive majority, had pronounced to-night. He intended to vote for the Bill of the hon. gentleman from Iberville (Mr. Béchard.) It would certainly be very improper to cut short those winding-

up proceedings, which were now going on, and he supposed there was a clause of that kind in the Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) had given expression to a very extraordinary opinion, that, when the House once voted upon any question, no member of the House was warranted in expressing any hostility in regard to that particular measure which the House had decided to adopt. The hon. gentleman spent the greater portion of the last five years in denouncing the last Legislature that assembled here, when, according to his new doctrine, he should have paid great respect to its doctrines. He (Mr. Mackenzie) adopted no such ground. Everyone had a perfect right to draw the attention of the House to what he considered the unwisdom of the Act. With reference to this particular measure, no doubt the hon. member for Halton was right in saying that public opinion was hostile to the continuance of the present Bankruptcy Law. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was hostile to it, but he believed the introduction of a repeal of that Act at present would be a measure of a very grave character to the commercial interests of the country. He believed commercial men had not yet attained the position which would enable them safely to repeal the Act. In Ontario, there was no proper legal provision for the equitable distribution of assets. That was one reason why he would not vote for the repeal of the law at present. Though there was a strong feeling against the law, by far the largest number of mercantile men, whom he had seen and who had large capital invested in business, looked with the gravest apprehension on a repeal of the Act during the prevalence of commercial depression.

MR. DOMVILLE said the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) was, from his point of view, a good one; but it did not meet the wants of the farmers, whose interests were as much entitled to be regarded as those of other classes. The present law had worked so much mischief that we would be better without it. A law should be enacted occasionally, during a lapse of years, to give relief to unfortunate and honest debtors, but should not be allowed to remain on the

Statute-book for a number of years, and thus afford opportunities to dishonest debtors to take advantage of their creditors. The proposed law, whilst it professed to do away with assignees, substituted something else in its place, which did not curtail the expense, and, in addition, it entailed the cost of the Court which was to be established, and to be paid out of the insolvent estate. This was making matters even worse than it was before, and the result would be the estate would be eaten up by law, whilst the hapless debtor could get no relief. He did not believe in a young country like Canada keeping a man under the hatches forever, but he could not sanction a law which would deprive the debtor of his estate, give it to the lawyers, and leave the insolvent hampered and unable to help himself or his family.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he endorsed everything that had been said on this question by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). It was a great misfortune that the House should have so disposed of the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead, and a still greater error would be committed if this House passed the Bill now before it for the repeal of the Insolvent Law. He would ask the hon. members from the Province of Quebec, who were in favour of the repeal, to remember that in Ontario the position was different from what it was in Quebec. In Quebec the creditors had an opportunity of dealing with the estate of an insolvent, whereas, in Ontario, there was no such opportunity. This was purely a commercial question. He would tell the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) that the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead, against which he had voted, gave protection to the farmers. If the law were repealed, there would be no protection for any one, either the honest debtor or creditor; the creditor who first got judgment would get the amount of his claim, and the others would be left out in the cold. Public sentiment was not against the Insolvent Law. Not a single petition had been presented to this House for its entire repeal. Any petition presented had always embraced the idea or suggestion, that some other mea-

MR. DOMVILLE.

sure should be introduced in its place. He regretted exceedingly that the Government had not thought proper to take hold of the measure of the hon. member for Stanstead, and make it a Government measure. It was their duty to do so. This Bill ought not to be allowed to go without being thoroughly discussed, and, therefore, he thought it would be advisable that the debate on it should be adjourned.

MR. MACDOUGALL said the hon. the leader of the Opposition was in error in assuming that he (Mr. Macdougall) had taken the ground, that the decisions of Parliament could not be reversed. He had argued in favour of the principle which lay at the foundation of Parliamentary law that, the House having pronounced on a question, that question could not be again put the same Session; there could not be contradictory decisions of the House the same Session. That rule was explicitly laid down by May, and was necessary to the proper conduct of business in a Legislative body. They had now the decision of this House on the question of the repeal of the Insolvent Act, and his hon. friend's objection to the Bill was a proposal to reverse the decision of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was not the same, but a different question entirely which they were now discussing. A new Insolvency Law was introduced, and there was a motion made to read it a second time. A motion was made, in amendment, that it be read this day three months. But there was an Insolvent Law at present upon the Statute-book; the motion now before the House was to read the Bill repealing that Statute a second time. Without a repealing Act, the present law would remain in force.

MR. McCARTHY said he had come here with his mind made up to vote for the repeal of the Insolvent Law, but was prevailed upon by the arguments he had heard in the Committee to think that the amendments proposed would be better than a repeal of the law, and, therefore, he voted for the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead. He could not, however, vote in the same direction. He must, in accordance with the views he had formed after consulting the com-

mercial men of his constituency, believe that if no change were made in the law, they would prefer to see it swept away. It was his duty, in his position, to give this explanation of his vote.

Question put, and second reading agreed to, on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messrs.

Allison	Kirkpatrick
Bain	Kranz
Béchar	Landry
Benoit	Lantier
Bergeron	LaRuc
Bergin	Little
Bill	Longley
Bolduc	McDonald (C. Breton)
Borden	Macmillan
Bourassa	McCallum
Bourbeau	McCarthy
Brooks	McCuaig
Brown	McDougall
Bunster	McInnes
Burk	McIsaac
Burpee (Sunbury)	McKay
Cameron (S. Huron)	McLennan
Caron	McQuade
Casgrain	McRory
Chandler	Malouin
Christie	Massue
Simon	Méthot
Cockburn (W. Northld)	Mongenais
Colby	Montplaisir
Coughlin	Mousseau
Coupal	Muttart
Coursol	O'Connor
Cuthbert	Oliver
Daly	Olivier
Desaulniers	Orton
Desjardins	Ouimet
Domville	Patterson (Essex)
Doull	Perreault
Drew	Pickard
Dubuc	Pinsonneault
Dugas	Rirfret
Dumont	Robertson (Shelburne)
Farrow	Robitaille
Ferguson	Rogers
Fiset	Ross (Dundas)
Fitzsimmons	Rouleau
Fortin	Routhier
Fulton	Ryan (Marquette)
Galbraith	Shaw
Gigault	Smith (Westmoreland)
Gill	Sproule
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Tassé
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Tellier
Grandbois	Thompson (Cariboo)
Houde	Trow
Huntington	Valin
Hurteau	Vallée
Ives	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Jackson	Wallace (W. York)
Jones	White (Cardwell)
Kaulback	White (E. Hastings)
Keeler	Williams
Kilvert	Wright.—117.
King	

NAYS :

Messrs.

Anglin	Lane
Arkell	Laurier [P.E.I.]
Bannerman	Macdonald (King's)
Bowell	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Brecken	McDonald (Pictou)
Burnham	McDonald (Vict., N.S.)
Burpee (St. John)	MacDonnell
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Mackenzie
Cartwright	McLeod
Casey	Merner
Charlton	Mills
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Ogden
Connell	Paterson (S. Brant)
Costigan	Platt
Dawson	Plumb
Elliott	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Fleming	Poupore
Flynn	Robertson (Hamilton)
Gault	Robinson
Geoffrion	Rochester
Gillies	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Gillmor	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Gunn	Scriver
Guthrie	Snowball
Hackett	Strange
Haddow	Thompson (Haldimand)
Hay	Tilley
Hesson	Wade
Holton	Weldon
Hooper	White (N. Renfrew)—60

Bill read the second time.

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes before
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 30th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FINANCIAL POSITION IN MANITOBA.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

“LOBNE.

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, certain papers having reference to the financial position of the Province of Manitoba.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, April 28th, 1879.”

BRITISH COLUMBIA GRAVING-DOCK.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

“ LORNE.

“ The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, certain papers having reference to advances to be made to the Province of British Columbia, for the construction of a graving-dock.

“ GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“ OTTAWA, 29th April, 1879.”

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 102) Respecting certain Ordnance and Admiralty Lands in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

HIS EXCELLENCY'S DESPATCHES CONCERNING THE TARIFF.

REMARKS.

MR. MACKENZIE said he desired to call the attention of the Government to a statement in the public press that certain despatches had been printed in England, which were transmitted by His Excellency, concerning the tariff. As these papers had become public in England, he could conceive no reason why they should not be brought down to the House here. He desired to ask the Government if they intended to lay them on the table; he presumed they would do it without requiring any formal motion.

MR. TILLEY said he supposed there could be no objection, seeing the papers had been made public on the other side; but he should have to decline giving an answer until he had had communication with the Governor-General. He would probably be able to give an answer to-morrow.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, as these documents bore upon a subject that was still to be discussed, he hoped the hon. gentleman would try and get them down to-morrow.

MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TILLEY said he would make enquiries about it.

SUPPLY.

X.—PENSIONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

61 To meet the probable amount required for Pensions to Veterans of War of 1812. \$35,000 00

MR. IVES said it was to be regretted that the Government had not found it possible to bring down a larger amount for this year than a sum of \$35,000. From the best information he could get, the original expectation, when the sum of \$50,000 was appropriated, was, that it would afford a sum sufficient to pay about \$100 to each of these old soldiers; but a much larger number had put in claims than was expected, and the result was that \$20 a year was all that had ever been paid. As the number decreased, however, the appropriations decreased also, and the original sum had been kept at \$20 a year. This year, some \$35,000 only was brought down. The House would remember that returns were asked for early in the Session, showing the number still surviving, and the number of those who were commissioned officers during the war. That return had been brought down, but, of course, it only showed the number surviving one year ago, when the amount for that year was paid, and it would be noticed in that return that nearly one-third of the original number were now dead—because he took it that those who had not been heard from were dead. When it must be considered that those men must be now all of them nearly 90 years of age—because those who were 21 years of age in 1812 must be 90 years old now—when that fact was considered, it might reasonably be expected that a very large number of those who had made application for the last year had not made application this year. He should say, in all human probability, at least one-half of those who received pensions last year would not make application on this side of time for the pension this year. Now, therefore, he thought, from the fact that

these men could only last a year or two longer, and many of them being in destitute circumstances, and from the fact that the services they rendered were honourable services, for which the country ought to be proud and grateful, the Government this year, without raising the amount of the appropriation, might use it all up in paying these old men. In his opinion, even though the sum appropriated was only \$30,000, yet, if the whole amount was paid, it would be found sufficient this year to pay them \$40 each. He regretted that the Government should continue to pay only \$20 each, and return the rest of the money to the Treasury. He thought, in the first place, we should return to the original sum of \$50,000. It would only be required for one or two years longer any way. Even though the Government should not be willing to do that, he believed the sense of the House, if it could be taken on the matter, would be that the whole amount of \$35,000 should be paid out, and not the sum of \$20 each, with the remainder carried back to the Treasury. He had no doubt, whatever, that \$35,000 would be sufficient to pay each pensioner \$40 a year. He did not desire to make any formal motion, but he was certain, from conversation he had with many members, that a large proportion of the House would be glad to see the original amount voted, and the amount increased that should be paid this year to each of these old men.

Mr. PLUMB said his hon. friend had been mistaken in supposing the pensioners who were on that list were all twenty-one years of age, or over, at the time they rendered their services. He knew of cases where they were very much younger, and he did not think that the Government had been, or was required to be, particular in scrutinising the ages of the applicants. Those who were twenty-one years of age even at the close of the war, would be now eighty-five. He knew a case where a man, Bernard Welman, of Niagara, had served as a teamster in the war of 1812, had applied four or five years ago for a pension, and had been refused, though another veteran of 1812, three or four years his junior, who had worked in the

same service, at the same time and place, and was afterwards a member of the Parliament of the two Canadas, had been put on the pension list. He had applied to the Department on that veteran's account, and trusted that he would not only receive his pension hereafter, but the arrears to which he was entitled. They should act liberally towards all veterans, and if they had actually served, as had the claimant in question, without doubt, they should not be excluded upon a technical definition. His old friend was present at engagements at Niagara, at Lundy's Lane, and at Stoney Point, and was under fire at those places while serving out ammunition. He was crippled while in discharge of his duty, and was now tottering helplessly upon the verge of the grave, "to dig unable, and to beg ashamed," and he (Mr. Plumb) desired most earnestly to appeal to the Government in the old man's behalf.

Mr. JONES said, as he understood it, in 1874, \$50,000 was set aside for those veterans. It was found that instead of their getting \$50 a-piece, which they were to receive, their pension was reduced to \$20. They only received \$20 each, yet, because the Government decreased the total amount yearly, as the poor fellows fell off—they had not increased it from \$20 up to \$50, intended to be given, notwithstanding the yearly vote for that purpose. He thought it a very small matter on the part of the Government, who should have been giving the \$50 instead of \$20, as first contemplated.

Mr. HAGGART said he would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to a subject he had often brought before that Department. In 1837, a company of volunteer artillery from the section he represented, had served in Kingston, when the General commanding the troop promised them a grant of 100 acres of land. This promise was published in the general order, but the men had never been able to obtain the land, or get any satisfaction on the subject. He understood that the promises and all the liabilities of the Imperial Government, on all such subjects, had been assumed by the Canadian Government. He would like to know the intention of the Government on the subject.

MR. McCUAIG said that the grant of the veterans should be raised from \$20 to \$50, or as much above \$20 as possible, as most of them were very poor. He (Mr. McCuaig) urged an increase in the amount granted, from \$20 to \$50. He wished the Government would divide the whole original grant among the survivors, many of whom, through the infirmities of age, were unable to take care of themselves, and were supported by their families and friends. Their meritorious services rendered to the Empire in times of need entitled them to be rewarded in a substantial manner by a grateful country.

MR. BOWELL said he was sure there was no hon. gentleman who would not be pleased to see the veterans of 1812-13 get as much as the public revenue would justify, but at present, with a depleted revenue, it was not thought advisable to ask for an increased sum. The hon. member for Sherbrooke was mistaken in supposing that any portion of last year's appropriation for the old veterans went back into the Exchequer. On the contrary, the \$35,000 was not sufficient to pay them the \$20 a piece formerly allowed, between \$2,000 and \$3,000 having to be taken out of the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose. The \$35,000 now asked was believed sufficient for that purpose. In reference to the case mentioned by the member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), he was informed that the applicant was but a teamster during the war, who never had been enlisted, but had been paid by the day when employed. Parties who had given evidence of having been in the service in 1812-13, had been placed on the pension list. With regard to the case mentioned by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), he had been informed by the officer of the Department that there never had been any order passed promising land to volunteers for services during the rebellion of 1836 and 1837.

MR. IVES said he was fully of the opinion that even the small sum of \$35,000 would be sufficient to pay a much larger amount than \$20 to each of the survivors this year. Was it intended to pay the \$35,000 to the survivors, or adhere to the payment of \$20 each,

MR. HAGGART.

saving the balance to the country out of those poor people?

MR. PLUMB said that the case he had presented was a parallel case to that of the former member of Parliament, who had received his arrears and a pension for service in 1812. The veteran for whom he applied was injured at the time, and had never been able since to go without a crutch or a cane, and it would be very tardy justice to that old man that he should have this miserable pittance at the hands of the country, which should not scrutinise any of those cases too closely.

MR. TILLEY said that this vote was, no doubt, a popular one, as would be any increase of it. It was a recognition, though small, of important services rendered to the country. But he feared that, in the present condition of the finances, it would be exceedingly difficult to increase the annual vote. If the finances of the country improved, they might be able to increase the vote twelve months hence.

MR. McCUAIG said he was quite content to leave the matter in the hands of the hon. the Finance Minister, who, he was sure, would appreciate the claims of these brave men in their old age and helpless condition, and do them justice by increasing the annual pension to the survivors, as he had suggested.

MR. BOWELL said that the intention of the Government was to pay \$20 each to those who had been receiving it. An exception was made by the late Minister of Militia, who had placed a teamster on the pension list for special services of some kind. The person for whom the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) spoke would be placed on the pension list if found as much entitled to it as the other teamster.

Vote agreed to.

XI.—MILITIA.

Ordinary.

63 Salaries of Military and District Staff....	\$23,800 00
64 Salaries of Brigade Majors ...	17,400 00

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) asked if it was the intention of the Government

to decrease the staff, which, it was well known, absorbed money which should go to the men.

MR. SCRIVER said he had a distinct recollection of questions put by the present Minister of Customs on this subject, when in Opposition. He hoped that hon. gentlemen had not forgotten the clear and able reasons he gave for his belief that the staff ought to be reduced—that it was too expensive. He trusted he would give the House similar reasons to-day for a similar conclusion, and that a change in this respect would be made before long; that the volunteers themselves would receive some portion of the money, which, he was afraid, was not too wisely expended on a large and expensive staff.

MR. WILLIAMS said that before this item passed, he wished to say a word or two in reference to it. He saw, by the detailed statement on the following page, that the salaries of the officer commanding the militia, and the Adjutant General, were not included in the Estimates, but were fixed by Act of Parliament passed in 1875. Upon referring to the Act he found that the officer commanding had to be an officer of Her Majesty's regular army, of stated rank, and, consequently, of experience. Although he must admit that, during the *régime* of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the military spirit of the country had been allowed to languish, he must also say that they deserved commendation for the course they pursued in this matter. He was sure the militia force felt the desirability of having at their head an officer who had made the study of arms his profession, who must possess the scientific knowledge as well as the practical experience necessary to lead the forces of the country in case of emergency. He thought, also, there was another consideration which we secured under the present arrangement. The General commanding was the connecting link between our militia system and the army authorities of the Home Government. He would, naturally, come to the country under the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief of the Imperial troops, and might be considered as his accredited representative, and would act, no doubt, to a certain extent, under his sugges-

tions. The force had been singularly fortunate during the last four years in having had in this position a gentleman, who, by his courtesy, as well as by his military knowledge and appreciation of the position of military affairs in the country, had gained the esteem, as well as the confidence, of all with whom he had come in contact. He thought it particularly desirable that these positions, from which must spring the life and stability of the military defensive strength of the country, should be placed on a comparatively permanent basis. As regarded the gentleman who now occupied the position of Adjutant-General, no one more competent could be found for the position; he was the admitted father of the present militia system, and its successful development was due greatly to his business abilities. On referring to the Militia Report of the year, he found it suggested that a further saving of expenditure might be made by the merging of some of the Military Districts; he could only express the hope that, if these suggestions were acted upon, the services of so valuable and experienced an officer as the gentleman now commanding No. 3 District at Kingston would not be dispensed with.

MR. BROWN said that it was understood last Session that some reduction would be made in this item. He was of opinion that several reductions might be made in the staff, and that either the Brigade-Majors or Deputy-Adjutants General might be done away with in the districts. He also thought that one paymaster might do for two or three districts, or that the payments might be made direct from headquarters. Everything had been done in attempting to economise, as far as the men were concerned, but where the largest expenditure was, nothing had been done.

MR. McCUAIG said the nominal strength of our militia was 45,000, and the actual strength, 37,000, and only 20,000 of these were annually drilled. Now, if there was anything he felt a pride in, as a Canadian, it was the militia of the Dominion. When the country was threatened by invasion, some years ago, the militia turned out with alacrity and cheerfulness, and he thought the country appreciated it. The

promptitude with which the militia responded to the call of their country on the occasion, created a confidence in them, and he was of opinion that the officers and men should be encouraged, after the laudable manner in which they performed their duty at that time, and he hoped that, under the guise of economy, the expenditure for this purpose would not be injuriously curtailed. If there was one thing more than another, in regard to which the Canadian people were inclined to be liberal, it was in the militia. He was opposed to any reduction on this item, believing it would be better to make a saving upon items less necessary. Although he approved, as a general rule, in cases where our militia were called out in support of the civic authority, that the expense should be borne by the municipality requiring the service, he, nevertheless, urged strongly the militia should be promptly paid by the Government for such service, and the municipality be made to reimburse the Military Department. He was aware of instances where delays had taken place in the payment of the militia by municipalities, greatly to their inconvenience, and he hoped this matter would receive the careful and earnest consideration of his hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence.

MR. BOWELL said if his hon. friend would take the trouble to look at the Estimates, he would see that a reduction had been made in the staff. In the first item a saving of \$4,800 had been effected by combining the duties of paymaster and store-keeper in one office. In some cases they did away with the paymaster, when they found the store-keeper better fitted for the duties. The services of the Brigade-Major that had been dispensed with had been so dispensed with by the late Government, and, in answer to the hon. member for Gloucester, he would say that that gentleman was Mr. Reed of Nova Scotia. An additional saving was effected by paying to each District Brigade Major \$400 for the whole district, instead of \$8 per company. This would result in a saving of about \$1,600, which, together with the amount saved by dispensing with a Brigade Major, made a total of \$2,600. This change

MR. McCUAIG.

had been effected in order to prevent the possibility of Brigade Majors being charged with reporting companies efficient in order to obtain the \$8 per company. The question of the Brigade Majors was, and had been for some time past, under the consideration of the Department, and he was in hope that his hon. colleague would be enabled, when the House met again, to show that another economy had been effected by dispensing with those officers in the manner suggested by his hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Brown), that was by combining the two offices of Brigade Major and Deputy Adjutant-General. He was quite in accord with the hon. gentleman on this point, and he had no doubt that, had the health of the Minister of Militia been such as to justify his looking more closely into these matters, he would have provided a plan by which this reduction could have been made. They would find that in the 68th item there was an increase. It was intended to apply that increase of \$-0,000 to assist rural companies to drill at battalion headquarters, and to pay for the transportation of men living a distance from headquarters. This expenditure would be made up by savings in other items. It was proposed to decrease the sum given to the Dominion Rifle Association by \$2,000, making it \$8,000 instead of \$10,000. If the association did not send a team to Wimbledon they would not receive the appropriation of \$6,000 which was given for that purpose.

MR. McCUAIG said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine to the position of the mariners of Canada. They had no organisation of officers and seamen in the Dominion. He thought, in view of the difficulties of navigation, it was desirable, in the event of hostilities breaking out, that we should organise lake and river masters, mates, pilots, engineers and others familiar with our rivers, as it was well known the navigation, particularly of the River St. Lawrence, with its swift currents and shoals, was difficult, and, without experienced and trained men, was dangerous to vessels navigating it. It took years to give the officers and men the necessary naval training and experience, and he was sure, if the Government

would give them the slightest encouragement, they would cheerfully organise. He hoped that, by next year, his hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have given this matter his consideration. The chief reliance of Great Britain was in her Royal Navy and her merchant marine, and, in times of danger, she depended as much, and, in certain cases, even more, upon this arm of her service than upon her soldiers, and, in the event of any difficulties arising in this country, an organisation of mariners would form a very strong power, and, being organised, would be subject to naval service without any delay.

MR. WILLIAMS said, as the hon. the Minister of Customs had referred to item No. 68, he thought that the attention of the House should be more particularly directed to it, and to its smallness, comparatively speaking, when it was considered that it covered the whole appropriation for drill pay, and the expenses connected with the training of 44,000 officers and men. He thought it should be clearly understood that the efficiency of the force could not be maintained on any such pittance. He was not in favour of any extravagant expenditure for militia purposes, but thought some fair consideration should be given to cover the expenses of those who, at great sacrifice, desired to make themselves efficient defenders of their country against internal as well as external troubles. He had listened attentively to the patriotic effusions of the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and to their declaration of loyalty and attachment to the Motherland, and felt satisfied that the sense of the House would have sustained the hon. the Minister of Militia, had he thought it desirable to double the amount of this item. The militia has been of great service to the country during the past years, and that it had been fully equal to all the emergencies it has been called on to meet, was fully sustained, not only by the General Officer commanding the militia, but by such authorities as Sir Garnet Wolsey, General Lindsay, Col. Thackwell, and other officers of the regular service. He saw, from the report of the Major-General, that he suggested that three stand-

ing battalions should be created; but he felt that in this he would not be sustained by the voice of the people of the country; the expenditure for them, alone, would be almost equal to the amount of the whole appropriation now asked for militia purposes, and he thought the active militia, as it now stood, would have to be sacrificed, and a blow given to the patriotic sentiment of the country. What we wanted in this country was a militia system that would be expansive, one that could reach and utilise the willing arms of the population in case of trouble. The present system, he thought, was such an one; it could be managed with strict economy, and, at the same time, be made to produce an efficient force. The object we should aim at was to secure well-qualified officers and non-commissioned officers conversant with their duties. Opportunities for acquiring such knowledge could be given to them at a small expense by opening again the Military Schools at Kingston, Quebec and Halifax, placing them under the control of the Deputy Adjutants-General of their Districts, and utilising "A" and "B" Batteries for the purpose.

MR. COURSOL said it was well known that Montreal had a large force of volunteers, well drilled and disciplined, and, he believed, second to none in the Dominion. The officers of the force were subject to very heavy expenses on account of the want of accommodation for drill purposes, and of paid officers to look after the various regiments. Unfortunately for Montreal, the drill shed, which had been erected some years ago, tumbled down, and at present there was no place where the volunteers could drill. He would ask the hon. the Minister of Militia, whether any provision had been made for the rebuilding of the drill shed. Interviews had taken place with the volunteer officers and the Adjutant-General, also with the members of the corporation, and he hoped to hear that the shed would shortly be rebuilt.

MR. BOWELL said he understood the Corporation of Montreal had now \$12,000 in their possession with which they should have rebuilt the drill shed, but had refused to do so. They should either spend the money in rebuilding it or hand it over to the Government and

allow them to build it. He was also informed that if they would place the property at the disposal of the Government, the probabilities were the Government would rebuild the shed. This was the statement made by the late Government, that the city of Montreal had this money to build the drill shed.

MR. GAULT: It would cost \$20,000 to build it.

In answer to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. BOWELL said there was one paymaster retained on account of the quantity of work to be done in Military District No. 1. The storekeeper that had charge of the stores of districts Nos. 5 and 6, would act as paymaster for No. 6, while the paymaster for No. 5 District would be retained.

MR. STRANGE said he wished to call attention to the small amount allotted for drill pay. In his opinion, the sum was altogether too small, and out of all proportion to the total amount expended on the Militia Service. For the last five years the appropriation for drill pay had been so meagre that it had been found impossible to organise any brigade camps, and unless a brigade camp was held at least every alternate year, it was impossible to keep the militia in a state of efficiency and discipline. He did not wish to embarrass the Government on this question during the financial distress under which the country was labouring, but he strongly urged upon the Administration the absolute necessity of liberally augmenting the vote for drill pay, as soon as the Public Treasury would permit. If the Government found this to be impracticable in the future, they would have no other alternative than to permanently reduce the number of battalions by disbanding all those which were weak or inefficient, and applying the available funds to the equipment and drill of those regiments, which, by the liberality of the officers, and the self-abnegation of the men, had remained efficient under most trying and adverse circumstances.

Vote agreed to.

65 Allowances for Drill Instruction..... \$40,000 00

MR. BOWELL.

MR. BÉCHARD said a considerable portion of that money was wasted: Some of the companies in the rural districts were utterly disorganized, and the officers, when the occasion arrived, would obtain the services of mere boys to go through the allotted drill. Military instruction should be confined to large centres where the militia could not fail to be kept organised.

MR. CHARLTON said that his hon. friend's experience must be limited to that part of the Province of Quebec known as Iberville. His (Mr. Charlton's) observation had led him to form a different conclusion. He should be sorry to see any discrimination against these battalions in the rural districts, especially those on the frontier. If his hon. friend had read the report of the Minister of Militia and the reports of the several Adjutants-General, he would have found that the organisation on the frontier compared favourably in numbers and discipline with those of the large centres of population.

MR. PLUMB said that, living on the frontier, he felt a great interest in everything connected with militia expenditure. He was sorry to see that the spirit which had prevailed in the House for the last few years had been in the direction of largely reducing the expenditure in that important Department. There had been a reduction during the past three or four years from an expenditure of \$1,300,000 down to about \$600,000. That was a poor economy, and whenever any spasmodic reduction of a large amount was made in any permanent expenditure in any single year, it was sure to result in a very extravagant expenditure later. In England, during the rage for cheese-paring economy of the Gladstone Government, a great reduction was made in the militia expenditure, and they all knew the enormous outlay which followed it. It was desirable that we should have an effective force, however small, and any expenditure made should be made in the right direction. He had seen the very bulky report of the Militia Department which had been laid on the table of the House, but had failed to hear the slightest allusion to that report, which offered the only justification for making those large allowances to be expended in that De-

partment. He had before him the report of the gentleman who was in charge of the militia forces in this country, but had heard no reference made to it whatever. That report came to us with a certain amount of authority. That gentleman was an old, experienced officer in the British army, who had seen active service, who came here entirely free from political prejudice, with the authority of the British Government, which had decorated him for able services, and whatever he said should be listened to with respect. That gentleman had proposed, that in the condition Canada was in at present, some provision should be made for a permanent force. Of course, the name of a standing army, however small, would create alarm at once, and no member of Parliament would attempt to ask such a thing. A recommendation of this kind was entitled to respect. He did not say that it should be carried out, but he wished it to be considered. He (Major-General Smyth) gave very strong arguments in favour of the forces so massed and arranged together as to provide for emergencies which were liable to rise in a country situated as Canada was. He referred to the trouble which occurred in Montreal last year, and pointed out very properly that no local force could ever be effective in case of a rising in its neighbourhood. Opinions from a gentleman such as the Major-General of the Dominion, speaking as he always did, in the interests of the country, was worthy of acceptance. He asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) acting for the hon. the Minister of Militia, whether it was intended this year to provide a volunteer camp at Niagara? He thought there was no gentleman in the House who ever had anything to do with volunteer camps in Ontario, but would acknowledge that the town of Niagara afforded the best accommodation for volunteers' camps that could be found anywhere in that Province. He appealed to his hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Skinner), who had experience in this matter, to say whether he (Mr. Plumb) was correct or not in that assertion. He did not urge the formation of a camp at Niagara this year, because he knew the position in which the present Government found itself upon getting

into power. He knew they were forced, from the financial position of the country, into a kind of economy, which he (Mr. Plumb) fancied was not sound economy, but which was made necessary by the temporary condition of the finances. He trusted that the hon. gentlemen who were now in charge of the Militia of the Dominion, would see that it was not in the true interests of the country—as represented by the great majority of this House occupying seats on the Government side—to pursue a system of petty economy in the matter of the militia expenditure. It would be the poorest economy in the world to follow the course pursued during the last two or three years in cutting down the Militia estimates for the sake of showing an apparent reduction in the expenditure of the country.

MR. BOWELL said there were not to be any brigade camps formed this year. Drill would take place at battalion headquarters, and, therefore, there had been an increase in the amount for this particular service. He found, in looking at the report of the Deputy Adjutant-General of the inspection of the companies at Iberville, to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Béchard) had referred, that it was stated by that officer that, while they were nearly all recruits, and wanting in drill, "they were able-bodied and active men," and not what his hon. friend had declared them to be—nearly all boys and striplings.

MR. BÉCHARD: I stated that a portion of them were merely boys.

MR. BOWELL said if they were good-sized boys he would not object. He thought that as soon as boys were able to shoulder a rifle they should commence to drill. If that were done, it would furnish better men for the service. He hoped the hon. gentleman did not desire to cast any reflection on the hon. Mr. Marchand, the Colonel of the battalion, when he stated that his command was composed of boys unfit for service. If they were to believe the Deputy Adjutant-General they were all able-bodied men. He regretted to have to inform his hon. friend from Niagara, (Mr. Plumb) that the finances of the country would not justify the Govern-

ment, at the present moment, in the expenditure of a larger sum for this particular service than they proposed to expend.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said he regretted that a camp could not be formed at Niagara this year, as a great deal of good had been accomplished by those camps. He saw by the newspapers that some volunteer battalions were to go to Montreal on the 24th of May, and he desired to know if they were to be sent at the public expense?

Mr. BOWELL said that a proportion of the cost of the transportation of the Queen's Own, of Toronto, the Governor-General's Foot Guards, of Ottawa, and of a Quebec battalion, to Montreal, to take part in the demonstration in that city on the 24th of May, would be paid by the Government. The total amount to be contributed by the Government towards that service, was \$4,000.

Mr. IVES said he wished to call the attention of the House to an instance of economy on the part of the Government. Last year, the country battalions in the vicinity of Montreal were called away from their harvest work to do duty in that city. They were on duty three nights and two days. The city of Montreal paid them for two days—the three nights had to be thrown in, and the Government had actually made a charge against these men to the amount of half their pay for rations while in that city. Yet now, the Government proposed to expend a large sum of money in enabling three battalions to go to Montreal for the purpose of having a pleasure party. He did not think that right or proper.

Mr. BROWN said he thought it was an injustice to appropriate money for the benefit of two or three particular corps, and he did not see why it should not be left open to any of the militia battalions that wished to take advantage of it. But he did not believe the money should be spent in that way at all. He certainly agreed with the hon. gentleman who had preceded him (Mr. Ives) in reference to economy. He thought the rural companies mentioned by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) would compare favourably with any other class of the

militia, and were equal to any town or city battalions.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal Centre) said he rose for the purpose of protesting against the objection made by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) to the small appropriation for the purpose of assisting the Toronto and Ottawa Regiments in being transported to Montreal, for the purpose of taking part in the demonstration in that city on the 24th May, in honour of the birthday of Her Majesty the Queen. He felt that, if there was any occasion upon which the volunteers were to make a creditable display, it was on an occasion like this, when a regiment was coming from New York, at their own expense, to join the volunteers in Canada in the demonstration at Montreal. He was satisfied that the turn-out of the Canadian volunteers would be one that would reflect credit on themselves and on the whole Dominion. He did not quite agree with the hon. member for Niagara, when he regretted exceedingly that the finances of the country were not in a position to expend a larger sum for militia purposes. He was quite sure that on all occasions in the future, as in the past, the volunteers would be always ready to turn out and do their duty with honour to themselves and with credit to the country. But there was one great question which occupied a great deal of public attention, and that was, whether the country received an equivalent for the very large amount annually appropriated for the volunteers' service. He thought that the best way to train the population to the use of arms was to train the youth of Canada in the schools. Those who had charge of the educational system of the country should, as early as possible, bring their influence to bear with every Local Government, in order that in every public school, which received a dollar of public money, an hour or two a day should be set apart for the purpose of training the youths of the country to the use of arms. By that means, he believed, we would get the whole country accustomed to the use of arms, and, if ever an emergency arose, the country would have at its service a large number of comparatively well-trained men. A great number of people were prepared, if necessity arose, to make greater sacri-

MR. BOWELL.

nices in the future than they had already done, for the maintenance of our volunteer force; but, at the same time, they had doubts as to whether the present system was the proper one for this country. He desired to make another remark, with reference to a statement of the hon. gentleman acting for the Minister of Militia, in regard to militia affairs in Montreal. The Government of Canada had given a certain sum to the city of Montreal to aid in the erection of a drill shed. The city had borrowed, in its corporate capacity, a certain sum of money, for the same purpose. The drill shed had been erected, but the roof had fallen in, and ever since it had been unoccupied, except for storage purposes by the city. Gentlemen, who, in the past, had made great sacrifices for the volunteer force of Montreal, believed that the city was bound by law to reconstruct that drill shed. So far they failed to do so; but, as regarded the \$12,000 given by the Government, he had no hesitation in saying—because he had the authority of the Chairman of the Finance Committee of Montreal for the statement—that they were ready to return that sum of money at any time. The Government gave not only \$12,000, but they were bound to pay an annual rental of \$1,200 besides, for the use of the drill shed. He admitted that the city of Montreal had not done, in connection with this drill shed, what it should have done, and had not treated the volunteer force as it deserved. He merely alluded to the fact now, in order to say that the Government of Canada ought to take some steps to bring this question to a settlement at the earliest possible moment—either to get back the money they were entitled to receive from the city of Montreal, or compel the Corporation to fulfil their duty toward the volunteer force of that city.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said he did not object to the troops going to Montreal on the 24th of May, but he did object to any money being taken out of the public chest to pay their expenses. The people of Montreal were able to pay for any celebration they might undertake. Instead of spending money for such purposes, it should be given to drill the country battalions, who were the bone and sinew of the militia force. He

did not believe in these pet militia associations in Toronto, Ottawa, and other places being taken to Montreal at the public expense.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre) said they were not going at the public expense, as he read sometime ago in the newspapers that, in Toronto, Colonel Otter called his men together, and every one of them was prepared to make a pecuniary sacrifice, and pay his own expenses to Montreal.

MR. PERREAULT said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia to the existence of the Charlevoix Battalion, which was composed of well-trained men. Unfortunately, however, they had not sufficiently frequent occasions for meeting together and drilling. He hoped the hon. the Minister of Militia would think of them, and enable them to meet together oftener. By this means he would ensure the existence of a battalion of excellent men, who asked nothing better than to develop their military qualities.

MR. MILLS said the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) complained that the volunteers who were called to Montreal last year to assist in maintaining the peace, were charged with rations. He thought there was some misapprehension on this point. Whenever the volunteer force was called out for the purpose of maintaining the peace, it was not as military at all; they were not called out in a military capacity, but simply as a constabulary force. If the hon. the Minister of Customs, who appeared to dissent from this view, would take the trouble to look at the Act providing for the calling out of this force, he would see that they were called out as a constabulary, and not as a volunteer force. The principle was well recognised in Mr. Clode's work on the Military Forces and Crown. It was the duty of every citizen to assist in maintaining the peace, and the responsibility of maintaining the peace devolved on the local authorities. It was quite competent for the Local Government in every Province to organise the people into a constabulary force, to arm and drill them the same as a military force, and to make it their duty to turn out for the purpose

of assisting to maintain the peace. In England, in recent years, since 1839, that had been the practice; and the military force were called upon as rarely as possible for that purpose. The principle was also well recognised in Bowyer's work on the Constitutional Law of England, in which he said:

"We have seen that the House of Commons has never admitted, and the preamble of the Mutiny Act by implication denies, that a standing army is required to maintain the Government at home; yet it sometimes happens that the aid of the military force is called for by the civil magistrate, in cases of riot or disturbance, to preserve the peace. But in such cases the law looks upon the soldiers rather as armed citizens (and, perhaps, as sworn servants of the Crown) than as a body of men under martial law, and separated from the rest of the community. Thus it has been laid down that a soldier is gifted with all the rights of other citizens, and is bound to all their duties, and he is, therefore, as much bound to prevent a breach of the peace, or a felony, as any other person. If it be necessary for the purpose of preventing mischief, or for the execution of the law, it is not only the right of soldiers, but it is their duty, to exert themselves in assisting in the execution of a legal process, or to prevent any crime or mischief being committed. So it has been laid down that a magistrate may assemble all the King's subjects to quell a riot, and may call in soldiers who are subjects, and may act as such; though this should be done with great caution. And thus much for the militia state, as acknowledged by the laws of England."

That was exactly the principle recognised here. It was not in the power of the Government of Canada to call out the militia force as a militia force for the maintenance of peace. The Government of Canada had gone to the utmost limits of its authority, in his opinion, on the occasion already referred to. It was extremely doubtful whether they had the power to place the militia force of the country as such at the disposal of the local authorities, but there could be no doubt that, when that force was placed at their disposal, it was not as a military force at all, but as a constabulary force, to assist the civil authorities in the maintenance of peace. This principle was fully discussed on the occasion of the Lord George Gordon riots when the Mayor of London permitted the insurrection to go on for days together; and, after the Houses and members of Parliament were attacked, upon the

advice of the Attorney General of the day, Wedderburne, the King called out the military force, but he did so on the understanding that the riot had assumed such dimensions that a state of rebellion existed within the city, and then the force was called out as a military force—not to aid the civil authorities, but to assist in putting down an insurrection. In this matter, if the volunteers were charged with the rations, it was simply because there was no other course open; and, if there was anyone to be complained of, it was the municipal authorities where the presence of this force was required.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he always found some difficulty in reconciling himself to the large expenditure which this country annually made for military purposes. He did not agree with the hon. gentleman from Niagara (Mr. Plumb), that it was desirable to incur a large expenditure for keeping up a military force. The Minister of Militia would confer a boon on this country if he could reduce this expenditure even below its present figure—not, however, that he objected to an expenditure of money for militia purposes, if it could be directly applied to those purposes. This large sum of over \$700,000 was not all applied directly for drill purposes; on the contrary, a large portion, perhaps the largest portion, went to the payment of officers' salaries. During the last few years our volunteers had scarcely done the usual amount of drill, and yet he found the officers' salaries still continued the same. Large sums were also expended for Departmental management and Adjutants-General, and when they came to figure up what the volunteers actually received for the time and labour they gave in drilling and preparing themselves to serve the country, only the comparatively small sum of \$175,000 was paid to them. He believed there was no danger of our being called upon to do much fighting for some years to come, in defence of our country; still, he should never object to the expenditure of a reasonable sum of money annually, in order to maintain a certain military spirit which every Canadian must recognise as having an important influence on the institutions of a free people. What

he objected to was the large expenditure for other purposes than for the development directly of the military spirit among our young men. He desired also to call attention to the Wimbledon Team annually sent to the Old Country. He was not quite satisfied with the mode in which that team was selected. While agreeing that it was well our various Provinces should be represented in such a team, still, he thought that, for the honour of Canada, the best men should be selected irrespective of Provincial distinctions. He would like to see Canada take a higher position, if possible, in military competition in the Old Country, but, as long as the selection was by Provinces, and, perhaps, not the utmost care being taken to select the best riflemen from the various Provinces, there would always be a lack of military *éclat* derived from the expenditure of this money. A better mode would be to select the best men irrespective of Provinces, and send them over to allow them to practice there for some time before the competition opened, and we should then, probably, score higher results than we had done heretofore. He did not call attention to these matters in any carping spirit, because he agreed that the militia item was an important one, but for the purpose of securing the expenditure of this money in a more direct manner towards the purposes in view.

MR. CASEY said his hon. friend (Mr. Ross) was mistaken in his reference to the Wimbledon Team. The men were not now selected by Provinces, but by competition open to the whole Dominion. Matches were held in the different Provinces, and the highest scores taken entitled the winner to a position on the Wimbledon Team. It was a very difficult matter to decide as to the best means of selecting the best men from the whole Dominion to compose this team. The Dominion Rifle Association had had this matter up year after year, yet had not been able to come to any satisfactory decision. He thought the best plan would be for the Government to give the Rifle Association an annual grant, sufficient to allow competitors from the different Provinces to meet at one place at the same time, with

their expenses paid, and there to have the trial take place for the best men. He thought the House would agree with him that the money expended in sending this team to England every year was money well spent. It had been a small grant, but he was sure that every member in this House would agree with him that no sum of money had done so much towards bringing Canada before the British nation, and producing a good feeling abroad towards this country.

MR. SKINNER said he desired to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia to an article now going the rounds of the press, which was directly insulting to some of our militia regiments. He had received numerous letters from friends all over the country desiring to know whether there was any truth or not in the article, which was copied from the *Detroit News*. He wished to know whether Col. Gzowski had really said that only 2,000 men could be recruited in this country under the circumstances.

Several HON. MEMBERS: He never said it.

MR. SKINNER said the article was highly insulting to the force, and he wanted to know whether there was any truth in it.

MR. BOWELL said he could inform the hon. gentleman that there was no truth whatever in the statement so far as the Government was concerned. On the contrary, they all knew that had they required 10,000 men at that time there would have been no difficulty in raising double the number in Canada to assist in fighting England's battles.

MR. MACKENZIE said that this referred to something that was alleged to have taken place when there was a prospect of war in Europe, in which Britain was thought likely to be involved. The Government was then constrained, by public appearances, to take measures to prepare the coast defences for any emergency, and, no doubt, confidential communications passed between the Canadian and Imperial Governments; but up to the time the late Ministers left office, there was no such commission entrusted to Col. Gzowski, or anybody else.

MR. BOWELL said that he might supplement the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton with the statement that, since he had left office, there had been no such correspondence between the Imperial and Canadian Governments on that subject. He would inform the member for Richmond and Wolfe that the Government had nothing whatever to do with the militia force, when called out to assist in putting down a riot, further than to see that the requisition made by magistrates was carried out. The expenses attending the calling out of the volunteer force, including transport, rations and pay had to be met by the municipality requiring their services. It was not his intention to discuss whether the volunteers should be called a constabulary, or to be considered as acting as policemen. All he would say in reply to the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was that, if he had looked at the Militia Law, he would have found that he (Mr. Bowell) was right when he indicated his dissent from the hon. gentleman's remarks. He was not disposed to discuss the constitutional point or any theoretical question in connection with this subject, but would say that the Canadian law, which provided for the turning out of the volunteers, enacted that they should be liable at all times to be summoned in aid of the civil power, in any case of riot, disturbance of the peace, or on any other emergency; also that they should then act only as a military body, obeying the orders of their commanding officers only. They were then under the Queen's regulations and martial law, like soldiers in her Majesty's Army. It was true that, in the suppression of riots, the officer took his instructions from the mayor or magistrate officiating, and, so far, he was under civil authority. In reference to their pay, in the case referred to, they knew that the volunteers were not properly treated by the municipality into which they had been called to prevent what was then thought probable, a riot. It was the duty of Montreal to have provided not only for the transport and rations, but the pay of the men. Failing to do so, a suit was instituted. In the meantime, the late Government advanced a sufficient sum to pay for the rations. Whether they would enforce their claim, for which a demand had been made, was

not yet decided. His hon. friends would observe by the notice papers that it was the intention of the Minister of Militia to so amend the law as to enable the Government, under similar circumstances, to pay the men and officers of the force, and also their transport and rations, and then hold the municipality served responsible for the expenditure. That Bill, he thought every member of the House, and of the force, would support, its object being to prevent the force from being kept out of its pay and provisions, and exposed to suffering, as it was when called out last summer. In reference to the aid to be given to some of the battalions on the 24th May next, the concession was made after a very great deal of pressure on the part of some of the men, and after they had agreed to pay a large portion of their own expenses. For instance, the Queen's Own of Toronto—than which a better battalion was not in the service of the Dominion—had offered to pay for their own rations, and to contribute \$2 per head to make up the expense of their trip to Montreal, and the Government had agreed to appropriate \$2 a head, in addition, to assist in covering those expenses. As to the propriety of sending many battalions down to Montreal on that occasion there might be room for discussion. But it was well known that there was a very great desire, on the part of those who had lately arrived among us, to see what the Canadian volunteer force really was. He had no doubt that, after they had witnessed the review in Montreal, on the 24th May, they would go away satisfied that Canada had, at least, produced as fine volunteer corps—men as able, ready and willing, to do their duty in case of necessity, as any country in the world. He thought that his hon. friends who had referred to this matter would concede that, for the small expenditure that would be incurred on this occasion, the country would be amply remunerated by the *éclat* the force would gain in other sections of the Empire. His hon. friend from Middlesex had called attention to the great expense attending the departmental staff at headquarters. He (Mr. Bowell) supposed that the labour of that staff would be just as great, or nearly so, whether there was company drill at headquarters or not, or any drilling at all.

MR. MACKENZIE.

But he thought the hon. gentleman played upon another string, and sang another tune upon this subject last Session. If he would consult the Estimates he would find that the item for drill had been increased by \$20,000 over last year. If he understood correctly the member for West Hastings (Mr. Brown), he had complained that a sufficient sum was not appropriated for the drill of rural battalions and companies. While fully in accord with his hon. and gallant friend, who commanded the 49th battalion, he might reply that a step had been taken this year, to be followed, he trusted, in future, in the direction of an improvement in this respect, by adding \$20,000 for that purpose, most of which had been saved from staff expenditure, of which they had complained for years. In reference to the Wimbledon team, the selection was made not by the Government, but by the Dominion Rifle Association, and, if the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had any suggestion to make for the better selection of the marksmen, he was quite satisfied the President of the Dominion Rifle Association would only be too glad to receive it, and probably act upon it. There would be very little difficulty in carrying out his suggestion if the House was prepared to double the appropriation in aid of that association. But, if he (Mr. Bowell) recollected aright, it had been a disputed point, on every occasion when the militia estimates were before the House, as to the propriety of making any appropriation to send that team to England. The hon. gentleman had said that a sufficient sum might be set apart to enable the selected men to go to England some time before the competition for practice. He (Mr. Bowell) had no doubt that such practice would aid them materially; but he questioned whether the House would be prepared to double the estimate for that purpose, and thought that the reduction of \$2,000 this year was a step in the right direction.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said that, on the occasion of the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunter), for the publication of the names of those who had offered their services to England, when trouble in the East was

anticipated, he had said that the 37th Battalion, to which he belonged, was among the number, but in a return brought down it had not been mentioned. After a good deal of hunting and correspondence with the Adjutant-General, he had received an acknowledgment from that gentleman, which had been previously sent to the Colonel commanding, who forwarded it to him, which he would read to the House, in order to place himself right before it, and prove that his battalion had offered their services on the occasion:

"BRIGADE OFFICE,
"HAMILTON, 12th July, 1877.

"SIR,—I have the honour of enclosing an official letter from the Adjutant-General, in answer to your official address to the Major-General commanding, on the efficiency of the 37th Battalion, and beg to offer my congratulations.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"H. V. VILLIERS, Lieut.-Colonel,
"Brigade-Major.
"Lieut.-Colonel Davis,
"Commanding 37th Battalion."

"OTTAWA, 5th July, 1877.
"SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ult., enclosing marching out state of the 37th Battalion after their annual drill, and letter from the commanding officer, addressed to the Major-General commanding, who directs me to inform you that he has been much pleased with the report of the efficient state of the 37th Battalion during their training under Lieutenant-Colonel Davis, and regrets being unable to see that fine body of men, and that the loyal volunteers of the battalion shall not be lost sight of, should occasion arise to use their services in the ranks of the Rifle Brigade or of any other corps of her Majesty's Army. A note has been made accordingly.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient Servant,
"W. POWELL, Colonel,
"Adjutant-General of Militia."
"The Deputy Adjutant-General
"Commanding Military District,
"No. 2, Toronto."

MR. BOULTBEE said that the member for South Oxford (Mr. Skinner) appeared to have fallen into the trap set for him and others by a paper in Detroit of no reputation. Such charges were frequently made in such American papers. Of course, their object was attained by the notice of the matter in the House of Commons. He thought such notice was unfortunate—that the charges were unworthy of it. It would

be better not to notice them hereafter. The people of Canada were instinct with loyalty, intelligent, energetic and brave; and, having seen the militia in England, France and the United States and other countries, he might say as a Canadian militia man himself, that our force was second to none of them. There was no doubt that, in the event of any difficulty to the old Motherland, if necessary, the last man in the force competent to bear arms would be willing to serve in her defence.

Mr. BROWN said the whole of the names of the persons had not been given in the return that had been asked for. There was another matter he desired to mention, and that was in regard to the ammunition. He thought it would be a great benefit to the volunteer force if the Department would reduce the price of ammunition. He was aware that the Government had reduced the wholesale price, but if they could sell it to the Rifle Association for Regimental Clubs, it would be a great inducement to them to practice. He desired to know where the money realised by the sale of ammunition went, whether to the Receiver-General or to the credit of the Militia Department?

Mr. BOWELL said that money was placed to the credit of the Receiver-General, and went into the general fund.

Vote agreed to.

66	{	Ammunition	\$25,000 00
		Clothing.....	50,000 00
		Military stores	40,000 00

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he desired to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the great disproportion between the amount expended on the men and the amount expended on the staff. He saw, from the report of the Minister of Militia, that, in the Province of Manitoba, 200 men were drilled, and received the usual sum of 50c. a day, which amounted to \$1,200, whilst the maintenance of the staff amounted to \$29,000.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said that, last year, the Minister of Militia announced that he intended to have two armoury sergeants to examine, and put

MR. BOULTBEE.

into proper order the arms of the militia. He desired to know whether those armourers were in the country?

Mr. BOWELL said these two men were in the country. One was stationed at Toronto, and the other at Kingston. They had been in the country six or eight months, and received \$1.50 a day. In answer to the hon. member for Middlesex, he would say the amounts were disproportionate, but he hoped in the future they would be enabled to make changes which would remedy this defect.

Vote agreed to.

67	Public armouries and care of arms, including storekeepers and caretakers, storemen and the rents, fuel and light of public armouries.....	\$52,000 00
68	Drill pay and all other incidental expenses connected with the drill and training of the militia.....	175,000 00

Mr. CASEY asked what was the drill programme for the coming year? He saw that there was an increase in this vote, which he thought was a step in the right direction.

Mr. BOWELL said the programme was that 21,000 of the volunteer force would be drilled this year, and they would be selected by ballot. The extra amount was for the purpose of assisting rural companies to get to battalion headquarters.

Mr. CASEY enquired if all the drills were to be at battalion headquarters.

Mr. BOWELL: Not necessarily.

Mr. CASEY said he would strongly urge upon the Government the drilling of the volunteers at headquarters as far as possible.

Vote agreed to.

69	Contingencies and general service, not otherwise provided for, including assistance to artillery and rifle associations and bands of efficient corps.....	\$46,000.00
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

Mr. HESSON said that nothing tended more to impart an *esprit de*

corps to a battalion than a good band, and he deprecated the reduction in this particular. He thought the allowance for bands should be increased.

Vote agreed to.

70 Drill sheds and rifle ranges.... \$10,000 00

Extraordinary.

71. Care and maintenance of military properties transferred from the Ordnance and Imperial Government, including rents..... 8,000 00
72 Royal Military College..... 59,000 00
73 Military Schools and drill instruction in Colleges..... 14,000 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked what was the cause of the increase proposed.

MR. BOWELL said it was for the purpose of providing for military instruction in collegiate institutions throughout the Dominion. Inspectors would be taken from the batteries, four for Ontario and three for Quebec, and two for the Maritime Provinces, and would visit the different colleges throughout the Dominion. They would devote their whole time, except during the holidays, to the instruction of the pupils. During the holidays the instructors would return to their batteries, when they will be prepared to give instruction to militia volunteer officers desirous of obtaining a second-class certificate.

Vote agreed to.

74 Pay, maintenance and equipment of "A" and "B" Batteries, Garrison Artillery, and Schools of Gunnery at Kingston and Quebec..... \$115,000 00
75 Pay and maintenance of guard at Rideau Hall. 5,000 00

Special.

76 Ordnance and improved firearms..... 20,000 00

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Acts incorporating the Côteau and Province Line Railway and Bridge Company, and the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company, and amending Acts, and to amalgamate the said Companies.—(Mr. McLennan.)

SUPPLY.

**XII.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS
CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.**

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

RAILWAYS.

77 Intercolonial, to deep water at St. John.....\$100,000 00

MR. TUPPER said this was for the purpose of completing the work that was under contract, and was the final vote expected to be required. The whole expenditure on the work, including this \$100,000, was \$337,796. The work had cost more than was estimated. This covered the dredging as well as other work.

Vote agreed to.

78 Intercolonial, Nut Locks..... \$40,000

MR. TUPPER said the attention of the Government had been called to an invention to prevent nuts from unscrewing. The liability of nuts to become loose was not only a source of great danger, but involved a heavy expense in watching the road in relation to that. A patent nut-lock was recommended to the Government, and referred by the Department to the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, and, after careful examination and report by these officers, and evidence from Mr. Light, Chief Engineer of Quebec Provincial Railways, who had applied the patent, the Government concluded the adoption of this patent would save a large amount of money in the maintenance of the road. A contract was entered into to expend \$55 per mile, on the application of this patent, to 651 miles of railway, the total cost amounting to \$35,805. Mr. Senecal was the contractor. He claimed to be in possession of the patent, and no money would be

paid him unless he was in a position to fulfil the contract.

MR. MACKENZIE: How many nut-locks to the mile, and the cost of each nut-lock?

MR. TUPPER said that, before the item came up for concurrence, he would bring down the reports of the engineers upon which the contract was made.

MR. MACKENZIE: Was this submitted to the Mechanical Engineer?

MR. TUPPER said it was submitted to the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, and it was supported by the authority of Mr. Light, who, after applying it to several miles of the Quebec Government Railway, and thoroughly tested it, said that it fulfilled all that was claimed for it.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was always the practice, in his time, to send every mechanical appliance to the shops at Moncton, to be tested by Mr. Whitney himself. Whilst a civil engineer might be an exalted civil engineer, he generally knew very little about applied mechanics. He recollected that something of this kind—though he could not say positively that it was the same thing—was submitted to him (Mr. Mackenzie), and it had been rejected as worthless. He believed he was correct in saying there was a general impression that the lock was not worth more than one-quarter, one-fifth, or even one-tenth part of what was paid for it. He had no objection to deferring further remarks until full information was obtained, on the understanding that there must be the same latitude for discussion on concurrence as was allowed now. He objected to this being placed to capital account. It was clearly the same as a renewal of stock, and should be so considered.

MR. TUPPER said the opinion which he entertained, and it was fortified by the judgment of the Chief Engineer of the road, was that it was a repair in no sense of the word, and that he was fairly justified in charging it to the capital account of the road. The calculations entered into by the engineers to whom he had referred, were not based upon the

MR. TUPPER.

value placed upon the patent by the inventor, who asked a very much higher sum than was allowed; but the amount which the Government engaged to pay was based upon the estimated value of the Chief Engineer, and upon his calculation it was found that the use of this lock would save a very large sum of money annually. He might say, in relation to not having submitted it to the Intercolonial Engineer, he thought better evidence was furnished than could be furnished by any engineer, in the fact that this patent had been in use on the Quebec Government Railway, and that the Chief Engineer of that road, Mr. Light, after testing it for a considerable time, stated that it proved to be all that was claimed for it. Under these circumstances, he believed he was justified in having it applied to the road. He would bring down the papers, to which he had referred, and would be able to give the fullest information on concurrence, when there would be the same latitude for discussion as in Committee.

MR. ANGLIN suggested that the article itself might be brought down.

MR. TUPPER said he had a section of the rail, with the patent applied, which he would bring down, so that every hon. gentleman would have an opportunity of seeing for himself the exact character of the invention.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said he desired to know if the hon. gentleman had taken into consideration that there was a great necessity for a passenger station at St. John. The present station was entirely unfit for traffic or for the accommodation of the public.

MR. TUPPER said he was surprised to hear that observation from the hon. gentleman, after occupying the position he did for the last five years. Knowing how zealously the hon. gentleman had, while in office, guarded the interest of St. John, and how thoroughly alive he was to everything connected with the welfare of that city, he hardly expected that there was anything in relation to that city that would have been left unattended to by the hon. gentleman. But that would come under the question of management, because it was charged

to revenue, and the matter could be discussed when that was reached.

Vote agreed to.

Pacific.

79 Canada Central Extension
(subsidised)..... \$1,000,000 00

MR. TUPPER said it had been usual to take the discussion upon the very important question of the Canadian Pacific Railway when passing these items in the resolutions. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) knew, he (Mr. Tupper) had always endeavoured to defer raising any discussion until that period, so as to save time by limiting the discussion to one question, which was found to be very much more convenient to the House. He proposed to have these items passed without taking up the general subject, because he intended, in a few days, to submit to the House the whole question of the policy of the Government in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway, by resolution, when the whole matter could be fully discussed. If that proposition met with concurrence, the House could pass these items now without discussion.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had no objection at all to do that, although the hon. gentleman had objected to him (Mr. Mackenzie) doing that on more than one occasion. It was a matter of indifference to him when the discussion came up, provided it was not in the last two or three days of the Session. He would like the hon. gentleman to explain what he meant by submitting the policy by resolution. Was it intended to have a new Bill?

MR. TUPPER said he did not know that a new Bill would be required, but he required to take authority from the House in regard to two or three sections in connection with the Pacific Railway, in the form which had been taken by the leader of the Opposition.

MR. MACKENZIE: Regarding contracts?

MR. TUPPER said yes. There was no intention to submit to the House any material modification of the Railway Act as introduced by the hon. the leader of the Opposition.

MR. ANGLIN said the hon. the Minister of Public Works appeared to have forgotten that to-morrow would be the 1st May, on which day one of the Provinces of the Dominion contemplated secession in case the expectations which it regarded as just were not fulfilled. He thought it was understood that a statement would be made to-day, that would probably allay the apprehensions of that Province, and induce them to wait a little longer. To-morrow that Province determined to leave the Dominion, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had not said a word.

MR. TUPPER said he was quite sure the hon. member for Gloucester would agree with him that the Government could not give a much better earnest of their determination to vigorously press the prosecution of the Pacific Railway, then by voting nearly six millions of dollars for that purpose, and, when they did take up the discussion, their friends in British Columbia would find that they had no just reason to complain of the desire of the House, on all sides, to do full justice to that Province.

MR. MACKENZIE said, as to that Province, it never had any reason to complain, and yet it went on complaining all the same. He grieved most that the hon. gentleman would to-morrow lose his colleague, the right hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald). He observed that hon. gentleman was absent to-day, and presumed he was packing up preparatory to removing to-morrow. He (Mr. Mackenzie) sent his sympathy across to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) and his colleagues now in distress, and could only hope the Dominion would survive the shock to be received to-morrow upon that extraordinary movement. He proposed, if the hon. gentleman's colleague should again have the pleasure of gracing the House with his presence, to give some reasons why he thought some other steps should be taken than what were proposed.

MR. DECOSMOS said he was surprised at the leader of the Opposition daring to rise in his seat and say the people of British Columbia had no just reasons for the rejection of the policy of

the Canadian Government, when led by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie). He was utterly astonished that a gentleman, occupying the political position he did, who had sent ambassadors to British Columbia to offer to build the railway from Victoria to Nanaimo, and to expend at least \$1,500,000 per annum in the building of a line on the mainland, should dare to tell this House that the people of British Columbia had no just ground of complaint, when those promises were not fulfilled. How could the hon. gentleman justify his want of honour in that respect, and make the assertion he had just made? To use the hon. gentleman's own words, he was amazed at the audacity of the hon. gentleman.

MR. MACKENZIE said, if the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) thought, by using this offensive language, to frighten him (Mr. Mackenzie) or the House, he was greatly mistaken.

MR. TUPPER said the House was taken a little aside from the question before the House. He did not take the remarks of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in so serious a manner as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos). He might say there was no desire on the part of the House to excite any uneasiness in the ranks of the hon. gentlemen from the Province of British Columbia, and there would be found no ground for uneasiness to anybody, as his hon. friend behind him (Mr. DeCosmos) would find when the resolutions were brought down.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman behind the hon. the Minister of Public Works would allow hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches to do anything they pleased, and express perfect satisfaction with the result.

MR. TUPPER said he had forgotten, in consequence of the hon. member for Victoria forestalling him, to refer to the jocular remarks of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in reference to his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald). He regretted very much that, owing to temporary indisposition, the right hon. gentleman was not in his seat. But the Government had this to console themselves with, that if any untoward event,

MR. DECOSMOS.

at any time, deprived that gentleman of his seat as representative of Victoria, there would be found any number of constituencies in the Dominion delighted to place their representation at his service.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is consoling.

MR. BUNSTER: Mr. Chairman—

Some HON. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

MR. BUNSTER said he congratulated the hon. members of this House, and this country, for giving him such a hearty cheer on rising. The hon. the leader of the Opposition had treated with jocularly the complaint of the Province of British Columbia, and had characterised the remarks of the hon. the member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos), in regard to his (Mr. Mackenzie's) jocularly, as offensive. The remarks of his hon. friend were not offensive, and they had been well called for. The Province of British Columbia had been treated most unfairly by the Government of Canada, especially by the Government led by the present leader of the Opposition during the past four or five years. Every contract made with that Province by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), and his colleagues, had been violated, and, when hon. gentlemen who were sent to this House as the agents of that Province, to watch over her interests, complained of the treatment which their part of the Dominion had received, they must be jeered at, and their remarks called offensive. Was that just? Would any hon. gentleman in the House, within whom there was a spark of statesmanship, say that the Pacific Province had been fairly treated by the late Government? It was well-known that Canada was the first British colony that had failed to fulfil promises such as those made to that Province. It was a matter for consideration that, to-morrow, the first of May, was the day in which that Province threatened to secede should the contract made with British Columbia not be carried out, and he would ask hon. gentlemen if it would not be a serious blow to the prosperity of this Dominion if that threat were to be carried out, as it most certainly would, sooner or later,

if the just expectations of that Province were not realised.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Oh.

MR. BUNSTER said hon. gentlemen might cry "Oh," but, nevertheless, they owed British Columbia a debt that they now claimed to have partially paid, if not paid in full. Although some might say they came here exacting their pound of flesh, they never had done so; they came patiently, believing that the present Government would have brought down their policy more promptly than they had done.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BUNSTER: Hon. gentlemen might cry "hear, hear," as much as they pleased, but the people and press had done British Columbia an injustice, such as the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway could not remove, by the language that had been used towards British Columbia. Was it just, was it reasonable, to abuse the only Province that gave this country an outlet to the Pacific, and when this item of the estimate came up, to make objection to the paltry sum of \$1,000,000? By not bringing down their policy before this late hour, the Government was imitating their predecessors. They had delayed it until the eleventh hour when the representatives of that Province were preparing to go home, as was jocularly remarked by the leader of the Opposition, who stated that the hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald) was packing up because he was absent from his seat. This Pacific Railway matter had brought more ridicule on this Dominion than it had on British Columbia. He could say, without contradiction, that British Columbia would have been better off to-day if she had never entered the Confederation. Before that time she had her Agent-general in London inducing emigrants to come to her shores, but when she joined the Confederation she withdrew him, thinking that the building of the Pacific Railway would attract all the emigrants she required. Had they done it? No, they had not; they had been foolishly spending their money in works that were not required in the interests of this Dominion, in order to stave off the question until

after another election. This election had taken place, and, by it, the people had declared in favour of British Columbia, in favour of the present Government which had declared itself willing to build the Canadian Pacific Railway; but he was sorry to say that, though the present Government had such a power at their back, they had not come forward vigorously with their policy. They had got their warrant from the people to build that railroad, no matter at what expense, because the people of this country knew that Canada had entered into a contract for the building of this road. The people of British Columbia had fulfilled their part of the contract by taxing themselves over \$100,000 extra in accepting the National Policy, in order to assist in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and there could be no excuse for the Government in not building that railway. Now, British Columbia had got something to say about the building of that railway, since the right hon. the Premier represented one of their constituencies. For five years he (Mr. Bunster) had sat in this House, and he had never been able to see anything in the way of bribery or corruption committed by the leader of the Government, and he believed that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) would yet consummate the great achievement of his laborious and eventful life—the construction of the great highway across the continent on British soil. Some hon. gentlemen present treated this great national enterprise in a jocular way. Why? Because they had not got brains or ability enough to treat it in any other way; if they had, that railway would be an accomplished fact to-day. The building of the Union Pacific by our American neighbours showed the feasibility of our own road. Had Sir Hugh Allan's scheme, about which so much hue and cry was raised, gone on, the people of Canada would to-day have been glad to give him double the amount the leader of the Government was going to give him. Instead of giving him \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land, they would have been glad to give him \$60,000,000 and 100,000,000 acres of land. But the more this scheme was decried in the British market, and the more its difficulties were magnified, the more the people of British Columbia

would have to suffer. But the people of that Province would suffer this no longer, probably, than to-morrow, because to-morrow the contract was up; and, if the people said to-morrow that they had no longer any confidence in the promises of the Canadian Government, and should request their representatives to return home, they would obey that summons and leave this House, regretfully, but firmly determined to stand by their own territory and people. They would go home, bidding adieu to deception and broken pledges, and he would say more—to false pledges. He was in sober earnest, and meant business, and he would say again, if the people of his Province asked him to go, he was ready to go at once, and so cut short all connection with this great Dominion of ours.

An Hon. Member: Go.

Mr. BUNSTER said he had said he would go if his people told him to, and probably that was more than the hon. member would do under similar circumstances. His Province had been mocked and insulted, both by members of this House and by a portion of the press—he did not say the respectable portion of the press, because there were some newspapers too respectable to abuse his Province. He still hoped that the people of British Columbia would, for the present, at all events, wait for the development of the Government's policy, in order that it should not be said hereafter, that the Province was anxious for separation. Let the responsibility for that step, if it should come, rest upon the shoulders of a people and a Government who had deceived and betrayed a loyal, generous-hearted, and confiding people.

Vote agreed to.

80 Georgian Bay Branch (as under contract).....\$800,000 00

Mr. DAWSON said he had a great deal to say about this Georgian Bay Branch. He did not intend entering into the controversy of the general question, but he would offer a few suggestions in regard to it, which might, possibly, be of some value.

Mr. BUNSTER.

Mr. TUPPER said he supposed his hon. friend was not in the House when he (Mr. Tupper) stated to the Committee that, for the purpose of saving time, he proposed to ask them to pass these items through Committee, and, before concurrence, he expected to submit the whole policy of the Government in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway, when discussion would be in order. He hoped, therefore, his hon. friend would fall in with the suggestion, as he would have an opportunity, within a very few days, of discussing the whole question.

Mr. DAWSON said he had no intention of entering into a long discussion, but, under the assurance just given him by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, he would withhold his remarks for the present.

Vote agreed to.

81 Fort William to English River.....	\$ 110,000 00
82 English River to Eagle River	800,000 00
83 English River to Keewatin, (Rat Portage).....	1,100,000 00
84 Keewatin (Rat Portage) to Selkirk (Red River).....	1,000,000 00
85 Engine House at Selkirk.....	30,000 00
86 Pembina Branch.....	150,000 00
87 Station House and Water Supply.....	80,000 00
88 British Columbia.....	600,000 00

Mr. BUNSTER asked if it was the intention of the Government to have this money really expended, or was it merely put in the Estimates as it had been for the last four or five years, and brought up again each year.

Mr. TUPPER said that it was the intention of the Government to expend the money for the purpose for which it was voted, and the expenditure would commence as early as possible.

Mr. BUNSTER said he was glad of that assurance, but was really sorry that they had not put the amount of the Carnarvon award of \$2,000,000 in the Estimates, instead of \$600,000.

Vote agreed to.

89 Telegraph Lines and Roadway.....	\$140,000 00
90 Surveys.....	100,000 00

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

MR. TUPPER said the Government considered it of the greatest possible importance to obtain further and more exhaustive information with regard to the character of the country, and the lands upon which they hoped very largely to establish a basis for the construction of the road.

Vote agreed to.

Canals.

91 Lachine \$1,500,000 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Does that close the expenditure, or nearly so?

MR. TUPPER said it nearly closed the expenditure for the present. It was not expected it would be necessary to draw off the water another year, the work being so nearly completed.

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

MR. TUPPER said this outlay was not expected to deepen the canal to the extent ultimately contemplated, which would involve additional expenditure not necessary at present. This item was expected to complete the works in progress, with the exception of from \$29,000 to \$30,000.

Vote agreed to.

92 Cornwall \$140,000 00

MR. TUPPER said that the money was required to complete the existing contracts.

Vote agreed to.

93. St. Lawrence.....\$ 80,000 00

94. Welland..... 2,000,000 00

Mr. McCUAIG said that there was a difference of opinion at present as to the superior mode of carrying produce, many favouring railroads as against canals. If grain could be carried cheaper by rail, the policy of expending such large sums on the canals was very doubtful. The Government, he thought, should fully and carefully consider whether, with all these improvements, under the present trade policy of Great Britain, we should secure benefits corresponding to the enormous canal expenditure, and whether we could carry

grain from Chicago and other western ports to tide-water at cheaper rates by water than by rail, and successfully compete with the great rival route to Europe via New York, particularly in the fall of the year, when the movement of grain from the west for the European markets was the largest in volume, and insurance largely increased. He contended that the Welland Canal had not been taxed to its full capacity, even before the enlargement, for which the present appropriation of two millions of dollars was wanted for its completion. In the United States freights from the west to New York had been lower by rail than by water, and the most distinguished American statesmen, in connection with the leading commercial men of that country, had now under consideration the advisability of converting the Erie Canal into a freight railway, or the construction of a railway for the sole purpose of carrying freight, at slow speed, along its banks. He deprecated the expenditure, at the present moment, with a depleted Treasury, of any additional undertakings, with the view of deepening the channel of the River St. Lawrence to fourteen feet, which, he contended, could not be accomplished. For all practical purposes, in the present state of the transport trade of this country via the River St. Lawrence and Montreal route to the ocean, he thought the capacity of the whole line of the St. Lawrence Canals was sufficient to meet the growing wants of the trade for some years to come. Time and experience had demonstrated that our expectations in connection with the enlargement of our canals, in the hope of securing the trade from the great West, had not been realised, and if Great Britain continued her present policy towards her colonial possessions on this continent, it was doubtful if we would succeed in the expensive race of competition with our neighbours on the south of us, for the coveted profitable transport trade with Europe, for which our canal system was first undertaken. He would ask whether the Government tug line, established many years ago, between Kingston and Montreal, in connection with our canal system, and which had realised the expectations of its advocates, was to be continued? He con-

tended the policy of our Government, in the establishment of this tug line, was wise and patriotic. It gave security to shippers of grain from the West to the European markets, of prompt transport and despatch, which could not be so successfully obtained in any other manner. His lengthy experience in the transport trade of the country, extending over a period of thirty years, enabled him to speak authoritatively on this subject. The contractors with the Government, for the proper discharge of this service, Messrs. Calvin & Buck, eminent business men, and of large and extensive practical experience, and of established responsibility to meet their engagements, gave the desired confidence to Western shippers that the conditions of the contract for the tug service would be faithfully and efficiently performed, and that vessels reaching Kingston with cargoes could proceed by the aid of the tug line, at a low rate for tonnage, which was fixed by the Government, in their contract with Messrs. Calvin & Buck, by the payment of a reasonable subsidy, in 48 hours to Montreal, instead of running the risk of delay at Kingston for want of barge capacity in which to tranship at that port. The struggle with our American neighbours for supremacy in securing, for our own St. Lawrence route, the transport trade of the West to the ocean, would require all our energies, and would call into requisition all our resources and enterprise. The Government, which commanded every confidence and respect, would be found equal, he had no doubt, to the emergency, and a policy would, he hoped, be carefully considered by its members, and adopted with promptitude and energy, in connection with the Mother Country, which would secure to us the splendid prize now within our grasp.

Mr. TUPPER said that the questions raised by the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) were of great importance. He (Mr. Tupper) was much inclined to the opinion that the ideas he had thrown out, as to recent experience having shown that railway communication for large amounts of freights was rather gaining on the canals, was correct. The advantages in favour of water seemed to have diminished. But the

Mr. McCUAIG.

question of public policy was hardly before them now. The whole of the item before them was for the completion of existing contracts. In reply to the hon. member for Lambton, he might state that this item was expected to complete all the works on the Welland Canal but what would be represented by \$700,000.

In reply to Mr. Ross (Dundas),

Mr. TUPPER said he did not think it was intended to make any alteration with regard to the tug line between Kingston and Montreal this year; nor to expend anything on the Williamsburgh Canal this year.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said that the member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) had brought under the notice of the House a very important question, with regard to the expenditure on those great public works, the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals. Though this proposed expenditure was in accordance with a policy sanctioned by Parliament, and in order to complete public works in progress, it was just as well, when they were voting those millions for this purpose, that they should consider whether the Government might not very properly take means to prosecute a scientific and practical enquiry in regard to the expediency of proceeding any further than they were obliged, under existing contracts, in the completion of the great through line of water communication. Could the Minister of Public Works give the Committee an estimate of the millions that would be required to complete the improvement of the navigation to Montreal, and secure a depth of 14 feet? He (Mr. Macdougall) thought it would require a great many, as there were considerable stretches in the St. Lawrence that would require to be in some way deepened, or otherwise vessels would have to break bulk or lighten, thus failing to carry to Montreal those freights which were the object of this expenditure. If they had to break bulk, the steel rails would beat them in the competition. He would repeat what he had said many times—that he thought it was a great misfortune, and a great blunder, on the part of Parliament, to have appropriated enormous sums for the vain purpose of obtaining cheaper means

of transport, by way of the St. Lawrence, in competition with their railway system, especially since the introduction of steel rails. He quite admitted, that when they had carried the produce of the North-West to Thunder Bay, they would find it expedient to put it on vessels for transportation a considerable distance by water; and, no doubt, it would be expedient to provide for vessels of a large class, in order to carry it cheaply. It would be convenient, for our own purpose, to be able to send the produce of the great North-West on its way to the markets of the world as far as possible by water. He was afraid it would be a good many years before they would realise their expectations of railway communication between the railway system of Ontario and the railway system of the North-West; therefore, for a long time, they would have to depend upon the water communication, and he confessed, if they were not mistaken in regard to the productions of that country, that the expenditure on the Welland Canal would not be altogether lost. At the same time, while they could not alter the past and recall the millions they had sunk in the bottom of the Welland Canal, they might ascertain the expediency of attempting to secure a 14ft. water communication between Lake Ontario and Montreal. A great many millions would be required to effect it, and he did not, for one, consider that he was justified in voting to involve the country in the enormous expenditure required to realise the whole of this scheme. What had they accomplished by the deepening of the Welland Canal? They had provided a better highway to the ocean for the producers of the United States. They had provided a means, by which the farmers of the Western States could send their productions at a cheaper cost to the market of the world, and undersell the Canadians. The Welland Canal was quite deep enough, before its enlargement, to convey all the Canadian produce seeking that outlet to Europe. While admitting, therefore, that they might derive some advantage from this expenditure, by carrying our own produce from Manitoba and from the great Provinces that would grow up beyond it, he trusted the Government would take steps to examine

the whole question in the light of past experience, and in view of the improvements which were likely to be made in transportation by land, and that they would stay their hand, as much as possible, in the meantime. They required the money they were raising for the development of our great empire in the West, and for the realisation of the expectations of British Columbia. The people of that Province might be a little impatient, but when they looked at the deficits in the revenue, and how much more the little that had been accomplished had cost than was expected, he thought their friends on the Pacific would acknowledge that they were asking Canada to assume burdens that the people could not bear, and that necessity would compel the Government to go a little slower than their friends had expected them to go in that direction. He was quite willing that they should stay their hands with respect to those large expenditures on canals, in order that they might be better able to open up communication with the North-West, and thereby reach British Columbia, and realise, at an earlier period, the expectations of their friends in that part of the Dominion.

MR. McCALLUM said he was surprised at the remarks of the last speaker, because it was well known that he took a very active part, and he deserved great credit for it, in the union of the Provinces of the Dominion. One of the terms of Confederation was that the canals of the country should be enlarged, and it was too late for the hon. gentleman now to say that he had always been opposed to that policy. He (Mr. McCallum) had had some experience in regard to this question, and he believed the expenditure on canals would be a great benefit to the country. The only public work they had to-day in the country that paid any money to the country, over and above repairs and expenses, was the Welland Canal. One reason why the trade had gone to the Erie Canal was that larger vessels were used in the Western trade than could be accommodated by the Welland Canal. If they deepened the Welland Canal to the extent of 14 feet, and, according to the Minister of Public

Works, only \$700,000 additional would be required to accomplish that, it would prove an incentive to the building of large vessels, to engage in the trade during the summer months. If they had 14 feet in the Welland Canal a large proportion of the trade that now went by the Erie Canal would be diverted to the St. Lawrence. The deepening of the Welland Canal, he was satisfied, would turn out to be a successful financial undertaking, and it would be a great benefit to the country, irrespective of that, because if they were going to carry the trade from the great North-West they must have large vessels. In this respect the Americans had the advantage of us. The Americans, as he predicted they would last year, had lowered the tolls, and that had taken trade from the Welland Canal. He would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when this work would be completed?

MR. TUPPER said it was expected to open the Welland Canal in 1881 for general use. He agreed with his hon. friend (Mr. McCallum) in regard to the responsibility of the hon. member for Halton in reference to the canal policy. He (Mr. Tupper) thought it was quite possible that, if Parliament were now considering the subject for the first time, they might be disposed to view it from a somewhat different standpoint from that which they did a few years ago. But, if he understood aright, the country was committed to this question, which was the policy of the Government when the hon. member for Halton was Minister of Public Works. If that were so, he thought his hon. friend would scarcely be in a position to shift all responsibility from off his own shoulders in regard to that important question of public policy. He might say, in regard to the question asked by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that the completion of the aqueduct was not expected to be effected by 1880.

MR. MACKENZIE: Is it not intended to use the canal until the maximum depth of 14ft. is obtained?

MR. TUPPER said he thought not.

MR. PLUMB said he had always been deeply interested in this work,

MR. McCALLUM.

and he was somewhat surprised at the general attack made by the hon. member for Halton, on the canal policy of the Government. He had been very much disappointed in the progress of the work of enlarging the Welland Canal, without which we could not compete with the Erie Canal for the western trade, which could be carried to Buffalo in a larger class of vessels than could now pass through the Welland Canal. In the State of New York great efforts were made to prevent the western trade from being diverted from the Erie Canal. Although his hon. friend might state that the railways had taken the place of canals for the traffic which must be carried eastward to the sea board, it would be found that the tonnage of the Erie Canal was much larger than that of all the railways in the State of New York competing with it during the season in which the canal was opened. He had before him an able and exhaustive argument which was addressed to the representatives of the State of New York in the Legislature, in respect to lowering the tolls on the Erie Canal, and if it were necessary to keep the trade, the whole toll would be taken off. It was now so far reduced that the amount the canal paid to the revenues of the State was merely nominal. The State debt, which had been incurred for the building of the canal, had been nearly, if not altogether, paid off. The following was the argument to which he had referred. It was on the speech of an influential member of the New York State Senate, delivered before that body in the Session of 1878:

"The question for the Senate is not one of the amount of canal revenues—it is the question whether the Erie Canal shall earn any revenue at all, and whether the five or six thousand canal boats, and the thirty thousand or more canal boatmen, and the sixty thousand or more people dependent upon them, shall be thrown out of employment, and \$1,500,000 of capital invested in canal boats remain not only unproductive, but depreciating in value. I do not assert that the proposed reduction will increase the tonnage on the Erie canal; but it will give the partners of the State in its transportation business an opportunity to struggle through an unpropitious year, and possibly to earn an honest livelihood, and aid in retaining a portion of the income, which, without it, would be lost to the State.

"The pending question is one entirely outside of, and above, political considerations.

It is purely a business question which involves not only the future of the canals, but the future of our internal and foreign commerce. New York city is falling behind in her percentage of the increase of business, growing out of the rapid development and increased product of the agricultural regions of the West. New York cannot afford to retrograde—she cannot afford to stand still. She must keep step to the music of the age, and advance to the front in her commercial policy. The producers of the great growing West demand, and are seeking, cheaper transportation, and New York must furnish it, or strip her motto from her coat of arms! And more than this, lose the millions upon millions that she has expended in constructing this great artificial waterway,—upon which should float the commerce of a continent—and which is to be driven from it, if lost, by individual enterprise and foreign competition, aided by a short-sighted policy adopted under circumstances which have no application to the present, and which, if persisted in, will drive the commerce from our State.”

That canal was the chief competitor the Welland Canal had to fear. And he was very sorry that the policy of the late Government had so long retarded enlargement. One of the principal sections of the canal was nearly completed, but the water had not been let into it. Another very important section, which cost several million dollars, had been completed for some time. He knew, from what had been stated in this House and elsewhere, that the central part of the work, which was essential to the utilisation of the whole, had only very lately been put under contract, and it would be at least three years before that part of the canal could be utilised for vessels of the size which could navigate the east end of it now. That part of the canal which lay the nearest to his place of residence, was being materially injured by not having the water let into it. The frost and the floods, cutting out the banks and undermining the masonry, were greatly damaging the work. That might not be the fault of the late Minister of Public Works, but every year during the last five years, when the Welland Canal question came up, the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) had stated the necessities of the case in the language of a practical man, of a man who understood the subject, and who had as deep an interest in it as any man in the country. He remembered perfectly well that another gentleman who ought to have an equally

large interest, used to express himself as perfectly satisfied with the arrangement of the canal. The late First Minister stated last year that the work would be completed in about a year and a half. Now, the hon. the Minister of Public Works had stated it would be two years, at least, before that work would be completed in such a way as to afford transit to vessels of the twelve feet draft of water. He trusted that, under the efficient management of his hon. friend, the work would be pushed forward as speedily as possible.

MR. TUPPER said that, in referring to the additional amount of six millions that would be required to give the depth of 14ft., he referred to the canals for which they were taking estimates to-night. They would have to add, in addition to that, about \$3,000,000 for the Williamsburgh Canal, in order to give the 14ft. of water navigation from Kingston to Montreal, and an equal amount for the Beauharnois canal, making \$12,000,000 in all.

MR. MACKENZIE said, to his recollection, the deepening to 12ft. would require 1½ million; it would require a much larger amount to deepen it to 14ft. He had long ceased to expect any fair play or candour from the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). He had never said the canal would be finished in 1½ years. He said all but the aqueduct could be finished in that time, and he believed so still. He did not even intend to deepen the canal to 14ft., but intended opening it with 12ft. before the other aqueduct was built. That was the statement, but it was impossible for that hon. gentleman to say one word without falsifying some person's testimony. No one said one word to bring up this offensive speech to-night, but it seemed a monomania with the hon. gentleman to attack every person opposed to him, whether there was cause for it or not.

MR. MCCALLUM said, if the hon. gentleman would consult the *Hansard*, he would see that, in reply to the question of the hon. member for Frontenac, he said that the canal would be finished in a certain time. He (Mr. McCallum) had then got up and said that the First Minister should be very cautious in an-

nouncing the time a certain public work would be finished; that in this the shipping interest was watching the work closely, and shipbuilders would change the whole character of their ships, depending on the word of the Minister that the work would be completed at a certain time. He was not finding fault with the hon. gentleman. It was a matter of impossibility to tell when the canal would be finished, but referred to the matter merely to prove that the hon. member for Niagara was right in his statement.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the contract for the aqueduct was newly let, and these contractors had until 1881 to finish the aqueduct. He could not possibly have meant that the aqueduct and everything would be finished, but that in one and a-half years the canal could be used for the passage of vessels by means of the old aqueduct. That was the scheme of the late Government, and to which he must have referred in the answer he gave.

MR. McCALLUM: At the time the hon. gentleman announced the Welland canal would be ready for twelve feet of water, I said he was only thinking of that portion from Marlatt's Pond to Dalhousie.

MR. PLUMB said, with reference to the remarks of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, he was accustomed to see that hon. gentleman lose his temper and was not in the slightest affected by it. He paid no regard to what the hon. gentleman said, because the hon. gentleman was in the habit of making statements on the floor of the House which, on being called to account for them, he denied having made. He (Mr. Plumb) had always addressed this House in a courteous and parliamentary manner, and could afford to pass without further comment the remarks which the spleen of the hon. the leader of the Opposition had induced him to make.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) said he felt called upon to place before the House what he believed was the common-sense way of proceeding with these improvements. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had stated that the estimated cost of enlarging the Williamsburg, Corn-

wall and Beauharnois Canals was \$6,000,000. His hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) was greatly mistaken if he expected that \$6,000,000, or \$10,000,000, or \$15,000,000 would give him fourteen and one-half feet of water from Kingston to Montreal.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman was mistaken. He (Mr. Tupper) had stated it would take \$6,000,000 to complete the works for fourteen feet draft of water in the Lachine and Cornwall Canals and Gallops Rapids. He had also stated that it would take \$3,000,000 additional for the Williamsburg Canals.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) said that they had heard in the House, some time ago, a gentleman who stood as high, professionally, as any gentleman in this country, and it was his opinion, expressed in this House, that a fourteen foot channel from Kingston to Lachine was impracticable in this way. He had some experience of the St. Lawrence, as he had lived on its beautiful banks all his life. He knew the depth and the various peculiarities of the water, and had a knowledge of the public works there. At the point where he lived, the depth of water changed frequently during the fall as much as six feet in twenty-four hours. He agreed with his friend, Mr. Shanley, the gentleman to whom he had first referred, that a ten foot channel could be obtained in the St. Lawrence at all seasons of the year during navigation, and that he thought was quite sufficient for any purpose for which that river was applicable. He knew also the opinion of those who navigated that river, and an opinion which he had often placed before the House, that a fourteen foot channel was impracticable, taking into account the matter of expense alone, because if vessels drawing fourteen feet of water were to be enabled to run up and down safely, the canals would all have to be made of equal depth, and to do that it would not cost one cent less than \$20,000,000. If they looked at the Gallops Rapids, they found that there was a rocky bottom, but at what depth could not be stated, because no person had been down to examine, but there was a rock projection, which, at

MR. McCALLUM.

ordinary times, prevented vessels, drawing even eight feet of water, passing safely, and the expense to remove it would be very great. It was not contemplated that vessels going eastward should enter into the Williamsburg Canal. The policy was, that these vessels should pass down the river. In the channel at the head of the Cornwall Canal, it was found quite impossible to give a sufficient channel for vessels of fourteen feet draft, and, besides that, it was stated that west of Kingston there was no safe harbour for vessels of that description. The opinion he had received from persons of experience in this matter was, that vessels of that size were not requisite. He hoped the gentlemen would consider well their policy in this enlargement scheme. It would be a useless waste of public money to spend so many millions as would be required to make a 14ft. channel east of Kingston. Besides enlarging the canals, the rivers in certain portions between the canals would have to be deepened or enlarged, and what with the cost of that work and the improvements that would be required at the various ports, the whole would cost a sum of money that certainly this country was not prepared to expend for such a purpose. He did not believe the wants of the country demanded a canal of that capacity. A vessel of 10ft. draft of water would carry 40,000 bushels of grain from Chicago—a sufficient quantity for any vessel to carry with safety. A 10ft. canal system would cost only half the expense, because if they went 4ft. below 10, the value would be increased at an enormous rate, besides the cost of clearing away the obstructions that would present themselves under a depth of 10ft. Nineteen out of twenty, having any knowledge at all of the subject, would tell the House that the business of the country could just as efficiently and profitably be performed by a 10ft. canal system as by the larger system proposed. If the Government could save to the country the large amount of money they proposed to expend in this direction by changing their policy in this matter, it would be but right to alter it, whatever they might have committed themselves to. It must be borne in mind that there were great facilities for the carriage of

grain by railway. He thought the age demanded that they should review their policy with regard to the canal improvements on the St. Lawrence River. A considerable length of canal was in his county, and it was consequently in his interest to have this money expended there, but public interest forbade such a course, as he was confident that all the wants of the country in respect to the transport of grain by our water system could be amply satisfied at half the expense which the fourteen foot scheme would necessitate to the country's loss.

MR. TUPPER said the question raised by the hon. gentleman was a very important one, and on which there was a great difference of opinion among gentlemen well qualified to form a judgment upon such a subject. But he might state, for the information of the hon. gentlemen, that there was nothing asked for in this estimate that was not required to complete contracts now being carried out, with the exception of \$80,000, which was asked for the purpose of testing a system by which it was hoped to deal with the Gallops Rapids in a manner to accomplish a much larger amount of work, by the chaining system, than could be done under the usual mode. They thought it was desirable, as a considerable expense had already been incurred in dealing with this question, to ask for this vote, in order that the system might be fairly tested. If it was successful, the cost of dealing with rock, under water, would be largely cheapened. Before there was any other expenditure of money, the Government would have an opportunity of weighing, maturely, the observations of his hon. friend (Mr. Ross), and considering the question in its various details.

MR. MACKENZIE said he observed, from the calculations made by Mr. Page two years ago, for the Welland Canal, that \$9,240,000 would complete a twelve foot water navigation, and to get fourteen feet of water, it would require \$12,240,000. By a return brought down to the House, early in the Session, he found that there had been an expenditure, up to the 1st January, 1879, of \$8,907,754, and that there was required to complete, the sum of \$3,592,246, making in all \$12,500,000, or

\$260,000 more than Mr. Page estimated for the fourteen foot water channel. It was not the intention of the late Government to go beyond 12ft. So that there was about \$3,000,000 expended, or to be expended, on the Welland Canal more than the late Government intended to expend, except what would have to be expended on the permanent structures above the Thorold level. He admitted it was a question for argument whether it was desirable to have a 14ft. navigation or not. His opinion was it was desirable to get it; but he did not think they would be justified in carrying out such a scheme at a time when so much money was being expended elsewhere. Mr. Page's estimate for the Lachine Canal, two years ago, was \$5,920,347 for 12ft. navigation, but he understood the estimates now before the House were for a depth of 14ft. in the Lachine Canal.

MR. TUPPER: 18ft. below, and 12ft. above.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was very glad of that, because he quite agreed with the hon. member for Dundas, that whatever might be done with the Welland Canal, and however desirable it might be to get to Kingston with 14ft., any attempt to get 14ft. below that should be given up as impracticable. It would cost such an enormous amount of money that it was entirely out of the question. The estimate of Mr. Page, two years ago, was \$5,920,347 for 12ft. depth on the Lachine Canal. There was expended on the Lachine Canal, up to the first of last January, \$4,010,341; and it would require to complete it, according to the return brought down, \$1,904,659, being within \$5,000 of the amount estimated by Mr. Page three years ago. This was for 12ft. Then for the Cornwall Canal the estimate was \$2,160,000. When the late Government commenced the works on the Cornwall Canal it was done much for the same reason that the Lachine Canal was commenced three years ago—not so much because they believed it an absolute necessity at the moment, for making the large locks 12ft. deep, as for the purpose of furnishing employment to masses of our people, as far as possible, on works which were likely to be executed, at any rate, within a comparatively short time. As to the

MR. MACKENZIE.

works that were let out on the Cornwall Canal, they were for the more difficult portion of the work at the lower end. It would not take a large amount of time or money to finish the balance, if it should be found necessary, but it would not be found necessary for some time; he presumed, as the only advantage to be gained by enlarging that canal to the same size would be chiefly for the accommodation of steamers. Large barges could now be taken down the St. Lawrence by tugs and transport grain, not, certainly, quite as cheap as larger barges, in locks similar to the Lachine and Welland, but still at a comparatively small cost. Mr. Page's estimate for the Cornwall Canal was \$2,160,000 for 12ft., and that of the Williamsburg Canal at \$2,110,000. The deepening of the St. Lawrence in the two places he had mentioned, that is, through Lake St. Louis and above the Gallops Rapids, was estimated to cost \$1,520,000. He thought the estimate might be safely depended upon for Lake St. Louis, but it was premature or speculative, to some extent, at all events, in the other place. It was a rough estimate altogether in the upper reach above the Gallops Rapids; it might cost much more, or it might not. Mr. Page was usually very close in his estimates, and they might be taken as nearly correct where he had proper data. Then, supposing a canal to be requisite where the Beauharnois Canal was situated—and it was a question with engineers whether it was possible to navigate the Cascade Rapids by means of a stationary tug, such as that now experimented with at the Gallops Rapids—if that could be done it would save a large amount of expenditure. There was a very general belief with some engineers that the canal was made on the wrong side of the river at the Cascades, and he was not at all certain that the hon. member for Soulanges did not share that opinion. He believed himself that was the right place, but it would cost to make it there now, according to Mr. Page's estimate, \$3,360,000, to which he (Mr. Page) thought 10 per cent. might be safely added, making \$3,700,000, while the enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal to the same dimensions as the locks in the Cornwall Canal, and the same size as the locks in the Lachine

Canal—that is, 12ft.—would cost about \$2,000,000. The deepening of the channel, at the head of the canal, about \$450,000, making altogether a little less than \$2,500,000. Now, the conclusion at which he had arrived himself, while officiating as Minister, with all the responsibilities of these matters on his mind, was this: that it would be desirable to get 14ft. in the Welland canal as soon as possible, but he did not think that there was such an urgent demand for it as would justify the Government in asking for \$3,000,000 additional at the present time; and he had, therefore, adopted the plan of having all the works constructed to suit 14ft., but without raising the walls of the locks on the descent from the top of the hill above Thorold, without raising the locks to the height where they could get 14ft., as that could be done, and the locks enlarged a little without obstructing traffic, or seriously interfering with it, some years afterwards. He could see no immediate necessity for building the works between the Lachine Canal and Kingston. It would be advantageous to have got them larger, so as to make the transportation by the large barges cheaper than it could be transported in vessels carrying what could now be carried by the present locks; but, at the same time, he did not think the difference in transportation would be so serious as to justify us, in a time like the present, in the expenditure of \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000 on that part of the river. He believed that the grain, at any rate, would always have to be shifted at Kingston, and transhipped again into the vessels going to sea at Montreal. The idea had long since been given up by practical shipowners and mariners, of attempting to bring ocean vessels to the upper lakes, and taking in cargo at Chicago and other places, and going directly to Liverpool. It could be done, but it was not a profitable business, and we must, therefore, calculate on transferring grain at Kingston from vessels suited for lake navigation to barges suited for river and canal navigation, below that point. For these reasons, he had adopted the course he did. He ventured no strong opinion or criticism upon the decisions of the Government, in getting 14ft. at present on the whole line of the Welland Canal,

further than to say that, in his opinion, it was premature, though he had no doubt it would serve a good purpose. The principal object, perhaps, that would be served was this: it would enable parties who were building vessels suitable for the lake trade to build at once a class of vessels that lasted from ten to fifteen years, to build them at once with a draught of 14ft. of water, instead of building them with a draught of 12ft., which would subject them to a certain loss. He presumed there was no doubt but that vessels drawing 14ft. would carry a good many more thousand bushels of wheat, and with the same proportion of sailors, which was another benefit to be derived. It was a benefit, no doubt, but it was one that we were purchasing for them at the expense of three millions of money. He doubted the wisdom of that course at the present time, though it might be the best; he ventured, as he had said, no strong criticism upon it.

MR. TUPPER said he would like immediately to follow the remarks that had just been made, because there was a misapprehension involved in them. The leader of the Opposition was under the impression that his policy was to secure a draught of 12ft., and rest at that, for the Welland Canal. Now, he (Mr. Tupper) thought, if he remembered right, that there was a formal decision of this House that there should be 14ft. draught, and that his hon. predecessor proceeded on that principle. He believed he would be able to convince the hon. gentleman that he was labouring under a misapprehension in the impression he had just expressed, that there had been a change in his policy. There had been no change; the matter had never been brought under his (Mr. Tupper's) notice at all. The contracts had proceeded precisely as they were going on under the Administration of the hon. gentleman; and the expenditure, as he had correctly stated, to obtain the draught of 12ft., was only \$9,240,000. Now, the expenditure up to the end of the fiscal year in carrying on the contracts, as they were proceeding under the Administration of the hon. gentleman, would exceed \$9,000,000 considerably.

MR. MACKENZIE: To the end of this financial year, the expenditure, according to the return brought down, was \$8,907,754.

MR. TUPPER said the expenditure up to the 30th of June next would be \$9,079,186; and the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well, from the state the work was in, that it would be utterly impossible to complete the work now going on within the estimate, that is, Mr. Page's present estimate, which was \$9,240,000, which was required to give 12ft. of water. He was, therefore, satisfied the hon. gentleman would find that Mr. Page had been proceeding on the principle of obtaining a draught of 14ft. of water.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is quite possible; there may be some mistake.

MR. TUPPER said he was satisfied of that, because the hon. gentleman had correctly stated the amounts, and he would find also that it would be utterly impossible to complete the work for less than \$200,000 and open the canal. He merely drew attention to that, because he thought it was undesirable that there should be any erroneous impression as to where the policy resided. He was not complaining of it at all, but his impression was that there was an expression of the House, upon which the hon. gentleman acted, which was, that so far as the Welland Canal was concerned, 14ft. draught of water should be obtained. The hon. gentleman knew that the whole question was taken in consideration with the Sault Ste Marie Canal, and that it was intended that there should be there a draught of 14ft., and that it was considered desirable to have navigation for ships drawing 14ft. of water as far as Kingston.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman was correct in stating that opinion had been assented to in the House. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had stated before that he approved of that opinion, but he doubted merely as to whether it should have been done then. His impression was that he had only so far modified the plans as to make all the structures, which required to be sunk to the Lake Erie level, to the 14ft. depth. He presumed nothing had been done yet

MR. TUPPER.

towards raising the locks on the descent eastward. Some of them, as the hon. member for Niagara had pointed out, had been finished for a considerable time. One between St. Catharines and Thorold, built on the 12ft. principle, had been finished nearly two years. He could not recollect of having done anything to complete those portions of the work for 14ft.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he might, perhaps, be allowed to say something on this matter, as he remembered the discussions that took place in this House with reference to the depth of water in the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence Canals. He thought the hon. member for Lambton was correct in saying that he promised that the works in the Welland Canal should be so constructed as to obtain 14ft. of water when necessary, but for the present they had to be completed for a depth of 12ft., with the works for making it 14ft. when necessary, without disturbing navigation. That was the decision, but he did not know that the House had formerly pronounced in favor of 14ft. navigation. There was a motion brought forward about it, and a strong feeling expressed in favour of it. Various arguments were given, and the opinion of the House was that Lake Ontario should be for the present, at all events, the foot of lake navigation, and that vessels capable of navigating the upper lakes should be enabled to come down to Lake Ontario. The opinion was also general that at some not distant day it would be necessary to get 14ft. of water in the Welland Canal. The hon. gentleman declared that he was of the same opinion, and that he would make the necessary works in the locks so that the depth of water could be obtained without disturbing navigation. This was the 28th of March, 1877. With regard to the St. Lawrence canals, he entirely concurred with the hon. gentleman opposite, and he was fortified in his opinion by conversation he had had with men who were interested in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and they all agreed with him that the work of constructing or deepening the canals to the depth even of 12ft., would involve such an

enormous cost as practically to put it out of the question. The hon. gentleman said the estimate made was \$12,000,000. The hon. member for Dundas had said he believed it would involve a cost of some \$20,000,000. Why should these canals be enlarged? For the purpose of bringing the commerce of the West down these canals, so that it could pass out to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence. The hon. gentleman said it would cost \$12,000,000 to build these works. At 5 per cent. interest this would be an outlay to the country of \$600,000 a year. Now, last year about 12,000,000 bushels of grain passed down between Kingston and Montreal; at 5c. a bushel that would amount to \$600,000. But that would mean that the country should pay towards bringing that grain down to the sea, 5c. per bushel. But the actual cost was only 3c. per bushel, last summer, for all the grain transported between Kingston and Montreal, including the cost of elevating the grain at Kingston. He was sure this fact alone would induce the House and the Government to pause long before they incurred the great expense of going on with this work of enlarging the canals. There was no use in enlarging the Cornwall Canal, which was but one link in the system of St. Lawrence navigation, unless we determined on going on with all the rest of these works, and deepened the channel of the River between the canals. He hoped, therefore, that the House would, as the present state of the country required the employment of all their energies and resources to develop the North-West and carry on those important works, pause long before entering on that gigantic expenditure; and he trusted that this work might be placed in the category of those spoken of by the member of Lambton as practically impossible.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said that this discussion, although on a very practical and important subject, was largely of a speculative character. There was no item in the Estimates for any new works, but only for the completion of some long in progress. He agreed with some of the remarks of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), but dis-

agreed with others. He did not concur in his view, expressed in 1871, and since, that the enlargement of the Welland Canal and St. Lawrence Canals was expressly for the benefit of the Americans. Our object was, in reality, to gain the profit of handling and transporting their produce on its way to the ocean and Europe. Whoever was responsible for the deepening of the Welland Canal to 14ft., he thought were to be congratulated for having decided upon its being done at once. What they wanted in connection with the Welland Canal was, that vessels navigating Lake Erie, many of which drew 14ft., should have access to Lake Ontario. The moment they entered that lake, the contest lay between Oswego and Kingston, and Montreal; because it was a remarkable fact that, notwithstanding those magnificent works, and the number of propellers that came down the lakes, 90 per cent. of the grain that came from the west to Montreal to be shipped there for Europe, was brought in barges from Kingston. If that was the case, so far as the grain trade of the West was concerned, he thought they might assume the St. Lawrence canals were large enough for all practical purposes for many years, and might be left as they were. He was quite sure that there could be but one opinion, one of regret, that the late Minister of Public Works should have incurred an expenditure of \$2,000,000 for the enlargement of the Cornwall Canal, the largest, if he mistook not, on the St. Lawrence, at a time when there was no intention of going seriously to work to improve the entire navigation between Kingston and Montreal. It was quite true there was, at that time, an event in progress in the neighbourhood of Cornwall, or at any rate expected: that a very important member of the Government had been transferred to a position he had since adorned as Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, and that an election was imminent in the neighbourhood of those works. That the expenditure of those \$2,000,000 was now admitted to give work to the people of the vicinity, and not solely for the purpose of improving the canal, showed, at any rate, that the expenditure might have had some connection with that other event. But, whatever the

motive was, he thought that the discussion to-night must lead them to the belief that the expenditure at that time was most unwise. No doubt, however, there had been a very strong feeling in Ontario in favour of the enlargement of those canals; and at Confederation, a clause, with that object, was inserted in the Union Act, to offset the Intercolonial Railway, which was supposed to be exclusively for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces. It was then thought that vessels from Liverpool could be passed through the enlarged canals to the West, and, in addition, that a large intercolonial trade between eastern and western Provinces might be developed by them. But the moment the Intercolonial Railway was opened, it was worked as to tariff arrangements, so as to drive off the Gulf port steamers, whose business had been destroyed by that railway. They need not, under those circumstances, look forward to any great trade between the West and the Maritime Provinces by vessels in summer; there was no certainty of such a trade as would justify them in enlarging those canals. The hon. member for Halton referred to the competition of railways with water ways. They were building the Georgian Bay Railway, presumably to draw the trade of our own North-West to tidewater at Montreal and Quebec, and he sincerely hoped, with a view to this object, that everything would be sacrificed to easy gradients. The question of competition between rail and water depended very largely on the character of the railway. No doubt that the bringing of grain from Manitoba, by rail, to Thunder Bay, and there passing it through an elevator into vessels and subjecting it to a similar operation at French River and Montreal, would put it in such a condition as to realise, on the other side of the Atlantic, more than the cost of the handling. That fact led him to think that the scheme of the Georgian Bay Railway might be looked forward to as a very important factor in their struggle for the grain transport trade of the North-West. He sincerely congratulated the Government on its determination to deepen the Welland Canal to 14ft., as soon as possible. Unless they set to work with a view to availing themselves of every means of competing with the Erie Canal

MR. WHITE.

and the American Railways, he was afraid they would not realise those great advantages they had in view in their enormous expenditure of money in those improvements.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) had been pleased to insinuate that the enlargement of the Cornwall Canal was intended to assist a candidate of the party of the late Government in his election. When he told that hon. gentleman that that contract was not let, nor the estimate for the work voted, till nearly a year after that election took place, he might be satisfied that he was as unfounded in his insinuation, as he was ungenerous in his conception.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said he thought the hon. member for Lambton was mistaken. He had taken a tolerable active interest in that election, and knew that discussion included the contract that had actually been made.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not believe it was let in 1875, the year of the election.

MR. WHITE said he begged the hon. gentleman's pardon for having said it was let at the time. It was not actually let, but it was generally understood that it was to be, and it was given out immediately afterwards.

MR. MACKENZIE said that that was a very different matter, but the hon. gentleman was not yet quite correct. He recollected very well that during the second Session of the late Parliament, when Mr. A. F. Macdonald was a member, he urged the letting of the contract; so it could not have been done for the purpose of promoting his election.

MR. McLENNAN said he remembered the rumour that the work was to be commenced, and that it did its work quite as well as if it had been.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was not responsible for rumours. Mr. Macdonald had been elected in the month of May, 1875, to support the Government. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was out of the country about three months, and he thought it was during his absence that the election

took place. There never was a word of discussion about the contract one way or the other.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria) said that he remembered the circumstances of the canvass for that election, which resulted in the return of Mr. McNab, and the retirement of Mr. Macdonald, who was appointed Lieutenant-Governor in the spring of 1876. In the summer of that year, when the election was held, his hon. friend (Mr. McLennan), now the representative of Glengarry, was a candidate. His hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), and he himself took an active part in that Glengarry election, which enabled him to corroborate the statement of that hon. gentleman; that the proposed letting of the work for the extension of the Cornwall Canal was made use of to the utmost extent by the friends of the Liberal candidate. The farmers in the neighbourhood of Cornwall, were told that their teams would be hired, and an era of general prosperity created if they would only support Mr. McNab.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that might well be the case, but Lieutenant-Governor Macdonald was appointed in May, 1875, not 1876. The Government had no responsibility for the circulation of rumours. His experience, besides, had invariably shown that the Government had invariably lost support from the location and building of public works in the localities benefitted. In the constituencies on the line of Lachine, Cornwall, and Welland Canals, the late Government did not ultimately find one supporter, notwithstanding the millions spent on them. This showed that the difficulties which arose from people not obtaining what they wanted for their lands, and expected on other grounds, led to infinitely more injury than benefit to the Government in such outlay. He (Mr. Mackenzie) never recollected a word of discussion with Mr. McNab about the Cornwall Canal, though Mr. A. F. Macdonald had urged publicly and privately it that should be proceeded with, and the present Minister of Militia and Premier had also urged it in order that employment might be found for the people. The work was undertaken wholly on public grounds, and

at the time the Government need not have been very anxious about the election of a single member when they had a majority of sixty or seventy.

Vote agreed to.

95 St. Anne's Lock and Canal..	\$ 50,000 00
96 Carillon Lock and Canal..	300,000 00
97 Grenville.....	200,000 00
98 Culbute (improving approach to Canal—Supplementary Estimate, 1878-79, \$20,000)	12,000 00
99 St. Peter's.....	90,000 00
100 Miscellaneous.....	10,000 00

Public Buildings, Ottawa.

101. {	Grounds.....	3,000 00
	Extension of Western block.....	5,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE asked if the Government had let the shovelling of the snow by contract this winter.

Mr. TUPPER said they had not. The Government saw, from the tender sent in, that, if the winter proved a long one the contractors would be unable to do the work. Therefore, they considered it would be safer to do it by day work.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that one day he saw forty-five men at work, thirty-five of whom seemed to him to be doing work entirely unnecessary. The expense, he thought, must be enormous.

Mr. TUPPER said he would bring down the amount of the expenditure in this particular.

Vote agreed to.

XII.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—
CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Improvement of Navigable Rivers.

102 {	Improvement of navigable rivers.....	\$10,000 00
	St. Lawrence, removal of chains and anchors.....	12,000 00
	Neebish Rapids, River St. Mary, Lake Huron.....	9,000 00
	Removing rock, Victoria, B.C.	8,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE enquired how much more would be required for clearing the Quebec Harbour, and how much had been realised from the sale of the anchors and chains.

MR. TUPPER said the labour of removing the anchors and chains had been practically completed. The expenditure asked for this year was for the purpose of removing a rock, the removal of which was indispensable to the safety of navigation. He was not aware at that moment what had been realised from the sale of the chains and anchors, but negotiations were in the course of progress for the sale of a large amount of scrap iron.

Vote agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Ontario.

103	{	Ottawa Drill Shed.....	\$15,000 00
		Hamilton Post-office.....	1,500 00
		Windsor Post-office and Custom-house.....	18,000 00
		Brantford Public Offices.....	12,000 00

MR. MCCUAIG said he desired to make a few observations in regard to the grants for the erection of Custom-houses, post-offices, etc. He wished to know whether these grants could not be capitalised, and a certain amount awarded to towns if they would undertake to erect buildings for these purposes.

MR. TUPPER said the subject had been under the consideration of the Government, and they would be glad to consider any proposal that would save the money of the country.

MR. BROWN said that Belleville was classed, last year, with Brantford and Windsor for assistance in this regard, but circumstances over which they had no control prevented the late Government from carrying out their intention. The Government derived a large revenue from Belleville, and he thought the matter should receive the attention of the Administration.

MR. TUPPER said he would like to speak for a great many members as well as himself, and say that the Government were quite of opinion that the town of Belleville, from its importance and its population, and its resources, was entitled to the consideration of the Government in regard to the provision for public buildings. But these Estimates were framed principally with a view of carrying out the contracts of their predecessors. In reference to new work,

MR. MACKENZIE.

the Government had not felt themselves able, in consideration of the present fiscal condition of the country, to engage in these expenses until they restored, as he trusted they would restore, the equilibrium between the expenditure and the revenue.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the towns of Guelph, Brantford and Windsor had been selected, in this regard, on account of their size and importance as commercial centres. It was the intention of the Government to take the towns next in importance and population, which would have been St. Catharines and Belleville. It was not their intention to take the towns all together, but one or two at a time, so that they could provide the required accommodation without entering into very serious engagements all at once.

Vote agreed to.

Quebec.

104	{	Quebec and Levis fortifications, including Dufferin improvements.....	\$40,000 00
		Durham Terrace extension.....	15,000 00
		St. John's Post-office and Custom-house.....	9,000 00

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) asked how it was that Quebec got everything and Belleville was passed over? The revenue collected at Quebec was not as great as that collected in Belleville, and he was satisfied that, had the late Government remained in power, Belleville would not have been so passed over.

MR. MACKENZIE said that no one could fairly complain that the Province of Quebec got too much during the last few years. It so happened that there had been a large expenditure upon the canals, but that was not of a local character. The expenditure upon the Customs buildings and the new post-office in Montreal, were, no doubt, very large in the years 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877, but, with those exceptions, and the erection of a small building in St. Johns, there was no very large expenditure in the Province of Quebec, and there was a general assent to the proposition made two years ago, that something ought to be done to preserve the historic character of the historic city of Quebec. With

regard to Belleville, a good deal of money had been spent there in connection with harbour improvements, and the hon. member for East Hastings could have no ground for reasonable complaint in that respect.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): \$2,000 was just the amount spent in Belleville. That was not a great sum.

Mr. JONES (South Leeds) said, as Canadians, they all desired to see the old fortifications of Quebec kept in repair, and would have no hesitation in voting this sum. With regard to the Custom-house at St. Johns, and the buildings at Belleville, Guelph, in Nova Scotia or Manitoba, or elsewhere, they were all for the benefit of the whole Dominion, and brought revenue into the country. The sectionalism shown by hon. members, in carping at these small items, was to be regretted.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) said he found no fault with these items. They were all elected to look after the interest of their respective sections. He would ask the Minister of Public Works if the Government intended to think of Belleville next year.

MR. TUPPER said as soon as the Government was in a position to deal with those public works, they intended giving them their consideration.

Vote agreed to.

New Brunswick

305	{	Custom-house St. John.....	\$100,000	00
		Savings Bank. do.....	14,000	00
		Post-office do.....	89,500	00
		do Fredericton.....	16,000	00

MR. DOMVILLE said he would like to ask why these works had not been constructed heretofore. A fire took place in June 1877, which destroyed a large portion of St. John, and yet those buildings had not yet been rebuilt. New Brunswick had contributed \$400,000 or \$500,000 in duties to the public revenue owing to that fire, and deserved better treatment.

MR. TUPPER said the reason given by the late Minister of Public Works was that the rebuilding of them, shortly after the fire had occurred, would have

caused an undue expenditure, owing to a scarcity of labour at the time, and would have interfered with private parties, who were building, by taking from them a certain amount of available labour.

MR. DOMVILLE said he could not accept that as an explanation. There was any quantity of labour to be had, and it would have been a godsend to have furnished work to the people. It was a disgrace to the late Ministry that they had not carried out these works.

MR. MACKENZIE said he felt no disgrace in the matter. If there was any place above another, unless it were Halifax, which had reason to be satisfied with regard to public works, it was St. John.

MR. ANGLIN said the statement of the hon. the Minister of Public Works was correct. It was impossible, for some time after the fire, to find labour to do anything like the amount of work required. Buildings had to be long delayed, because skilled labourers could not be obtained. Numbers of mechanics came from the United States, and from various parts of the Dominion, to supply the demand, still, the first year, it was almost impossible to get work done, particularly in stone buildings, and it would have been very unwise for the Government to have entered into competition with private parties for labour.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was surprised to hear the statement of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), that the late Government could not go on with the building. Why, they ordered the iron work for the vaults from Boston, and then employed a company in St. John to make them. There were two sets of vaults for that building before it was completed. There was any quantity of labour to be had, and relief had to be provided for the labouring classes.

MR. MACKENZIE said everything was absurd that did not please the member for King's (Mr. Domville). Before many weeks elapsed after the fire, the Chief Architect of the Department was instructed to go to St. John to make such investigations as were necessary to

enable him to prepare plans for the new buildings. The plans were prepared as rapidly as possible, and the Government proceeded as fast as the regular forms required by the Government rendered absolutely necessary. Of course, every hon. gentleman knew that a Government could not proceed in the same way as a private individual could. It was necessary to proceed in a form acceptable to Parliament. They had first to prepare the plans, and then wait to get a vote of money in the Session of 1878. Then the contract had to be let and approved in the regular way, and it so happened that they had very serious difficulty with the contractors in getting them to carry out their engagements. It necessarily took a considerable time to do that. He hoped the hon. the Minister of Public Works would not, in connection with public buildings, attempt to hurry their construction unduly, for the sake of being able to say that they were completed within a certain number of months, or years. The more years taken to build, the better the building would be. The building in which the House was now sitting, although it had taken twenty years to finish, would have been a much better structure if more time could have been afforded for its construction. He spoke from a personal knowledge of architectural work. There was not a single day unnecessarily lost in proceeding with these St. John buildings. The foundation of the Custom-house had to be sunk some 17ft. or 18ft. below the level of Water-street.

MR. DOMVILLE: The foundations had to be sunk?

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

MR. DOMVILLE: I think not.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is so wise, and knows so much, in his own estimation, that it is impossible to inform him on any subject. The hon. gentleman knew he had already made a great many mistakes, and ought not to make rash statements. It would be better for him to get his leader, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, to bring a statement from his Chief Architect, to show how far the foundations

MR. MACKENZIE.

had to be sunk. The foundations of the Custom-house were on a sloping rock. The old walls had to be taken down.

Vote agreed to.

Nova Scotia.

106	{	Marine Hospital, Lunenburg	\$4,000 00
		Sydney, C.B., Quarantine	
		Hospital	2,000 00

North-West Territories.

107	Public Buildings.....	\$10,000 00
-----	-----------------------	-------------

British Columbia.

108	{	Public Buildings, Repairs..	\$5,500 00
		Custom-house and Storehouse Wharf, Victoria...	5,000 00
		109 Public Buildings generally..	10,000 00

PENITENTIARIES.

110	{	General Penitentiary for the Maritime Provinces.....	\$16,000 00
		St. Vincent de Paul.....	4,000 00
		Manitoba, (drains, etc.)....	3,000 00
		Kingston Penitentiary.....	3,000 00

RENTS, REPAIRS, ETC.

111	{	Rents, repairs, furniture, heating, etc.....	\$175,000 00
		Heating Public Buildings..	40,000 00
		Removal of snow, Public Buildings, Ottawa.....	1,800 00
		Gas, Public Buildings, Ottawa	18,000 00
		Allowance for fuel and light.	
		Rideau Hall.....	5,000 00

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS.

Ontario.

112	{	Kincardine.....	\$5,000 00
		Toronto	10,000 00
		Collingwood Harbour.....	6,500 00

MR. MILLS said he wished to know if the Minister of Public Works intended to ask the House to make an appropriation for Morpeth Harbour.

MR. TUPPER said that was one of the works that had to be postponed for the present.

MR. ROBINSON asked whether the \$10,000 for Toronto Harbour was to be expended solely in dredging the western entrance. The hon. the Minister of Public Works would recollect that a deputation waited upon him the other day asking for improvements to the eastern

entrance. The importance of their suggestion would be recognised, especially as the Welland Canal was enlarged to 14ft. navigation, which would make it necessary that some permanent improvement should be made in the Toronto Harbour, otherwise the larger vessels would have no harbour of refuge in the lakes.

MR. TUPPER said there was no doubt this was an important question. The \$10,000 was intended exclusively for the western entrance, for the purpose of obtaining a channel 15ft. in depth, and 300ft. in width. The work to which the hon. gentleman referred was of great importance, but it was a matter that was still a question of controversy between engineers, and the Government intended to investigate it carefully before any expenditure was made, in order to see just in what way the expenditure could be made most serviceable.

MR. BROWN said there were a great many improvements required every year at Belleville, and the Government had, during the past eight years, contributed \$13,550 towards those improvements. During the same time, the city had paid towards dredging the harbour \$47,151. The harbour was frequented by very large vessels from foreign ports, and it was necessary that the harbour should be kept in good condition. He trusted the Government would see its way to aiding the city either with a money grant or in lending them one of the Government dredges to keep the harbour clear.

MR. McCALLUM said he protested against the Government expending money on works such as Morpeth Harbour, which would be of no advantage to the country. The moment they came over to the Government side of the House, they got new light, they saw they could help their friends all through the country by taking hold of local works of no interest to the public. He raised his voice now and protested against this Government spending money on local works. We had plenty of public works to carry out without attempting to improve private property.

MR. McCARTHY said he did not rise to make any complaints about the plans

for Collingwood Harbour, but to ask whether it was the intention of the Government to spend the money voted for that purpose. Last year a grant of \$10,000 was made for the improvement of that harbour, but he saw, by the returns brought down, that only \$2,000 had been spent. It was a cause of great dissatisfaction to the people of that town, after being promised time and again that a grant should be made for the improvement of the harbour, to find that a sum of money was voted for that purpose, and only a pretence made of expending it.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think the hon. gentleman had reason to complain that the harbour of Collingwood had not received its full share of the public money. Large amounts were spent there years ago. The vote taken last year was with the view of getting a greater depth of water, by dredging the existing harbour. The Government and the Northern Railway, combined, had spent about \$30,000 on that harbour.

MR. McCARTHY said the expenditure of which the hon. gentleman spoke was not altogether by the Northern Railway Company, but partly by the municipality, one-fourth being by the company and the balance by the municipality. That was after the agreement made at the time and which they complained had not been kept. At that time it was understood the harbour was to be free; but shortly afterwards, when the hon. member for Lambton's Government was in office, the harbour was placed subject to harbour dues, which, to some extent, interfered with the business of that place.

MR. MACKENZIE said Mr. Kingford received instructions to take the necessary steps to get the money expended which was voted, but the hon. gentleman would remember that there was a difficulty about getting a dredge in that quarter, and the dredge that was ultimately sent to Collingwood was sent from Lake Ontario. There were peculiar difficulties in dredging those northern harbours, and he had never spent a cent for dredging in his own county during all the time he was in office.

MR. McCARTHY: The dredge never got to Collingwood.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no kind of intention of not proceeding with the work. He had endeavoured to do his best to carry out the intended improvements, but was unable to get a dredge into the harbour before he went out of office.

MR. TUPPER said the year for which that money was voted did not expire until July 1st; the expenditure was still going on, and a considerable portion of the money would be expended before the expiration of the fiscal year for which it was voted.

MR. MILLS said the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), had laid down a principle to which he (Mr. Mills) had never subscribed since he had been a member of this House. He moved for a return some time since, which he hoped would be here, before this discussion took place, in order to show whether such a principle had ever been acted upon. He was sorry to see the hon. gentleman did not adhere to that principle with anything like consistency. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that it was right and proper to make expenditures for harbours of refuge, but that it was entirely wrong for this House to appropriate money for harbours of commerce. What were they making appropriations for post offices, Custom-houses, etc., for? Was it understood that the people in the neighbourhood who were accommodated with those buildings should pay for their erection? They did not act on any such principle. The hon. gentleman was a shipowner; would he like to have Government say to him that he should build harbours of refuge for himself? What claim had the hon. gentleman and other shipowners on the Treasury of the Dominion, any more than any other portion of tax-payers? He did not act on such a principle, and he believed that expenditures of money for harbours of refuge, where they were needed, were very proper and justifiable.

MR. MCCALLUM said he did not consider the lake shore a harbour. He could tell his hon. friend that he could not get shelter there at all. The hon. gentleman asked this House to appropriate money for a locality within twelve miles of where the Government had spent

MR. MCCARTHY.

a quarter of a million to build a harbour, and yet the hon. gentleman called that locality on the lake shore a harbour. It would not benefit commerce, because the railway station was within five or six miles of the harbour.

Vote agreed to.

Quebec.

113 Lower St. Lawrence, repairing various breakwaters .. \$10,000 00

MR. CASGRAIN said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to a very dangerous place in his county opposite St. Roch, where the people had, at their own expense, begun to build a harbour of refuge. If the Minister would refer to the documents, he would find a petition from the municipality and adjoining parishes asking for aid to build that harbour. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was aware of the facts.

MR. TUPPER said he thought that was provided for; he would look into the matter.

Vote agreed to.

New Brunswick.

114 St. John Harbour \$5,000 00

In answer to MR. MACKENZIE,

MR. TUPPER said this sum was to repair a breakwater that was carried away. It would protect the harbour, and prevent any further damage until the Government was in a position to undertake the work as before.

MR. ANGLIN said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to a case that was not provided for here at all. An appropriation was made, some two or three years ago, for the purpose of opening what was called the Gully, at Shippegan, in his county, and rendering the passage accessible and useful to a great number of fishing craft, at all times of the tide. It was of great importance to all who were engaged in the fisheries in that part of the Dominion. Through that gully, in the season, several hundred boats passed in the course of a week, and there was no other harbour within a great many

miles. Many lives had been lost there at various times, because the water was shallow at low tide. He had made these representations to successive Governments of the Dominion, and from the late Government he obtained an appropriation for the purpose of building a brush breakwater, extending from the point close to this gully to the extreme point of the sand bar. He hoped that by this means a harbour of refuge would be afforded, at all times of tide, for the hundreds of fishing smacks engaged in that part of the country. Unfortunately, there was a great difficulty in getting contractors to take this work, and the man who eventually took the contract made some mistake in regard to the facilities for obtaining material in the neighbourhood, and he broke down. The work was again let, and again the contractor failed, and the work remained unfinished. What had been done, however, had already rendered great service to the fishing smacks. But as the breakwater was not yet extended to the end of the sand bar, the sand still washed in, and the passage was not as deep as it might be made. Even as it is, in stormy weather it afforded protection to the smaller craft that succeeded in getting under its lee, but it would be of much greater advantage if the work were carried out according to the original intention. It would afford a short cut to vessels engaged in the trade of the Miramichi and Bay Chaleurs of about 100 miles. He hoped the hon. the Minister of Public Works would, at least, expend this year, towards completing the work, the balance of the amount appropriated for this service last year, and which still remained on hand.

MR. TUPPER said that the work was of considerable importance. There was an unexpended balance in hand, and he intended to carry on operations with it in order to extend and secure the work between this and the 1st July.

MR. ANGLIN said it was almost impossible to do any work before June, as the coast was stormy and the ice troublesome.

Vote agreed to.

Nova Scotia.

	{	Annapolis River, Annapolis Co.....	\$1,500 00
		Ragged Pond, Guysboro Co.....	2,000 00
		Digby Co. (repairs).....	2,000 00
115	{	Mount Cove, Digby Co. (repairs).....	1,000 00
		Cow Bay, Cape Breton.....	5,000 00
		West Arichat.....	4,000 00
		Lingan Harbour.....	2,000 00

MR. MACKENZIE asked for explanations as to the works at Cow Bay. Was it intended to pay Mr. Archibald?

MR. TUPPER said the item was for work to be done, and not to pay Mr. Archibald, whose claim was under consideration. If the Government submitted any claim of that kind, they would state so openly.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the late Government declined to pay that claim, after full consideration. What did they want the \$2,000 for at Digby?

MR. TUPPER said it was to repair damage to a pier to which a storm had driven a vessel. The work was indispensable.

MR. MACKENZIE said that that place was in no sense a harbour; there was simply a wharf or landing, which ought to be maintained by the locality. The local authorities collected dues at it, and yet begged Government assistance for that work. If the Government was to maintain it, they should levy tolls to meet the expenditure.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman himself had expended \$2,500 on the work, in 1874. It had been built, and since repaired, by public money. Digby pier was the point of communication between a large portion of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, thus possessing a public character.

Vote agreed to.

Prince Edward Island.

116	{	Colville Bay, Souris.....	\$ 5,000 00
		New London.....	1,500 00
117	{	General Repairs, Maritime Provinces.....	10,000 00

SLIDES AND BOOMS.

118	Slides and Booms.....	\$15,600 00-
-----	-----------------------	--------------

DREDGING.

119	{ Dredge Vessels.....	\$10,000 00
	{ Dredging.....	98,000 00

MISCELLANEOUS.

	Miscellaneous Works, not otherwise provided for...	\$10,000 00
	Surveys and Inspection...	30,000 00
	Arbitration and Awards....	10,000 00
	Land and Cable Telegraph Lines for the Sea Coasts and Islands of the Lower River and Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Maritime Provinces, viz. :—	
120	Annual Subsidy for the Cables to Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands and Land Lines on the same..	15,000 00
	For several Land Lines in the Maritime Provinces to join the Lighthouses on prominent points to the telegraph system of Canada. Subsidy once for all.....	20,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE asked for information in regard to the vote for telegraph lines.

Mr. TUPPER said that this expenditure was necessary in the interest of humanity, in the interest of commerce, in the interest of navigation, and in the interest of the fisheries of the country. The matter was briefly explained on the vote itself. It was for the purpose of enabling the company to lay down cables to Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands, and land lines on the same. The next item proposed a subsidy once for all, of \$20,000, for several land lines in the Maritime Provinces to join the lighthouses on permanent points to the telegraph system. It was hoped that by this appropriation an extensive system of telegraphic communication would be opened between the lighthouses and the humane establishments. It was believed that this would result in a great saving to the country, not only by causing an additional saving to life and property in connection with shipping, but by reducing the rates of marine insurance. In regard to the vote of \$15,000, that was placed in the Estimates to recoup the company for an outlay of \$300,000, which would be necessitated; \$12,000 for interest on that sum, and \$3,000 for unforseen expenses.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he did not rise for the purpose of objecting to either sums, but of calling attention to the fact, that in regard to the first item a Bill ought to be introduced. It was a perpetual contract, and should be introduced by way of resolution, and a Bill founded on the resolution.

Mr. TUPPER said he was satisfied the hon. gentleman was correct.

Mr. ANGLIN said he supposed it would be necessary to have lighthouse keepers who were telegraph operators, and that would entail additional expense.

Mr. TUPPER said that there were instruments upon which anyone could send messages, and that this would not involve much, if any more, additional expense.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes before
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 1st May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. TUPPER, in the absence of Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, moved :—

“That for the rest of the Session the House do meet on every Saturday at two o'clock, P.M., and that Public Bills and Orders take precedence on that day after Routine, except on Saturday next, when the Notice of Motion of Mr. Fortin, of 9th April, shall take precedence after Routine Business.”

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE.

RESOLUTIONS WITHDRAWN.

MR. TILLEY: I take this opportunity of stating that, after careful consideration on the part of the Government, at this late period of the Session, the tariff having occupied so much more time than was expected, and considering the importance of this question, I will ask leave to withdraw the insurance resolutions.

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

HIS EXCELLENCY'S DESPATCHES ON THE TARIFF.

MR. MACKENZIE: I would like to ask the Premier whether he has agreed to bring down the letter published in England, which I asked for yesterday?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I asked His Excellency to ascertain from England what had been communicated to the public, and whatever it is will be communicated to the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: When may we expect a reply?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: To-day.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, and reported:—

Bill (No. 60) To amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 88) To amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Pilotage Act, 1873.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 94) To amend the Indian Act, 1876.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 89) Respecting "the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 90) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 92) To amend the Scamens' Act, 1873.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 97) To provide for the salaries of two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 102) Respecting certain Ordnance and Admiralty Lands in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SUPPLY.

XIII.—OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Dominion Steamers.

121 Maintenance and repairs of steamers *Napoleon III*, *Newfield*, *Druid*, *Glendon*, *Sir James Douglas* and *Northern Light*..... \$125,000 00

SIR A. J. SMITH: What are the intentions of the Government with regard to the *Northern Light*? Are they going to continue the steam service? I had hoped the Government would have made provision for bringing the railway to Cape Tormentine, so as to facilitate communication between the mainland and the Island.

MR. POPE (Queen's P.E.I.) said the *Northern Light* was altogether a failure, and had been a most expensive plaything. The Government had not finally decided what to do with her, but it would never do to maintain her at such great expense considering her maintenance, cost, and the small amount of work she could do. She was now lying in Georgetown. There were seasons when it was impossible for a vessel to cross between Georgetown and Pictou. The service could be done by a good propeller in the fall and early part of the winter, and in mid-winter the crossing would have to be made between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, small boats being used when the ice was too close packed for a steamer.

The Government had asked \$5,000 less than was voted last year, and he hoped it would not all be required. He hoped they would have a railway down to Cape Tormentine.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the *Northern Light* was built in pursuance of a treaty obligation entered into by this Dominion with Prince Edward Island to have steam service between the Island and the mainland when Prince Edward Island came into the Union, and for which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was partly responsible. With respect to the *Northern Light*, there was a difference of opinion as to whether she was a failure or not. As the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) had a motion on the paper with reference to the *Glendon*, he would not discuss that question now, but would only observe that she had done, and was at present doing, good service.

MR. PLUMB said the treaty obligation had nothing specially to do with the *Northern Light*. The late Government must bear all the responsibility for having built her. She had been a most conspicuous failure in every respect. After the hull was completed, it became necessary to strengthen her in every direction, and the Superintendent appointed by the Government stated that she could not be made sufficiently strong for the work, that when she got into the ice she became squeezed together like an orange, and that the expenditure on her was fabulous. He should be willing to take his share of the responsibility for having moved for the papers in reference to that vessel.

MR. VALIN said he would advise the Government to sell the vessel, as it would cost more than she was worth to put her in a good state of repair.

SIR A. J. SMITH said, in regard to the repairs of this vessel at Picou last year, the Public Accounts Committee examined Capt. Scott yesterday, and Mr. Doull, who was present, and who was the cause of the enquiry being made, after the witnesses were examined, had the fairness and manliness to state that he acquitted and exonerated him (Sir A. J. Smith) of all blame in connection with the matter.

MR. POPE.

MR. TASSÉ said he would seize this opportunity to take exception to the manner in which the annual report of the Marine and Fisheries Department was usually prepared. He was animated by no personal feelings in calling attention to this matter. The officials of that Department were, as a rule, most zealous and painstaking, and had done much to ensure its proper working. But the voluminous shape which was given to the report of the Department, accompanied, as it was, with numberless appendices, was well calculated to defeat the very object of public usefulness, which it must have in view. The Department spent annually not more than a million dollars—less even than the Post Office Department—and, nevertheless, it threw all the other Departments in the shade by the voluminousness of its publications. In order to be useful in these busy days, when time was money, their Blue-books must be prepared in a clear and concise way, and the extent of their contents kept within proper bounds. A report of 300 pages would be read, perhaps, attentively, whilst a report of 2,200 pages would hardly be turned over by those who were more specially concerned in these matters. He believed this report could be reduced to 400 or 500 pages, without the slightest prejudice to the public interest. He would not conclude, however, without making a few remarks on some statistics in connection with our shipping. According to the report, Canada was to-day the fifth maritime power of the world, being surpassed only by Great Britain—the Queen of the seas—by the United States, which occupies the second rank; by Norway, and by Italy. Such a statement might flatter our national pride; he wished it could not be disputed; but official statistics led forcibly to another conclusion. We possessed, undisputably, an important marine, which was increasing gradually; but—not to mention the maritime powers he had already referred to—we could fairly claim to hold a larger tonnage than either France or Germany. Our tonnage was magnified by our official returns, because it was calculated on the number of ships registered in Canada, whilst it should be based on the number of ships registered and owned by our people. Many of the

ships enumerated in our official list, and built in Canada, some as early as 1819, had been sold to people of other countries, or destroyed for various reasons, and yet they appeared as our property. Moreover, in our tonnage was entered every craft of the smallest description, whilst foreign tonnage included generally but sea-going vessels, and not those navigating inland waters, which proved conclusively that a proper comparison could not be established on the basis adopted by the Department of Marine. According to the census of 1871, which gave the number of ships owned in this country, we had then a total tonnage of 843,126—whilst, according to the report of the Department, it should be 1,360,425—the tonnage of the sea-going vessels being 660,446, which was the proper tonnage, somewhat increased since, to be compared with that of European nations. Our census had been made under the supervision of a man thoroughly versed in statistics, Mr. J. C. Taché, Deputy Minister of Agriculture; and, to show the authority to be attached to the result of his labours, he might state that his statistics were of the greatest use to the International Commission which sat at Halifax in 1877. If our tonnage was of about 700,000 tons, not including our inland tonnage, we could not claim to be more than the seventh or the eighth maritime power, having, however, a more important marine than such great nations as Russia or Spain. The total tonnage of the world, according to the statistics of the *Bureau Veritas*, was estimated at 21,000,000 tons, out of which Great Britain possessed 6,170,000 tons; the United States, 3,180,000; Norway, 1,500,000; Italy, 1,400,000; Germany, about as much, and France, 1,000,000. We had nothing to gain by exaggerating or magnifying our resources; it was far better that a true statement of the facts should appear before the public; for even with the naked truth we had no reason to be ashamed of the proud position which we already held among commercial nations. After having urged the reduction of the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries as a matter of public usefulness, he might observe that such a massive report, published in both languages, was the cause of an enormous and wasteful expenditure.

The cost of the printing of that report increased immensely under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, for, while it was but \$2,611.24 in 1872-73 under a Conservative Government, it reached the enormous sum of \$14,680 under the auspices of the hon. member for Westmoreland. This hon. gentleman had acknowledged lately that he made a blunder in purchasing the steamer *Glendon* at such a high price; he claimed that he had been deceived by some people, not altogether, perhaps, disinterested—but in this case he could not appeal to the mercy of the House, and he must be held responsible for that extravagant expenditure. If they were to believe certain letters read lately before the House, the hon. member for Westmoreland had been evidently more anxious during his administration to induce other people to sail in his own boat, although the wreck was not then far distant, to secure the alliance of such an upright politician as the Minister of Finance, than to conduct this Department in an economical manner. When the celebrated Edmund Burke proposed, in 1780, his plan for the “better regulation of His Majesty’s civil establishments, and of certain public offices,” which included the abolition of the Board of Trade, it was urged, in order to prove the utility of that establishment, that it had published 2,500 volumes in folio; but Burke replied that an institution which had accumulated such a pyramid of huge and dusty volumes, which no one cared to look into, had well deserved its fate. He did not desire to obtain such a result in this particular case, but, having called the attention of the House and of the Government to this matter, he trusted that prompt action would be taken to reduce such an enormous and unnecessary expenditure, and to reduce the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department, of which he understood 1,300 pages were already printed, to the proportions of other official reports which had an equal importance.

Mr. HACKETT said the *Northern Light*, though not realising the expectations of the people, had not proved a total failure. It was well understood that the undertaking was merely an experiment, and, in placing her upon her

present route, between Georgetown and Pictou, it was not anticipated that she would successfully navigate the Straits at this point during the whole of the winter. Her operations on that route chiefly proved that, while she might keep up communication with the mainland for a month or so later in the fall, and commence a month or so earlier in the spring than heretofore, she would have to lay up during the middle of the winter. It was clearly proved, however, that the only route by which communication could be kept up with the mainland was by Capes Traverse and Tormentine. It was stipulated, at the time of Confederation, that the Dominion Government should maintain efficient steam communication between the Island and the mainland, winter and summer. This was one reason why the people agreed to the terms, as they knew that without such communication they could not participate in the advantages which the people of other parts of the Dominion would derive from the great public works then undertaken by the Dominion Government, and for the construction of which they would have to contribute their share. But up to the present time very little had been done, and the people remained in the same isolated condition as before Confederation. During the present Session hon. gentlemen from the Island were cut off from all communication with their homes and families for upwards of twenty days; at one period twelve consecutive days elapsed without an opportunity offering of crossing the Straits with the ice-boats. The late Government placed the sum of \$5,000 in the Estimates last year for the purpose of making a survey of a suggested line of railway from the Intercolonial, on the mainland, to Cape Tormentine, and from the Island Railway to Cape Traverse. He believed that this survey had been made, and a report was now in the hands of the Government, made by a very competent engineer, who, he believed, reported not unfavourably on the proposed route. The Government should take this matter up without any delay, as the people of the Island considered that they have been unjustly treated with regard to this part of the compact. It might be said that the building of these railways would cost a considerable

amount of money, but, when they saw the sum of \$6,000,000 voted for the purpose of building the Pacific Railway, so that the terms of Union with British Columbia might be maintained, they were surely asking too much if they insisted upon the Government expending \$500,000 to carry out the solemn compact entered into with Prince Edward Island. They felt greatly aggrieved over this question; communication must be kept in midwinter by the ice-boats, as of old, and, although the brave men who worked those boats were generally successful in crossing, still, at times, they must succumb to the influence of the weather, their boats being but small, and not calculated to withstand heavy storms. The carrying of the mails across the Straits of Northumberland in mid-winter was the most arduous and difficult to perform of any service in the Dominion of Canada, and the hardy men who performed it were the worst remunerated. He hoped, however, to see increased accommodation for this service, shortly; that the branch railways would be built; that a small steamboat would be placed there to supplement the ice-boats, and that good and sufficient boat-houses would be erected on each side for the accommodation of all parties interested. This, in a measure, would satisfy the people of Prince Edward Island.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he could not endorse the opinion of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) with regard to the usefulness of the *Glendon*. The vessel did the same work that a scow might do, and certainly she was not a credit to any Government. The *Glendon* was reliable enough in calm water, but she was altogether unserviceable against a breeze of five or six knots an hour. In proof of that, he would read an extract from the report of Captain Brown who was in charge of the vessel:

"Owing to the very small power, in proportion to the size of the ship, the least head wind or sea is immediately felt, and materially deadens her way. Against a strong breeze (say force 5 or 6), with the usual amount of sea, caused by such wind, she would not carry steerage way. It might be thought that in such cases, sails might be set, and the vessel worked to windward under steam and sail combined, but I have found, by experience, that she is much too leewardly for any advan-

age to be gained by adopting this course. Under any circumstance the model of the *Glendon* must be put down as a bad one, and when, in addition to this, we consider that there is but a single engine of 21 nominal horse-power, to propel a bluff-bowed, full-built vessel of 267 tons, and with thirty feet beam, it will not be difficult to understand why she is able to do so little against wind and sea."

He (Mr. Pope) thought it necessary to make the statement as the hon. member for Westmoreland had appealed to him for approval of his (Sir A. J. Smith's) assertions as to the usefulness of the *Glendon*. With regard to the crossing of the Straits, he was satisfied that this Government would endeavour to carry out faithfully the arrangements made for the maintenance of the winter service. The estimated expenditure for the steamship service was \$5,000, but he did not think that the whole of the sum would be required. The Government was not disposed to spend \$30,000 on the *Northern Light* for the sake of one or two months' service.

Vote agreed to.

Mail Subsidies.

122 Steam communication between
Halifax and St. John *viâ*
Yarmouth \$10,000 00

MR. FLYNN said he saw by the Estimates that there was no similar service provided for between Halifax and Charlotte, touching intermediate ports. A Mr. Fishwick had placed a boat on that route, which was the only means of communication between the eastern section of Nova Scotia and the Intercolonial Railway. Previous to that line being opened, the trade of that section of the Province had been gradually going towards the United States, but since Mr. Fishwick's boat had been running, the people there had been enabled to get their supplies from the Upper Provinces. If they were denied the advantage of this boat, the trade which Mr. Fishwick had been helping to build up must eventually go to the United States, and, in view of the duties imposed by the present tariff, there would be a great burden upon the people of that section of Nova Scotia who felt that they had contributed their full share towards the construction of the Intercolonial,

and justly claimed that they were entitled to some of the advantages derivable from it. The Government should do all in its power to effect a continuation of this interprovincial trade, and the only way to do so was to place a sum in the Estimates for the service he had mentioned. He wanted to know upon what principle the Government was justified in placing \$10,000 in the Estimates for steam communication between Halifax and St. John *viâ* Yarmouth, and emitting to do the same with regard to the service between Halifax and Charlotte, calling at intermediate ports. He need say nothing of the enterprise of the gentleman who was placing a steamer on that route, at a large sacrifice to himself, and the people of that section would be deprived of the advantage of connection with the Intercolonial Railway if that boat was taken off. He trusted that a sum would be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for that service. No appropriation would be more acceptable, or profitable, to the people of that section. Some apprehension existed that she would be taken off were no appropriation made.

Vote agreed to.

123 Steam communication on Lakes Huron and Superior	\$12,500 00
124 Steam service between San Francisco and Victoria, British Columbia	54,000 00
125 Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands....	4,200 00
126 Steam communication be- tween Grand Manan Island, N. B., and Mainland	1,500 00
127 Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton, N.B., and Gaspé and intermediate ports	10,000 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he thought that service was to be performed for \$5,000.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said there had been an arrangement with a party to do that work, but his vessel was too small, and unfit to give satisfaction. The service had been strongly recommended by Mr. Brydges, on whose advice the Government placed that amount in the Estimates in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. He supposed that a portion of the amount,

\$5,000, was, last year, charged to that railway. The present was a larger and more efficient boat, which would add to the business of the Intercolonial, and give to the ports below important advantages in getting their produce to market. The contract was made with Mr. Lunt—\$10,000 for the first year, \$9,000 for the second and \$8,000 for the third.

MR. ANGLIN said that the boat last year failed entirely to fulfil the agreement with regard to calls at the south side of the bay, and he thought that the service on the north side had been very inefficiently performed. He now wished to urge on the attention of Ministers the fact that on the south shore of the bay there was a population of from 10,000 to 12,000 people principally engaged in the fisheries, and from thirty to sixty miles distant from the Intercolonial, from which they derived no benefit. They were one of the largest fishing communities in the Dominion, contributed largely to the public revenue, and were entitled to all possible consideration at the hands of the Government. There were in that part of the country two very fine harbours, Caraquet and Shippegan, offering every possible facility for visits of the boat, and for reception and discharge of cargo. He was satisfied that for a very small sum the proprietor of the steamer would be willing to make a call at Caraquet and Shippegan once or twice a week, which would be a great benefit to that district.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he thought the people of that region were very favourably considered in having such a fine steamer put on that route.

MR. TILLEY said he would like to know how much the steamer would have to go out of her way to touch the ports spoken of by the member for Gloucester.

MR. ANGLIN said that the width of the bay was from 25 to 30 miles, and it would not cost much more to have the steamer make those calls.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said that he had no doubt the steamer would call at all places where the trade offered a necessary encouragement.

MR. POPE.

MR. HACKETT said that it was no doubt desirable that the Government should place a steamboat on the north side of the Baie des Chaleurs, as he believed the inhabitants of that locality required such accommodation. But he was surprised that the Government had not considered the interests of the people residing on the western part of Prince Edward Island, and on the north shore of New Brunswick, when entering into the contract. He believed that this boat could make a weekly trip between Campbellton, Gaspé, Cascumpec, Prince Edward Island, and Miramichi, New Brunswick, calling at intermediate ports, which, in his opinion, would be quite sufficient for the requirements of the people of that section. This route would place the western portion of Prince Edward Island one hundred miles nearer Quebec and Montreal than the present one, and, as a rapidly increasing trade was now springing up between the Island and the larger Provinces, a good steamboat could be profitably employed on this route. He hoped, then, that the Government would take this matter into their serious consideration, and have the contract so modified as to admit of the boat calling at those points, which would add materially to the prosperity of a large number of people, who had been heretofore denied the privileges of steam communication.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said it was thought it would be as well to withdraw the subsidy for steam communication between Halifax and St. Pierre. One of the reasons for discontinuing it was that there was a good deal of smuggling carried on in St. Pierre, and it was thought it might receive a check by the discontinuance of this service.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) said this was one of the most important services in the Maritime Provinces, and the withdrawal of this subsidy would create a good deal of disappointment in Prince Edward Island. He trusted the Government would see their way clear to place this sum in the Supplementary Estimates.

MR. RICHEY said he thought that the withdrawal of the subsidy at this moment would be a very unfortunate cir-

cumstance. He trusted that the matter would be reconsidered, and a vote placed in the Supplementary Estimates.

MR. TILLEY said that, when this matter was first considered, it was thought that this communication with St. Pierre offered increased facilities for smuggling. They had, however, found that this was incorrect, and that the smuggling was mainly carried on by sailing vessels. The matter was under the consideration of the Government, and, in the event of a favourable conclusion being arrived at, the vote would be placed in the Supplementary Estimates.

Vote agreed to.

128 To provide for the examination of Masters and Mates.	\$4,250 00
129 For purchase of Life-boats, Life-preservers, and Rewards for saving life.....	3,000 00
130 To provide for investigations into Wrecks and Casualties, and collection of information relating to disasters to shipping.....	1,000 00
131 Expenses in connection with Canadian Registration of Shipping.....	500 00
132 Montreal Water Police.....	13,090 00
133 River Police, Quebec.....	22,000 00
134 Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers.....	500 00

XIV.—LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE.

135 Salaries and Allowances of Lighthouse Keepers.....	\$154,938 00
--------------------------------------------------------	--------------

MR. SNOWBALL said he found that the Inspector of Lights, in New Brunswick, received a salary of \$1,200 and \$400 for travelling expenses, while the Province of Nova Scotia, with nearly double the number of lights, had no such Inspector. This officer had received as much as \$2,332.41 in one year, and, since his appointment in 1872, had received about \$13,000 in salary and travelling expenses, for doing absolutely nothing. The person receiving these favours at the public expense was James Mitchell, brother to the late member for his county, and all he (Mr. Snowball) desired was that this gentleman should be appointed to an office to which there were some duties attached. He did not think that this money should be spent year after

year, unless some duties were to be performed for it.

Vote agreed to.

136 Maintenance and repairs.....	\$272 505 00
----------------------------------	--------------

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said a petition had been sent from his county and presented by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Domville), asking for certain improvements in connection with a lighthouse at the entrance to the harbour. Was it the intention of the Government to grant those improvements?

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): I have taken a note of the hon. gentleman's question, and will give him an answer.

Vote agreed to.

137 Completion and construction of lighthouses and fog alarms.....	\$40,000 00
--------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne): Will the hon. Minister give an answer in reference to a question I asked some time ago as to the position of the coast light that is to be rebuilt at Shelburne Harbour.

MR. POPE: The Department will make every enquiry into this matter. All the officers connected with the Department recommend that the light be put at Surf Point.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne): Is it the intention of the Government to erect a fog-whistle at the entrance of Shelburne Harbour?

MR. POPE: Not this season.

MR. ROBERTSON said he was surprised at that announcement. Prior to the 17th September last, the present Minister of Public Works visited Shelburne, and, in a political speech delivered there, referred to the fact that the late Administration had neglected the interests of that port, and assured the people that, if the present Government were returned, a fog-whistle would be erected there. He trusted the Minister of Public Works would keep that promise.

MR. COCKBURN (Muskoka): Does the Government intend to carry out the lighthouse improvements, recommended by Mr. Thompson, in Parry Sound Harbour?

MR. POPE: The Department has provided for a light there.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Is the amount of \$40,000, asked for the completion of lighthouses and fog-alarms, required to finish lighthouses under contract, or to construct new lighthouses?

MR. POPE: It is intended for both. We have asked for \$10,000 less than the usual grant, and hope, on the amount asked for, to be able to provide such works as are absolutely necessary.

Vote agreed to.

XV.—FISHERIES.

Salaries and Disbursements of Fishery Overseers and Wardens.

	Ontario	\$12,000 00
	Quebec	12,000 00
	Nova Scotia	15,000 00
138	New Brunswick.....	10 500 00
	Prince Edward Island	3,000 00
	Manitoba	200 00
	British Columbia	1,000 00

MR. ROBERTSON said he had presented, the other day, at the request of the Inspector of Fisheries of Nova Scotia, an account for a quarter's salary of that officer, who had been paid to the 31st December, and was dismissed on the 1st February; also a balance due for travelling expenses. Would that account be paid?

MR. POPE: Whatever the late Inspector is entitled to he will get. He was dismissed because he never attended to his duties.

Vote agreed to.

139 Fish-breeding, fish-ways and oyster beds \$16,000 00

MR. SNOWBALL said, according to the fishery reports last season, the whole amount expended in New Brunswick was \$10,926, of which \$2,190 was paid for salaries in the county of Northumberland. In addition to that, the Inspector got \$1,400 per year, his clerk, who was his son, \$400, making the total bill for the Inspector, his clerk, and expenses, \$2,949. There was disbursements for travelling expenses of Warden, \$584. These made a total of \$5,723, being more than half the appropriation for the whole Province of New Bruns-

MR. COCKBURN.

wick. The Inspector did not live in the vicinity where his principal work lay. For this amount, everything should be in perfect order, but the fishermen were constantly annoyed by unnecessary regulations.

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

After Recess.

MR. SNOWBALL said that he understood that the Department of Marine and Fisheries had issued instructions to prohibit entirely the catching of gasper-ax in the Miramichi, during the present year. This was a great injustice to the fishermen, who had furnished themselves with fishing apparatus at a considerable expense. They should be allowed to catch fish as usual, under such regulations as the Department might deem necessary. Another important species of fish was bass, which frequented the North-West Miramichi and Napan Rivers in large quantities. The people in the North-West were allowed to catch fish during the fall and winter months. In January and February, when the principal quantity was caught, the fish lay under the ice almost dormant, when people took them with scoop nets in large quantities during spring tides. In that section of the country people were allowed to prosecute fishing to an improper extent; 600 licences for that purpose were granted in a single season for a district not exceeding ten miles. In this fishing locality, during the winter just passed, one fisherman was known to have in his possession as many as ten bushels of these undersized bass, and no attempt was made to enforce the regulation, whereas, in another instance, among a large number of small fishermen, where only one peck of these undersized bass was found, all these fishermen were subjected to great annoyance. Now, what he complained of was this: that in one section of the country people were subjected to unnecessary annoyances, and in other sections of the country they were allowed every liberty. He was afraid political reasons lay at the bottom of this partiality, and he would like to hear from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on that point. Since he came to this House

he had been asked in reference to the fish-breeding establishment on the Miramichi River, and he would now say something about it. Very grave complaints were for a long time current, concerning its inefficient management. On the 4th April, 1877, he visited this establishment to assure himself if these complaints were well founded. He was accompanied by a gentleman who took a deep interest in the fisheries. He found the man in charge of the establishment somewhat surly, and evidently not pleased to receive visitors. While the keeper was in company with the other gentleman, he (Mr. Snowball) improved the opportunity to count the trays containing eggs, and to calculate the number of eggs in the establishment. When the keeper saw this, he forbade him to count the eggs, but it was too late, as he had already assured himself that there could not be over 240,000 eggs in the establishment. He asked the keeper how many he estimated there were, and the latter replied that he was told there were about 700,000. The Government then sent an inspector, Mr. Wilmot, to visit the establishment, and in his report that gentleman stated there were 326,000 ova, less than half the number claimed by the people in the establishment. The only defence they made of the discrepancy of their statement with the facts was that the ova had died. But in the end of March they had reported that the ova were all in a healthy condition, and that they had not lost 50,000 during the season; when he visited the establishment on the 4th April, he found at the most only 300,000. What, then, became of the ova during the interval? There was fraud, evidently, and he (Mr. Snowball) claimed that all in any way implicated should have been at once discharged. But no person was discharged. Mr. Wilmot said, on page three of special report:

"The great loss of fish eggs being of such an extraordinary nature, the statement of the number of the trays being so conflicting, and the cause of their mortality, as related, being untenable, has not been satisfactorily explained. I am, therefore, compelled, however unpleasant it may be, in following out the dictates of my judgment, to say that the true cause of the difficulty and loss of ova at the Miramichi Fish-Breeding Establishment, has resulted, in my opinion, from incompetency or neglect, or both, on the part of the

officer in charge of the building; and that deception has been resorted to in order to cover up the actual state of affairs."

Again:

"It would be almost impossible, even with the most ordinary care, and quite unprecedented elsewhere, that the enormous loss of 50 per cent. of the whole should take place in so short a time. * * * Of the loss in 1875, I very plainly stated to your Department that it was caused by negligence and want of attention to the work. I am of the same opinion still."

That was the way the head officer of the Department referred to the establishment. The officer in charge of the establishment, Mr. Venning, undertook to contradict that statement, and, in doing so, he said that his statement as to the number of eggs was corroborated by Mr. Wilmot, which was far from being the case. Mr. Venning said also that the statement of Mr. Snowball was not correct. He (Mr. Snowball) maintained that his statement was correct, and wished to draw attention to the discrepancy between the 300,000 ova then admitted to be in the hatchery, and the 650,000 said by the official report to have been there a few days previous. If this great loss of ova really occurred between the dates stated, the end of March and 14th of April, as stated by Mr. Venning, why had it not been reported to the Department previous to his (Mr. Snowball's) visit? Again, Mr. Venning, on page four of the report, said he considered Mr. Sheasgreen, the keeper, incapable of making a false report, adding, that this could not be done without his and Mr. Hogan's knowledge. This was his (Mr. Snowball's) opinion, strengthened by Mr. Sheasgreen's assertion, before referred to, that he had only given such a number as he had been instructed. He (Mr. Snowball) distinctly laid the charge of misrepresenting the facts in reference to the establishment on the Inspector. These facts would show the incompetent manner in which the propagation of fish was conducted in this district. The establishment was provided with a suitable decked boat for bringing live fish from the spawning grounds. The boat had been injured by driving nails through, splintering her badly inside, and also leaving many of the nails protruding an inch. The fish, naturally frightened, scratched and cut themselves against these splinters and nails, became diseased

and died. The loss was so great that, on page 25 of the same report, it was stated that, of 374 parent salmon taken, 300 were killed. The men who had charge of this service knew little, or absolutely nothing, about it. Yet he found one of these men received that year, for salary and disbursements, \$955, a sum sufficient to pay a competent man, especially when it was considered that not over one month's service was given to the work. The parties who received salaries for this service could find plenty of time to interfere in elections. One of them had tried to annoy him (Mr. Snowball) five years ago, by disturbing meetings held in his interest, and trying to break them up, and again at the last election the same party stood at the door of one of the lecture halls, giving liquor to boys to induce them to disturb the meeting. He never had an unpleasant word with the man, and never intended to have. When he saw such things as these going on, he thought it was about time the attention of the Government was drawn to it. In his county there were twenty-nine of these officials. Mr. Venning, the inspector, was not at all suitable for the position. He might be a clever man, but he was, unfortunately, deaf, and, therefore, had only half the means of obtaining information that other men had. He claimed that a strict investigation should be held respecting the manner in which these matters were conducted in his county, and, until some remedy was applied, he would continue to press it upon the House and the country.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said that the hon. member for Northumberland had commenced his remarks by telling them that the people of Northumberland had become totally demoralised, and, indeed, he thought so when he heard they had elected that hon. gentleman. But he (Mr. Pope) had had some doubt on the subject until that hon. gentleman's exhibition this evening. He never would have imagined that anyone, unless demoralised, could have made so gross an attack on his own best friends and those who had endeavoured to serve him, including the late Minister of Marine and the late Government. The charge of mismanagement in the hatching

MR. SNOWBALL.

establishments and the destruction of fish concerned acts that took place under the late Government. The present Government had nothing to do with the circumstances complained of, nor were the estimates for those fishery services during the last few years theirs; so his indictment really stood against the late Government for its management during the last five years. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Snowball) was true in the statement that the fishermen of Northumberland had become thoroughly demoralised. He (Mr. Pope) was not in the Department a week till he perceived the fact, and that the hon. gentleman had done more to demoralise them than anybody else. He had found a good deal of trouble in his Department, there were certain regulations which might have been right and proper in some respects, but had not worked well. Much complaint had been made that the fisheries were being altogether destroyed: that no regulations had been observed. He endeavoured to ascertain what the regulations were, then ordered them to be carried out. If they were not what they ought to be for the proper protection of the valuable fisheries of the Miramichi, they were to have been improved with that object. He found that those regulations had been set aside or relaxed from time to time at the special request of the member for Northumberland himself, who represented that, if he could not get all he wanted from the late Minister of Marine, he would even go to the late Premier and beseech his interference to obtain a relaxation of those rules and regulations necessary for the proper protection of the fish. He (Mr. Pope) had been told that the great injury inflicted on the fisheries there, with the mismanagement and confusion witnessed, had been owing to the interference of the hon. gentleman himself. They now knew that hundreds of tons of small smelts and bass had thus been caught and destroyed and hauled on the land for manure, those fisheries being used up as fast as possible. Bass worth 12c. per lb. was taken in large quantities, little fish three or four inches long, and used for the sake of catching smelts, worth from $\frac{3}{4}$ c. to 1c. per lb.; in this way both those kinds would soon disappear. Their information showed that all the

fish around the coast, except salmon, which had received more than ordinary care, was becoming scarce, the catches of many sorts amounting almost to nothing. Unless some protection, therefore, was given to those fisheries, they would soon be exhausted, and the people would lose one of their most valuable interests. It was the duty of any Government, and particularly of the Minister of Marine, to enforce the regulations necessary for the protection of the fisheries. He (Mr. Pope) did not know what the hon. member for Northumberland wanted investigated. He would find a great deal of information in the able report of Mr. Venning, the able Inspector of Fisheries, who had been grossly abused. The hon. gentleman said that an inspector should live in Miramichi; but he should know that St. John was a better and more suitable centre for his operations. His heart was thoroughly in his work, for which he was most competent. All the waste and destruction of fish complained of by the member for Northumberland had taken place under the Administration of his political friends. If there was any grievance shown in regard to Miramichi or any other place, he (Mr. Pope) could order an investigation, but he would require good reasons for the step. The result of his advice with regard to the bass which were near the spawning season would be their destruction. With regard to the charge of dismissing officers for political reasons, when he entered office, he found a desire of one party to get the mastery over the other, and also, demoralisation. He had endeavoured to impress on the officers and Mr. Venning himself, the propriety of getting good, able men, living on the spot, who would take an interest in the fisheries, and of avoiding the appointment of men who had strong political opinions. His wish was to allay that bitter feeling that existed in Northumberland, and particularly Miramichi, to promote good feeling among them, and impress upon them the fact that the laws and regulations must and should be observed, and, if it was necessary to appoint additional wardens and obtain extra assistance, notwithstanding the declaration of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Snowball) and his friends, that they would defy the laws, he would do so to make sure of their enforcement.

The laws and regulations must be enforced, the threats of the hon. gentleman not making the slightest difference.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said he desired to direct attention to the river fisheries in Nova Scotia, in which there were hardly any fish now left, owing to the fish-ways, the ladders in those streams, under the superintendence of Mr. Rodgers, the recently appointed Fishery Inspector. It was stated by newspapers and other authorities that the fish could not get up those ladders. He believed the Commissioner of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. Whitcher) was desirous of improving the fisheries of Nova Scotia, but he did not believe that Mr. Rodgers was a proper man to administer the law.

MR. POPE: Under whose administration was this done?

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said he was not finding fault with the present Minister of Marine, or Government, but with the fish-ways laid down by Mr. Rodgers.

MR. GILLMOR said he knew that the Fishery Inspector in New Brunswick had performed his duties well, being quite competent and not receiving too much pay. He had no other motive but his duty, and no officer had more difficult duties to discharge.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he rose to a point of order; the noise was so great that he could hardly hear his friends behind him. If there was not better order preserved he would be obliged to offer a series of motions that would consume more of the time of the House than the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who were so much disturbed.

MR. MACDONNELL said he had always remarked that, when the question of the fisheries was discussed, members were listened to with the greatest impatience. It was a fact that many of the members of this House and a great portion of the people of the Dominion were entirely ignorant of the nature of those fisheries. But hon. gentlemen were not ignorant of the fact, nor were the people of Canada, that, while they were suffering from great depression, and

bankruptcy was staring this Dominion in the face, it had got \$4,500,000 paid to it through those fisheries to relieve it from its bankrupt condition.

MR. FORTIN said the fisheries of our rivers dwindled to almost nothing until the system of protection in this regard was established some twenty years ago. In establishing fish-hatching in this country, they had only followed the example of France, England, Germany and the United States, and one of the oldest countries in the world, China. It was only by the artificial cultivation of fish that the Chinese were able to sustain a large part of their immense population. He approved of the solicitude of the Government in this particular. The oyster banks, particularly, required a fostering care. The whole subject was one of great importance, as the land never produced food in such abundance as the sea, if well protected and fostered.

Vote agreed to.

XVI.—SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS.

Observatories.

140	Observatory, Quebec.....	\$ 2,400 00
141	do Toronto.....	4,800 00
142	do Kingston.....	500 00
143	do Montreal.....	500 00
144	do New Brunswick	1,200 00
145	Grant for Meteorological Observatories, including Instruments and cost of telegraphing weather-warnings	37,000 00

XVII.—MARINE HOSPITALS FOR SICK AND DISTRESSED SEAMEN.

Marine Hospitals.

146	Marine and Immigrant Hospitals, Quebec.....	\$20,000 00
147	{ Montreal General Hospital.....	4,000 00
148	{ St. Catharines Hospital, Ontario.....	500 00
149	{ Halifax General Hospital..	3,500 00
150	{ Hospital of St. John.....	4,000 00
151	Ports in British Columbia...	4,000 00
152	do Prince Edward Island	3,000 00

MR. MACDONNELL.

Expenses of Shipwrecked and Disabled Seamen.

153	{ Province of Quebec.....	\$1,500 00		
			{ do Nova Scotia...	4,000 00
			{ do New Brunswick.....	1,000 00
			{ Province of British Columbia.....	500 00
154	{ Province of Prince Edward Island.....	500 00		
			{ To reimburse Board of Trade, London, for expenses incurred in connection with shipwrecked and distressed seamen of the Dominion..	3,000 00

XVIII.—STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Salaries, &c.

155	{	Chairman.....	\$ 1,800 00
		Deputy Chairman.....	1,400 00
		Inspector, Toronto District	1,200 00
		do Montreal District.....	1,200 00
		Inspector, Three Rivers District.....	1,000 00
		Inspector, Quebec District	1,000 00
		do East Ontario District.....	1,000 00
		Inspector, British Columbia District.....	750 00
		Inspector, Manitoba District.....	100 00
		Travelling expenses of Chairman, and expenses in connection with Steamboat Inspection...	900 00
		Travelling and incidental expenses of Inspector of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.....	825 00
		Travelling expenses of Inspector of Toronto District, and contingencies of office.....	430 00
		Travelling expenses of Inspector, Three Rivers...	125 00
		Travelling expenses of Inspector, Quebec.....	150 00
		Travelling expenses of Inspector, East Ontario...	260 00
Travelling expenses of Inspector, Montreal.....	200 00		
Travelling expenses of Inspector, Manitoba.....	100 00		
Rent of Office, Montreal...	250 00		
For purchase of Instruments and Steam Gauges	200 00		
To provide travelling expenses, office rent, &c., of Inspector, British Columbia.....	500 00		
Engraving and printing Engineers' Certificates, and printing Steamboat Inspection Act in French	300 00		

XIX.—INSPECTION OF INSURANCE COMPANIES.

156 To meet expenses in connection with the inspection of Insurance Companies \$6,000 00

XXI.—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

157 Geological Survey \$50,000 00

MR. DAWSON said there was no grant so well applied as this \$50,000 for the Geological Service. He would ask the hon. the Minister of the Interior whether he had any intention of removing the museum to Ottawa. In Montreal it was visited by very few people, only 1,800 having visited it during the past year. It was in a bad situation there, and the building itself was falling to pieces.

MR. MILLS said he concurred in the remarks of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). The Act providing for the creating of this branch, provided that the clerks and officers of the Geological branch might be employed in any other portion of the Department of the Interior. There was a great deal of work of a topographical character done in this branch, which could not be done as well by ordinary surveyors connected with the Public Lands Department, as by the highly scientific men employed in this institution. If the people of Montreal were anxious to have a Geological Museum continued in their city, there were plenty of specimens from which to leave them an excellent collection. The amount paid in rent and repairs in Montreal would be sufficient to provide for a suitable building here. He had been looking with interest for a report of Professor Bell's explorations in 1877, but it had not yet come down. No doubt the hon. the Minister of the Interior would give satisfactory explanations of the results of the exploration.

MR. COURSOL said he was not at all surprised at the desire of the hon. member for Bothwell to have the museum brought back to Ottawa. No doubt the hon. gentleman would like to see Montreal deprived of all her public buildings as she had been of the Parliament buildings. Montreal was the chief city of the Dominion, and the most suitable place for

such an institution. He trusted the Government would not remove it from that city. If necessary, a branch of the museum might be established here.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was a good deal to be said in favour of having the museum here. It had not attracted the public attention in Montreal to the extent he thought it would. There was a great deal to be said in favour of having the officers here under the direct supervision of the Government. In their present isolated position, scientific men, who might be infinitely better employed, were doing surveyors' work, which could be well done, if they were here, by the surveyors' branch of the Department. The expense was a consideration in these hard times. He knew the rental paid in Montreal was very large, and capitalised, the amount might suffice to put up a suitable building. However, if a building could be got here, which would answer for some years, it would be well to use it. The Clarendon Hotel could be got at a sacrifice, and might be fitted up to suit the purpose. When the Supplementary Estimates were brought down, he would bring this question up again. Owing to some misunderstanding about the maps in Mr. Bell's report, the report had been delayed.

MR. HUNTINGTON said it would be scarcely fair to suppose that if the museum were here it would be better patronised than it was in Montreal, or, to take the statement of the hon. member for Algoma, as to the number of visitors at Montreal last year, as an evidence that it had not attracted sufficient attention there, multitudes of people, including scientific men, visited Montreal who never came to Ottawa. True, during three months of the year, numbers of people visited Ottawa, but they were mostly contractors and other business men, and not scientific men for whom this museum would have an interest. He hoped we would not lay sacrilegious hands on the labours of years without careful consideration, without remembering that, after all, Montreal is the chief centre of scientific interest in the Dominion.

MR. MILLS said there was no difficulty whatever, if the city of Montreal

wished, to keep up the museum as a separate institution—or to connect it with McGill University, as a scientific branch of that institution—quite as full and complete as at the present time, and to enlarge it constantly as occasion arose. But that was wholly beside the question of its utility as a branch of the public service. Besides its educational value, it had an economic value, and in that sense it was necessary that it should be under the immediate supervision of the Minister. There would be as much propriety in removing the Public Lands branch of the Department to Montreal or Toronto, away from the supervision of the Minister, as in removing the Geological branch. There was only a small portion of the year that the parties connected with this branch were in the field. The whole of the winter, and part of the autumn and spring, they were at the offices in Montreal. Whether they were well or ill employed was a matter of which the Minister could form but an imperfect opinion. In fact, this institution, as it now stood, was without any ministerial head, and without any proper supervision. In the Bill that was introduced when this branch was established as a part of the Department of the Interior, it was also provided that it should be a Museum of Natural History as well as of Geology. The Bill was passed in 1877, during the first Session he was in the Department as Minister. It provided for establishing a National Museum of Geological Science and Natural History, but that could never be efficiently done until there was a suitable building. The hon. the Minister of the Interior spoke about obtaining the old building known as the Clarendon Hotel, in this city. But if the hon. gentleman consulted Professor Selwyn on that point, he was sure that Mr. Selwyn would tell him that it was not a suitable place. A building to be used as a museum ought to be situated where the specimens would be wholly free from dust, and where the objects collected, representing the *fauna* of the country, would not be exposed to injury in that way, and where there would be an abundance of light. The Clarendon building was unsuitable for these reasons. A plain building had better be erected, such as was found in some of the American States, like the one in Central

Park, in New York, for instance. It should be made to serve as a Museum of Geology and Natural History, and might be of great practical utility—of real scientific value—largely contributing to the development of the mineral resources of the country. It should be here, under the immediate supervision of the Minister, and open to the inspection of the representatives of the people; and there was no doubt whatever, if this were done, but that it would be of great value in giving scientific information, and would lead to important economic results.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal Centre) said he was glad to see, from the Estimates, that there was no intention to remove the Geological Museum from Montreal. It was quite true, as had been stated, that if the museum were removed from Montreal it would not be visited by nearly as many persons as it was now. Two years ago he accompanied the Emperor of Brazil on a visit to that institution, and the illustrious visitor paid a high compliment to the gentleman in charge of the institution. He said it reflected credit on the Dominion of Canada. Apart from this, there was another reason why the geological collection should continue at Montreal. A large portion of the specimens, and of the expense attending their collection had been borne, not by the Dominion of Canada, but by the late Sir William Logan, who made it rather a labour of love than of remuneration, and out of respect for the memory of that distinguished man, who had done so much to benefit this country, the geological collection should continue at Montreal. He was aware that this was not the first time this question had been brought before the House; it had been discussed years ago, and invariably with the same result. The hon. gentleman, who was the late Minister of the Interior, said that this institution ought to be conducted under the immediate supervision of a Minister. In reference to that, he (Mr. Ryan) thought he might safely say there was no Department under the immediate supervision of any of the Ministers of the Government which was conducted with more care and more diligence than that institution at Montreal. He knew that in the past the officers who had had charge of that institution had been gov-

erned by a higher principle than that of emolument. He was satisfied the gentleman in charge at the present moment discharged his duties faithfully and well. He trusted the day would be far distant when the Government of Canada should remove the Geological Museum from Montreal.

MR. MACDOUGALL said it appeared to him there were two questions involved in that discussion that ought to be kept separate. He was sorry the hon. gentleman. (Mr. Mills) had not carried out the measure he now advocated when he had the opportunity, and was at the head of the Department. He was not disposed to pay much respect to the *tu quoque* argument, and he did not think neglect on his part would justify neglect on the part of hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side; but still one would think he ought to have distinguished his administration by doing himself what he now urged upon others. The point that struck him as important, was, that we should have here, at the seat of Government, the official staff of the Geological Department. They would then be under the observation and control of the Government. We should have the benefit of their explorations and discoveries in every part of the Dominion at the earliest moment. What was the position they were in to-day? Parliament was on the point of closing its labours for this Session, and they knew, some of them, at least, that very important information had been secured with reference to a portion of the North-West Territory. For instance, the character of the country in the neighbourhood of the Nelson River; facility with which communication might be established by rail between Lake Winnipeg and Hudson Bay; the climatic conditions with reference to navigation. All these matters had been ascertained and reported upon by a gentleman connected with the Geological Staff. He had had conversation with him on his return from his explorations, and was much pleased and instructed by the information he was able to collect in the course of an evening. But they had not yet received any report from Professor Bell, and could not therefore avail themselves

of any new discoveries he might have made. He was satisfied that if the Geological Staff were located at Ottawa, this kind of information would not be kept from the view of Parliament; they would have, at all events, an opportunity of interviewing these officers as well as the officers of the other Departments. Therefore, it seemed to him, that if this Geological Survey was part of the public service; if the people of this country were to reap any benefit from the money they were expending, the officers of that Department and the central organisation must be at Ottawa, where members of Parliament and the Government could have it under view. He had had the pleasure of visiting the museum at Montreal, on various occasions, during the life of Sir William Logan, and while the survey was under the charge of the Department over which he (Mr. Macdougall) for a short time presided. He must say that he would regret to see the institution, as an exhibition, as a museum, removed from Montreal. He thought in that city, the commercial capital of their country, it was desirable to have an institution or place where the geological character and the economic minerals of the country could be studied. He thought it was worth the expenditure involved in paying the rent of a building there; but let it be a local institution, let it be placed under the charge of some College or University in Montreal. Allow specimens to remain there, and, he believed it was a fact, as stated by the hon. gentlemen from Montreal, that there was some bargain, or some fact in the history of that institution, which would make it unfair on the part of the Government to move the entire collection, because a large portion of it was contributed by Sir William Logan himself, and left as a legacy to Montreal. But that need not prevent a selection from the specimens for use and exhibition at Ottawa. Further additions would be made in the prosecution of the Geological Survey. He hoped that the hon. gentleman at the head of this Department would take early steps to carry out that idea, and place the Geological Staff where it would be in close communication with the Government, and where members of Parliament would have an opportunity of knowing, by personal communication,

the progress of the Geological Survey of the country.

Vote agreed to.

XXII.—INDIANS.

Ontario and Quebec.

158	{	Annual Grant for Indians of Quebec	\$4,200 00
		Annual Grant for purchase of blankets for aged and infirm Indians of Ontario and Quebec.....	1,600 00
		Annual Grant for Indian Schools in Ontario and Quebec, where most required	5,000 00
		Annual Grant to bring up Annuities payable under the Robinson Treaty to the Chippewas of Lake Huron and Superior from 60c. to \$4 per head.....	14,000 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked whether any progress had been made in the negotiations with the Ontario Government for assuming this \$14,000. He considered this sum should be properly charged to the Ontario Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the matter had been engaging his attention during the short period he had been Minister of the Interior. He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman that the Ontario Government were responsible for this sum.

MR. DAWSON said there was not only an annual grant of \$14,000, but there were arrearages belonging to the Ontario Government, as well as a large revenue from the ceded lands of the Indians. This revenue was so large that, from that district alone, giving them credit for everything they had paid out, the Ontario Government had now a balance of \$820,000 on hand.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said correspondence had been going on, and somewhat vigorously, between the two Governments on this matter. The Ontario Government had promised again and again to approach the subject, but they seemed in no great hurry to do so.

Vote agreed to.

Nova Scotia.

159	Indians of Nova Scotia, relief, etc	\$4,500 00
-----	-------------------------------------------	------------

MR. MACDOUGALL.

New Brunswick.

160	Indians of New Brunswick, relief, etc.....	4,500 00
-----	--------------------------------------------	----------

Prince Edward Island.

161	Indians of Prince Edward Island, relief, etc.....	2,000 00
-----	---------------------------------------------------	----------

Indians of British Columbia.

162	{	Victoria Superintendency..	13,363 00
		Fraser ..	13,425 00
		Surveys and Reserve Commission.....	24,140 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it would probably be convenient if the First Minister would inform the House of the position of affairs as regarded the Indians, both of the North-West and of British Columbia.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said from all he could learn, the situation in British Columbia, with respect to the Indians, was not unsatisfactory. The apprehension of trouble seemed to have disappeared. The Indians were expressing a great desire to settle at once on the reserve. The reserve was doing a good work, and Mr. Sproat, at the head of it, was satisfactorily performing his duties. With respect to the Indians on the east of the Rocky Mountains, it had been found that the buffalo had left that country altogether, left, at all events, for the present year. They might return another year. A great deal of distress had been suffered in consequence.

MR. MILLS asked if the buffalo had left the whole country.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they had, and some of our Indians were pursuing the buffalo across the border and the United States hostiles had also crossed for some distance. Nothing unfavourable had occurred as yet, but, at the same time, as long as these Indians were there, and especially as long as the pressure for food existed, and while there was very little chance of there being a diminution of this pressure, or the danger of starvation operating upon the savage minds, disagreeable consequences might ensue. The Indians might quarrel with each other, or attack the whites. It was therefore necessary that the Indians should be induced by every pos-

sible means to settle down on the reserves, and take to agricultural pursuits, and those tribes which were purely nomadic, and which might be for the present considered incapable of settling down to such pursuits, at all events should be induced to become herdsmen, and have flocks and herds. The Department had carefully selected practical farmers, who were now being sent out to the country to induce the Indians to take to agriculture. Of course this would be followed by the Indians in a very rude and inefficient style, but when they settled down on the reserves and found that there were no buffalo and no game, they would, by degrees, it was to be hoped, take to farming, as was done in Ontario and Quebec, and the older portions of the Dominion, and become farmers to a certain extent. Of course, there would be a great many disappointments, and a good deal of money expended. They would find that the cattle bought for the Indians would sometimes become the food of the proprietor instead of being used for the purposes intended. But yet the Government must put up patiently with all this kind of disappointment, in the hope that in no great length of time these people would leave their wild life and settle down.

MR. MILLS said he thought that last year the correspondence relating to Indian difficulties with British Columbia had been moved for, but he did not remember that it had been brought down. His recollection was that the Department was unable to get it ready before the House rose, as it was moved for late in the Session. Now that the difficulty with the British Columbia Indians was over, he thought there would be no harm, in fact, some advantage, in allowing the correspondence to come before the public, so that the people might see how very narrow an escape there had been from an Indian war in that country. There was, no doubt, that the Indians there all along felt that they had not been fairly dealt with by the local authorities; in some instances the reservations which they had held for many years, and upon which they had made considerable improvements, and spent a great deal of labour in preparing them for irrigation, were taken

possession of by the white population. The Local Government had, in a few cases, granted patents for lands that had been in possession of the Indians for half a century, and a few of these cases had not been disposed of when the late Government went out of office. They had called upon the Local Government to cancel the patents they had issued, but, at the same time, they noticed no action had been taken. Could the hon. gentleman inform the Committee whether he had any further correspondence with the Local Government on the subject?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No.

MR. MILLS said it was very desirable to have every dispute settled. It was noticeable that where the rights of Indians came into conflict with the white men, the former generally went to the wall. It was particularly desirable that the Indians should feel that the Government was disposed to deal fairly with them. It was safe to say that, at the time the Indian war was feared in British Columbia, there had been a warlike combination of the Indians of that Province with the Nez Percés of Washington territory, and if the latter had been successful under Chief Joseph, in their contest with the United States troops, he thought that trouble would have ensued by the general confederation of Indians on the Pacific slope. There was no doubt that such a confederacy had been formed, and it was only the failure of the Nez Percés that put an end to the union. This being the case, care should be taken to prevent the possibility of such alliances taking place in the future. He observed that an appropriation was asked for the purpose of employing farmers to teach the Indians agriculture. That, he thought, was highly necessary, and the late Government had determined upon making the trial had they continued in office. In fact, last year, they had made a special effort to secure the location and survey of various reservations to which the Indians were entitled under the treaties made with them, to carry out, without delay, this policy. The late Government felt that, unless the Indians were induced to settle down and devote themselves to agriculture, as their natural supplies of food would soon be exhausted, serious

difficulties would arise the moment they were reduced to want. Now that these surveys had been made, and the reservations marked out for a large number of the Indian population, and agricultural influence had been furnished them, to a limited extent, it was necessary that competent people should be employed to teach them how to use these implements. He noticed that the Estimates this year also contained a considerable sum for agricultural implements. His impression was that the late Government had gone a long way towards fulfilling their obligations to the Indians in this direction. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could state how much the Indians were still entitled to under the treaties which had been negotiated? He thought it desirable that the House should be in a position to assist the Ministry in carrying out the policy upon which the late Government had entered with regard to the Indians. If men were to be employed to teach agriculture to the Indians, it was necessary that they should be active, vigorous and competent men, and that this work should not be made a refuge for men who could not find employment in any other sphere of life, and who knew little or nothing of agriculture. They should be persons in good health, ready and willing to work, and of such an age that the Department would be pretty certain that they would not become invalids, wanting their salaries and leave of absence when they got there. He had not been able to obtain information which the Minister had promised, and which he had hoped to have obtained with regard to the official changes made in the North-West Territories. But he would state what his own views were upon this particular matter. They had two superintendencies in the North-West—one known as the Manitoba Superintendency, which embraced Keewatin, Manitoba, Western Ontario, and a considerable portion of the North-West Territories, and the other, the North-West Territories proper, which embraced that region lying west of Qu'Appelle from the Saskatchewan southward to the American border. In the Manitoba Superintendency, the Indian Treaty Districts embraced were Nos. 1, 2, 5, and part of 4, and in the North-West Superin-

tendency they were part of 4, and Nos. 6 and 7. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) knew, from the papers in the Department, why the late Superintendent of the Manitoba Superintendency was removed. For some time there was no one appointed to that position. Mr. Graham, the assistant, and who was also office clerk, acted as Superintendent for the time being. Sometime in July, the late Government communicated with Mr. St. John, who had, about three years before, been appointed Sheriff of the North-West Territories, and induced him to resign his position as Sheriff and accept the position of head of the Superintendency. He was asked to take money from Winnipeg to Fort Ellice, for the payment of the Indians in Mr. Laird's Superintendency, and after his return he was to have been appointed. But owing to the elections coming on shortly after that time, an Order in Council appointing him was overlooked until after the elections. However, he was practically appointed as early as July. He had been induced to resign his position as Sheriff of the North-West Territories, and he was appointed to the office of Superintendent, solely on the ground that he was believed to be able, honest, energetic, well educated, and in every respect well suited for the work of that particular office. He (Mr. Mills) now understood from Mr. St. John himself, and from other parties, that he had been removed from that position, and that he had been placed in a very much worse position than before, for no defensible reason in the world, because the Superintendency still existed. When he (Mr. Mills) had entered upon the duties of the office, after looking over the accounts and the arrangements made for supplies, and after communication with the then Deputy-Minister (Mr. Meredith), he was convinced that the management of the Manitoba Superintendency was not at all satisfactory. At that time he submitted to the House the appointment of an inspector, though the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not approve of the idea. He (Mr. Mills) was then of the opinion that if they were to have a condition of things different from that which prevailed in the United States, if they were to have an honest administration of Indian affairs, it was

necessary that an intelligent surveillance should be exercised over the various agencies, and that some one should be in a position to know exactly the views and feelings of the various Indian bands, how the agents discharged their duties, and be able to advise the Government with regard to the treatment of the Indians. Mr. McCaul, a very intelligent, energetic and upright gentleman, was accordingly appointed to that position; the result had been most satisfactory, and he (Mr. Mills) had no doubt the present Minister of the Interior would find that Mr. McCaul would discharge his duties wisely and thoroughly. He now understood that Mr. McCaul had been appointed as purveyor. The late Government had transferred the work of purveying from the Indian Superintendent, because the work was unsatisfactorily done, to the purveyor for the Department of Public Works, who also purchased the supplies for the North-West Mounted Police. It was a mistake, a retrogressive step, to require the inspector to act as purveyor. He should have nothing whatever to do with purchasing supplies, or with any expenditure of money. It ought to be his business to ascertain the character of the supplies furnished to the Indians, to find out how the treaty stipulations were, in all respects, being carried out, to see if the agents were discharging their duties, and how the farmers who were employed were doing the work assigned them, to inspect any schools in operation, and to keep the Department informed in reference to them. It had been his (Mr. Mills') intention to make the local agents, in some places, act as farmers, and those who would not do so, when necessary, could be dispensed with. If it was the intention of the Government that the inspectors should have a healthful supervision over these people, and see that they assisted the Indians in their farming, furnished the necessary supplies, it was important that they should have nothing to do with any expenditure whatever. Their proper work was to supervise it, and report to the Government the manner in which it was done. The late Government had also appointed Major Walsh to inspect and report the condition of the Indians in the south-west portion of the North-West

Territories. His instructions were verbal. He (Mr. Mills) had several interviews with Major Walsh before he was sent. After making enquiries, it was found that the inspection of that region would cost more than was contemplated, and that the amount asked from Parliament for the purpose would not be adequate. After consultation with the Secretary of State, under whose charge the Mounted Police were at that time, the understanding was arrived at that Major Walsh should remain in the force, that his salary should be paid by one Department, and his expenses by the other, and that he should be relieved from active service in the Mounted Police for the year. He was to endeavour, as far as possible, to induce the Nez Percés to return to Washington Territory, and to try to accomplish the removal of Sitting Bull and his Indians from that section of the country, and secure their return to the United States. The arrangement was a temporary and tentative one. The hon. gentleman could, perhaps, inform the Committee what Major Walsh had done. He might say, before passing from this subject, that Major Walsh was instructed to ascertain the condition of our own Indians, and how far it might be possible to carry out the policy upon which the Government was entering, and to ascertain whether they could be induced to settle down on reservations and engage in agricultural pursuits; also, to ascertain where it would be necessary to furnish them with cattle for the pastoral occupation. So far as they could learn, the Black Feet Indians would not willingly take to cultivation of the soil, and, perhaps, the best thing that could be done, would be to furnish them with cattle and let them raise herds; but the prospect was not very encouraging. He was informed that, whenever their supplies became scarce, they destroyed, or were disposed to destroy, the cattle furnished by the Government. Was the Government carrying forward this policy, or had they marked out some other? He thought the hon. gentleman ought to tell them why he had removed Mr. St. John. It was, too, rumoured that Mr. Laird had resigned. Mr. Laird had tendered his resignation to the late Government, who declined to accept it, thinking

that his position would give a greater influence over the Indians than any other person could obtain. While acting as Superintendent, he was discharging most important duties. It was rumoured that the hon. the Premier had removed him, and it was important to know who had been put in that very responsible position. Mr. St. John was practically appointed in July last. He was induced to resign an important position to undertake the duties of a most arduous office; and if the hon. gentleman was disposed to act fairly towards him, if he had asked him to resign the Superintendency of Manitoba, he would transfer him to the position made vacant by the resignation of Mr. Laird, or restore him the Superintendency of Manitoba.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was rather inconvenient to discuss the question on the appointment or removal of an officer on the Estimate. All he knew about the matter was that he understood Mr. St. John had never performed any duties, though appointed on the 8th of October last. He believed that the Department was rather over-officered, and simply from the motives of economy, Mr. St. John's appointment was not confirmed. He had heard for the first time to-night that he had been employed actively as a Superintendent of the Indians for some months, and had assumed the duties. If so, his claim would be fairly considered. He heard that he was a man of some ability, but he (Sir John A. Macdonald) thought he might well have kept his former office. Mr. Laird had written, saying he threw up his office of Superintendent of Indian Affairs, which, so far, was inconsistent with his position of Lieutenant-Governor. He thought at the time Mr. Laird was appointed he would be expected to assume the chief charge of the General Superintendency of the whole of the Indian affairs in the North-West, as for a large part of the time the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West had very little to do. He was rather opposed to the appointment of a Lieutenant-Governor for the North-West, thinking that until there was a larger population in that country the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba might well perform all the functions of the new office. He (Sir John A. Mac-

MR. MILLS.

donald) was satisfied that, with the increasing difficulties of the Indians in the North-West, in connection with the growing scarcity of food, and the unfortunate intrusion of a large number of American Indians, that the greatest care would have to be taken, and prudence exercised, and the greatest vigour and promptness manifested in the management of Indian affairs in the region east of the Rocky Mountains to Lake Superior. It would be very difficult to find a man exactly suited to perform all the duties of that office—prompt, vigorous, experienced men, understanding Indian character, virtues and frailties, and possessing philanthropic views with regard to them, and who would see that, when the white man and the red man came into collision, the red man did not always go to the wall. Though very difficult, some person of this kind must be found to represent the Dominion Government in the management of Indian affairs. It was impossible to govern an Indian Department satisfactorily from Ottawa. It seemed to him that a man in the position of Lieutenant-Governor Laird would be looked up to by the Indians, and that he might usefully exercise prompt control over all the local agents. As regarded Mr. McCaul, from all he could learn, he was a good and energetic officer. Perhaps, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) said, the inspector and purveyor ought not to be the same person; that arrangement was recommended by a prominent officer of the Department for the sake of economy and efficiency. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not mean to say that the two offices, in the long run, should not be separated. As regarded Mr. Graham, no alteration had taken place. He intended to endeavour to study the Indian question with the same zeal and earnestness as the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in order to carry out the principle he had enunciated of a general supervision of Indian affairs on the spot, for which a man of high character and standing should be obtained, with a view to the settlement of any dissatisfaction or trouble that might arise in connection with the Indians.

MR. MILLS said he thought that if the hon. Premier wanted effectual super-

vision, he must have more than one officer—namely, three Superintendents for as many districts, and who should be responsible to the Department in Ottawa. The country was too extensive for one officer.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that Mr. St. John had not been dismissed.

Mr. MILLS said he was perfectly satisfied that if the hon. gentleman would permit Mr. St. John to enter upon the discharge of his duties, he would find him a very efficient and intelligent officer.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was simply a question of salary. He had been appointed Indian Agent, at a salary of \$1,200 a year, the same as he got as Sheriff. He was placed at Edmonton.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman could hardly expect a man of his ability and attainments to serve for that salary.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was appointed Sheriff at \$1,200 and had never served a writ.

MR. MILLS said he had resigned his Shrievalty to take the office of Superintendent. If the hon. gentleman had appointed farmers, men thoroughly competent, besides the three inspectors or superintendents, he would find no necessity for other officers.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said the right hon. gentleman had informed the House that it was the intention of the Government to send farmers into the North-West, to instruct the Indians in farming, and lead them, if possible, to adopt a pastoral life. That was very praiseworthy, indeed, and he trusted the result would be satisfactory. But, unquestionably, it would be a very slow process. It would be a very difficult matter, indeed, to lead the hunter of the plain to become a farmer, or even to tie himself down to any certain spot. No doubt at present there was very great uneasiness in the North-West, and cause for serious apprehension. He never had been an alarmist, but he believed that, at this moment, there was cause for using very great judgment in the treatment of the Indians of the North-

West. It was well known that at present great misery existed amongst them, and, in some instances, their extreme want had led them to help themselves to food at several of the posts. He desired to know what steps were to be taken to provide for their present necessities, as there was great cause for apprehension on that ground.

Vote agreed to.

Indians of Manitoba and the North-West.

163	{	Annunities, Treaties 1 and 2	\$25,820 00
		do Treaty 3.....	15,025 00
		do do 4.....	38,125 00
		do do 5.....	15,775 00
		do do 6.	50,170 00
		do do 7.....	41,625 00
	{	Commutation of annuities to possible claimants...	1,000 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he perceived that there was an increase of \$23,640, and he desired to know if this arose from the fact that more Indians had appeared as claimants than was expected.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was expected that this would cover the whole expenditure.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that this question of annuities to Indians was becoming a serious question. It had occurred to him, and he would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to it, that it would be extremely desirable, in the course of time, as the Indians became settled on the reservations, to endeavour to make some bargain in the way of commuting these annuities. Otherwise they would become a very serious charge to the revenue.

MR. DAWSON said he did not think there was any risk of the Indian population increasing. It would be contrary to all experience. He desired to remark that great care should be taken not to interfere with the tribal system which was so firmly engrafted in the Indian disposition. The law, as it stood, offered a premium to the breaking up of the tribal system, which, if broken up, severed the only tie that held the Indians together, and removed that which was the best protection to the white man.

Vote agreed to.

	{ Agricultural implements, cattle, seed-grain, tools, waggons, ammunition, freighting, etc., furnished under Treaties 1 and 2. . . \$	7,680 00
164	do do 3 ..	3,200 00
	do do 4 ..	6,500 00
	do do 5 ..	4,540 00
	do do 6 ..	10,500 00
	do do 7 ..	12,000 00
165	Provisions for Indians assembled to receive annuities, and also for relief accorded under Treaties. . .	56,930 00

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) asked what steps were being taken to relieve the present necessities of Indians in the North-West.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Government had ordered the purchase of a quantity of cattle at Fort Qu'Appelle and Fort Walsh. A large quantity of flour had also been purchased in that region, and there were large supplies with the Mounted Police, which were available for the Indians.

Vote agreed to.

166	Triennial supply of clothing under above Treaties \$	5,520 00
167	Salaries of School Teachers and cost of School Buildings	11,000 00
168	Surveys for Indian Reserves	15,000 00

General Expenses.

169	{ Manitoba Superintendency	25,035 00
	{ North-West do	14,400 00
170	Sioux, Manitoba and North-West.....	7,000 00

MR. MILLS said he supposed these were the Sioux of the Assiniboine River.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. MILLS said that the amount was larger than last year, and desired to know what was to be done with the extra amount.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that this applied not only to the Sioux on the Assiniboine, but to some at Forts Qu'Appelle and Prince Albert.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) said he hoped the Department would use all possible means to induce those Sioux to go on the reserves. It was quite true there was a large number living in the neighbourhood of Portage LaPrairie, and that they made very excellent labourers,

MR. DAWSON.

so far as an Indian would labour at all; but, on the other hand, they were continually in the habit of committing petty thefts, and the danger had arisen there, through their thieving habits, of a collision between them and the whites. This was far more than sufficient to counter-balance any good to be derived from them as agricultural labourers. He hoped the Department would exhaust all possible means to get them to go on their reserves.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said the farmers were glad to have the Indians to work for them, especially in the autumn and fall.

Vote agreed to.

171	To provide for the payment of Instructors in Agriculture in the North-West.....	\$11,250 00
-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

XXIII.—NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

	{ Pay of Force, including Staff.....	\$119,000 00
	{ Extra pay to Farmers and Artisans.....	3,500 00
	{ Rations.....	42,700 00
	{ Forage.....	45,700 00
	{ Fuel and Light.....	5,000 00
	{ Clothing.....	22,000 00
	{ Repairs, Renewals, Replacement of Horses, Arms and Ammunition.....	36,000 00
172	{ Miscellaneous Stores....	
	{ Medicines and Medical Comforts.....	2,000 00
	{ Books and Stationery.....	1,000 00
	{ Transport and Freight Charges, Guides, Teamsters and Labourers....	25,000 00
	{ Contingencies.....	3,000 00
	{ Buildings.....	4,000 00

XXIV.—MISCELLANEOUS.

173	Canada Gazette.....	\$ 4,000 00
174	Miscellaneous Printing.....	10,000 00
175	Unforseen Expenses: Expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council, and a detailed statement to be laid before Parliament during the first fifteen days of the next Session.....	50,000 00
176	Commutation in lieu of remission of Duties on articles imported for the use of the Army and Navy.....	12,000 00
177	For the expenses of Government in the North-West Territories.....	17,000 00

178	For the expenses of Government in the District of Keewatin.....	5,000 00
179	To meet expenditure estimated to be required to put in force the Act respecting the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.....	5,000 00

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

XXV.—CUSTOMS.

Salaries and Contingent Expenses of the several Ports.

180	In Province of Ontario.....	\$221,195 00
	do Quebec.....	192,630 00
	do New Brunswick.....	92,575 00
	do Nova Scotia.....	105,795 00
	do Manitoba.....	12,500 00
	do N.-W. Territories....	2,500 00
	do British Columbia....	23,604 00
	do Prince Edward Island	25,270 00
	Salaries and travelling expenses of Inspectors of Ports, and travelling expenses of other Officers on Inspection.....	16,000 00
	Contingencies of Head Office, covering printing, stationery, advertising, telegraphing, etc., for the several Ports of Entry...	15,000 00

MR. ANGLIN said that there was not an item in the Estimates to which greater objection was made than this, during previous Sessions. He had anticipated seeing this year a large reduction in this expenditure, but found it exactly the same, although Customs duties would be very much smaller this year than the previous years.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman had not established the premises upon which he based his criticism. The Government did not anticipate a decreased revenue next year. The hon. gentleman assumed that the late Government collected the Customs' duties for the amount they asked Parliament for, whereas the expenditure incurred, largely exceeded the Estimates. If he assumed, as he appeared to assume the amount in the Estimates would cover the expenditure, the first element of the hon. gentleman's calculation would be wanting.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What is the excess?

MR. TUPPER said something like \$17,000 or \$18,000, and the hon. gentleman

would find that exceeded, after the new tariff had been introduced, and that, in the new course of things, the collection of the revenue must be attended necessarily with a large increase of expense; but notwithstanding that, they might anticipate a largely increased revenue over last year. He believed the hon. gentleman would have good reason to congratulate himself, that the gentlemen who were responsible for the construction of these Estimates had been entirely consistent with the views held on the other side of the House.

MR. ANGLIN said he was not aware that the expenditure did exceed the Estimates to such an extent last year. We had no assurance just now, beyond what we derived from our faith in the honesty and administrative ability of gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that the excess would not be very much larger next year than was now anticipated. It was quite possible that they, too, would find it necessary to expend more than they had asked for. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, did not anticipate that we were to get a much larger revenue next year than two or three years ago, yet he did seem to anticipate, and correctly so, a larger increase of expenditure for the collection. While the cost of collection would be very high, according to the opinion expressed by the hon. gentlemen themselves last year, the cost would still remain high in proportion to the amount to be collected. His impression was that the hon. the Finance Minister would find a larger revenue next year coming into the Treasury than he calculated, because it must be sometime before the manufacturers could supply all the wants of the country. He apprehended, moreover, that the Government would have a great deal of difficulty with smugglers, who would carry on their operations to such an extent along the whole frontier, that it would be necessary to employ a larger number of persons to watch them, and expend a larger amount of money than had hitherto been the case.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre) said, in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Gloucester, he could say that he regretted exceedingly that the late Government thought proper to dismiss, from

the port of Montreal, an officer appointed by their predecessors, under the pretence of economy. They had also thought proper, on the same pretence, to reduce the salary of some of the most efficient officers at that port—he referred to the chief appraisers. In 1873, the former Government thought proper to increase the salaries of those gentlemen who had held a high and responsible position during many years; their salary was increased from \$1,800 to 2,000. One of the first Acts of the late Government was to reduce their salaries under the pretence of economy. How had they fulfilled that profession of economy? He held in his hand, to the utter discredit of the late Government, a list of a number of people, who had been employed at the port of Montreal, and yet not officially appointed, but holding absolutely permanent positions, and drawing regular pay for the last three years at the rate of two dollars per day. The Government did not dare to put them on the permanent civil list, because they feared public indignation. More than that—these men who were taken on to perform only a temporary service, received a higher remuneration for their temporary services which they were supposed to be rendering, than men who occupied the position of second, or even first-class clerks, in the Customs Department. They were placed over the heads of men who had been in the Department for ten years. Some of them received, he remembered, \$600, and fifteen or twenty others received \$550 a year. And so these hon. gentlemen, who professed so great a love of economy, employed some twenty-six men as a permanent charge on the country when their services were not needed. Their salaries were charged to incidental expenses, because the late Government did not dare to allow their names to appear on the Public Accounts. If the present Government had thought proper to act on the principle that, to the victor belongs the spoils, they would have dismissed everyone of these men. But he was glad to say that the Government had no desire to remove one of these men, though he believed it was the intention of the hon. the Minister of Customs to place these men on the permanent civil list, and appoint them on a reduced salary. In regard to another

MR. RYAN.

point which had been referred to, everyone knew that, during the summer months, an additional number of men were required as tide-waiters. In 1873 the amount of revenue collected at Montreal, amounted to \$5,000,000, collected at an expenditure of \$87,000. But, during the last fiscal year of 1878, the revenue collected at that port was but little over \$3,750,000, yet the expense of its collection was \$117,000. That was the kind of economy the hon. gentlemen opposite practised at the port of Montreal.

MR. BOWELL: You may add \$5,000 to the expense of collection last year.

MR. RYAN said that only made their case worse. The hon. gentleman from Gloucester complained of the lax way, as he said, in which the Montreal Custom-house was conducted during the late Conservative Administration. He (Mr. Ryan) could state, from personal knowledge, that the affairs of the Montreal Custom-house were conducted in a manner infinitely superior, under the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, to the manner in which they were conducted under the Administration of the hon. gentleman from Lambton. Whenever, under the late Government, a difficulty arose between a merchant and a collector, and an appeal was made to Ottawa, in every case the result of that appeal depended, in a great measure, not on the merits of the case, but almost entirely on the amount of political influence which the party could bring to bear. He was aware that was not the case at the present moment, and he trusted it never would be again.

MR. JONES said that the late Government had failed to practice economy in other places besides Montreal, particularly at the port of Gananoque, in his county. In 1875 a Custom-house officer was sent to that port, without any commission, but merely upon day's pay, receiving \$2.30 per day; whereas the collector, a most able man, and one who had been twenty years in the service, received at that time \$2 per day. This man, who came in 1875, and who was sent from Prescott, at the instance of a political friend of the gentlemen opposite, received \$30 a year more than the col-

lector at Gananoque, who had been twenty years in the service, and was between sixty and seventy years of age, That man was not required at all for any service at that port. The whole of the work could be done, and was done, to the satisfaction of the Department by the collector himself.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said he saw the sum of \$2,500 for the North-West Territory. He would ask the hon. gentleman how that was to be expended—if it was the intention to appoint regular officers of Customs for the North-West; and, if so, at what point they were to be placed?

MR. BOWELL said it was not intended to make any permanent appointment at the present time. He was informed the duty was satisfactorily performed by the Mounted Police. They were paid in the past by a percentage, and it was proposed to continue that system.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said a great deal of stress had been laid upon the expenditure at the port of Montreal by the hon. member from that city (Mr. Ryan). There was no doubt there was, and always would be, more or less expenditure there. It was very unfair for any hon. member to say the cost of collecting revenue could be increased or decreased according to the amount collected. The amount collected last year was some \$2,000,000 less than collected in 1874-'75, but the depression in the value of goods between those years was nearly the same, so that the volume of goods imported was about the same. It was true there was a larger number of officers in Montreal now than in 1873-74; but it was also true that there was always a large number of officers there not on the permanent staff. It was necessitated by the large number of warehouses. Now, that the new Government building was completed, he thought a great many of the warehouses could be dispensed with, and thereby a large saving could be effected. He was not aware that any unjustifiable dismissals had been made during his term of office.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Ryan), while complaining very bitterly of the late Government for their extrava-

gance in connection with the Customs Department, failed to notice that there had been a reduction last year on this item, as compared with the year previous, of \$9,000 in the actual expenses. The hon. gentleman ought to be candid enough to give the late Government credit for that, at least. He ought also have candidly admitted that, in the Estimates for the ensuing financial year, there was an increase over the Estimates of last year of nearly \$2,000. His hon. friend failed entirely to see this. In fact, he could see nothing but extravagance under the late Government, and nothing but economy under the régime of the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches. The present Government proposed to increase the expenditure at Gananoque. The hon. gentleman did not discover that fact. Last year, the present Minister of Customs occupied a good deal of time in criticising this expenditure. The criticism of last year's outlay, as compared with the present year's, and the saving placed his hon. friend opposite in no very enviable position. The great reductions the Minister of Customs claimed to have made in Montreal were truly astonishing. What did they amount to? To one-thirtieth of one per cent. of the whole collections at the port of Montreal. The whole reductions in the Province of Quebec amounted to one-sixth of one per cent. on the whole amount collected. That was the economy for which the hon. gentleman most deserved credit. He hoped that when the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Ryan) next espoused the cause of the Administration, he would be distinct in his statements, and say that they deserved a good deal of credit for the economy practised at that port.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre) said he had not particularly referred to the increased number of warehouses, noticed by the ex-Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee) but to the fact that the 26 men who were temporarily employed were kept permanently—the last three years, and paid more than the Government employes for the past 10 or 15 years; apart from that, the supernumeraries employed during the open season, had been increased by 100 per cent. under the late Government. The present Minister of Customs proposed to do the

work by 20, as efficiently as it was done before by 36. Appointments had been made against the strong remonstrances of the chief officer, which was in keeping with one of the last acts of the late Government, in appointing an officer at a salary of \$1,200, when the collector of the port said he did not require him. He was glad that the present Government, in the interest of economy, had dismissed him. The Customs service of Montreal had not been more efficiently conducted under the late Administration, notwithstanding its enormously greater cost, than under their predecessors. Further, he believed an enquiry would show that a quantity of goods had been taken out at Montreal which had not been accounted for to this moment. He trusted the Minister of Customs would early endeavour to test the truth of that statement, which he (Mr. Ryan) believed.

MR. ANGLIN: When were those goods taken away.

MR. MACKENZIE: Who took them.

MR. RYAN said he did not know, but they were taken away within the past four or five years, at a heavy loss to the country. This showed that the increased deficiency claimed by the ex-Finance Minister as an excuse for the increased expenditure of the Department, was not justified. In reply to the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) he did not complain of the excessive payment of the officials, as he believed in paying adequate salaries, but the present Minister of Customs would do with 20 men the work formerly performed by 36. No more efficient, reliable men could be found than the Deputy Appraisers, for whom \$2,000 salaries were not too much, though the late Government had reduced them to \$1,800 on the pretence of economy, which was falsified by an increase of the expenditure by \$30,000. The ex-Minister of Customs had stated that the change in the system mentioned was largely due to the fact that the produce merchants of Montreal had paid charges incident to the transport of goods from the vessel to the bond warehouse. He (Mr. Ryan) was not aware of any remonstrances on that subject. It was the

first time he ever heard a change took place at the instance of those merchants. He was informed it was made because of the existence of that pernicious system in St. John, N.B.

Mr. BOWELL said that the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) called the saving of \$20,000 on the whole estimate a very small item, \$4,000 to \$8,000 of which was to be saved in Montreal alone. During the tariff discussion he stated he would have to ask for about \$17,700 in addition to the Estimates voted for the service last year to cover the excess of expenditure by the late Minister, for the year ending 30th June next. The excess in Ontario would be \$7,430; Quebec, \$6,690; New Brunswick, \$1,290; Nova Scotia, \$1,150; Prince Edward Island, \$180, and Manitoba, \$1,000. The member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) and the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) told the House that the expenses attending the collection of a small revenue, would, or should be, just as much as that of collecting a larger amount.

MR. ANGLIN: What I stated was, that it did not necessarily follow that because of a falling off in revenue there should be a decline in the cost of collection, because that decline might be caused by the fall in the price of the goods, the volume of importation being as large as before.

Mr. BOWELL said that might be all true, but it did not follow that if it cost \$87,733 to collect between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000 of revenue in 1873-74, that it was necessary to charge the revenue \$117,982 for collecting about \$3,500,000 in 1878. If the gentleman would recollect this fact, and, with his usual logic and plausibility, convince the House that it was necessary to increase the expenditure from \$87,000 to \$117,000 odd to collect nearly \$2,000,000 less revenue, he would exhibit greater rhetorical skill than he believed he possessed. He (Mr. Bowell) was quite prepared to admit that an officer might collect \$10,000 with as little, or very little more, trouble than \$6,000 or \$7,000; but he could not understand how it should require \$2 to collect \$5,000, when one could collect \$10,000. The

rate at which the expense of the Montreal office increased would be seen in these figures: In 1873, it was \$87,000; 1874, \$95,000; 1875, \$99,000; 1876, \$117,200; and 1877, \$117,989. An explanation was attempted by the member for St. John, but he could not, by any possibility, cover such extra expenditure unless he would add the increase of the staff of that port, as had been so well pointed out by the member for Montreal Centre. The amount asked for Montreal this year, in the Estimates of 1878-79, was \$108,925. The amount expended for the year at that port would exceed that sum by \$5,000, and the amount asked for next year was but \$104,000, being a retrenchment of \$9,925. So that when the member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) attacked the Estimates for the ensuing year, and compared them with the Estimates for this year, he was probably not aware of the fact of this extra expenditure, or, if aware of it, had intentionally misled the House, and would mislead the people in the same way. The hon. gentleman must understand that the additions which had been made to the expenses of the port of Montreal were mostly of a permanent character, and the present Government must either go to work and dismiss a number of officers, or cut down their salaries, or they must provide for them in the Estimates. During the five months he had held office, not a single vacancy which had occurred, by death or superannuation, in Montreal, had been filled up. Why? Because the collector at that port had informed him that the extra services were not required. The fact was, men were pushed on him for political reasons, and that he had nothing to say in regard to their appointment. Other ports had been treated in the same manner. In regard to the appraisers, he thought there would be a saving of money if they gave more liberal salaries to them; many at present employed were reported as unfit for the position. They could not tell the difference between the various grades of sugar, nor did they know anything about the price of cotton, or any other goods which they had to appraise. These officers he intended to remove. Other appointments had been made which were not required; and he did not hesitate to say he was prepared to justify himself, not

only in the House, but in the country, in telling those gentlemen who had been appointed unnecessarily that their services were no longer required. Hon. gentlemen, if they made a careful examination of the Estimates, would find that there had been a considerable reduction in this respect. He thought the late Minister of Customs was not strictly accurate in stating that the Government paid cartage in all the ports of the Dominion except Montreal. He was not prepared to say that a uniformity should not exist, but he was aware that a uniformity did not exist. He did not believe that the revenue should be charged with the cartage. Merchants, however, should only pay the actual amount of the cost of carrying their goods to an examining warehouse. The House would observe, notwithstanding the criticisms of the Opposition, that the Estimates showed an actual saving.

Mr. BURPEE said the hon. gentleman had spoken about the Estimates of last year being prepared for election purposes. When they prepared the Estimates last year several reductions were made, and he was satisfied that the thought of the elections never entered his mind, nor the minds of his colleagues. In reference to the appointment of officers against the remonstrance of the Collector of Montreal, he might say they did appoint men there; but no letter was received, before he left, against any of the appointments. With regard to the efficiency of the appraisers—he believed the hon. gentleman referred to the appraiser appointed at Hamilton—they thought that that gentleman, accustomed to a general business, ought to make a good appraiser; but he (Mr. Burpee) had heard it said he had not proved the man he ought to have been. In regard to Montreal, there were only nine men more in the service, than when they assumed office in 1873. Merchants now paid the cartage from the examining warehouse to their own places of business. The appraisements, in almost all the small towns where there were no examining warehouses, were done at the merchants' stores' or at the ships' sides. The hon. gentleman stated that Customs decisions in Montreal were influenced by political considerations. The late Gov-

ernment had made enemies of their friends there through their decisions, and the charge made was entirely untrue.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions *reported*.

House adjourned at
Five minutes before
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 2nd May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and *read the first time* :—

Bill (No. 103) To regulate the labour of children and young persons in the mills and factories of the Dominion of Canada.—*Mr. Bergin.*

DIRECT UNITED STATES CABLE COMPANY BILL.—[Bill 47.]

(*Mr. McCarthy.*)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

MR. MCCARTHY moved that the Bill be withdrawn, and the fees paid thereon refunded, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

DIVORCE IN ONTARIO.

MOTION TO INTRODUCE BILL NEGATIVED.

MR. HOOPER moved for leave to introduce a Bill to enable the Court of Chancery in Ontario to dissolve the contract of marriage in certain cases.

MR. ANGLIN said, that although it would be a great relief to this Parlia-

MR. BURPEE.

ment, if divorce was to be permitted at all, that a Divorce Court should be established. Nevertheless, being entirely opposed, on religious grounds, to the principle of divorce, he must oppose this Bill at the very first stage; and if he could get another hon. gentleman with him to divide the House on it, he should call for the yeas and nays.

MR. HOLTON said he thought there was a stronger reason than that why the Bill should not be introduced at this stage of the Session, and that was, that it would have no possible opportunity of being considered. To introduce a measure of that kind in the expiring hours of the Session, was trifling with Parliament, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw it, and not press it any further. To introduce a Bill within a very few days of prorogation unprinted, and expect to make any progress in passing it this Session, was preposterous. He hoped the hon. gentleman would not press the motion.

MR. HOOPER said he should press his motion.

Motion negatived on a division.

INSPECTION OF PETROLEUM BILL.

(*Mr. Baby.*)

FIRST READING.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the inspection, and safe-keeping and storage of petroleum, and the products thereof.

(In the Committee.)

MR. BABY said the object of these resolutions was to protect, as far as possible, life from accidents occurring through the bad quality of imported petroleum. The Bill which the Government intended to found on these resolutions would be in accordance with the Act 14 Vict., chap. 14, the dispositions of which were well known to hon. gentlemen. The only new clauses to be introduced were those providing that the test of the oil should be 130 degrees; that inspection of the oil should be more thoroughly performed than hitherto;

and that on the packages containing oil the inspector should affix the date, the contents, the test, etc. As the difficulties of inspection would be increased and the officers would have more to do than heretofore, it was found necessary to increase the fees, and to this all the manufacturers had consented. This Bill was introduced with the consent of the various coal oil manufacturers in this country. The fees on every package of Canadian petroleum would be increased from five to ten cents.

MR. HOLTON said it seemed to him that the inspection *en masse*, as it were, of petroleum in large tanks would afford more opportunities for fraud, and for the substitution of an inferior oil, than existed under the present arrangement. By these resolutions the hon. gentleman seemed to be offering a premium to the mode of inspection which would be most open to abuse. But, obviously, if they imposed a less charge for inspecting it in the tank than in the cask, they offered a premium *pro tanto* for fraud and deception.

MR. OLIVER said he would ask if this 5c. for every ten gallons would apply to petroleum in mass in the tank, because, if it was, it would make the inspection of petroleum in the tank higher than if it were barrelled.

MR. BABY said that the only thing changed in the law was that the fees were doubled. In every other respect it remained as before.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said he would like to ask how they proposed to inspect coal oil imported in air-tight tin cans without irretrievably spoiling the package.

MR. BABY: Just the same as we do at the present time.

MR. ANGLIN said there was an important point in the second resolution. He doubted very much if they had authority to make any enactments in relation to the storage of oil after it had paid duty. He thought it was a question of civil rights and property with which they had no power to deal.

MR. BABY said that question would be taken into consideration.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. BABY introduced a Bill (No. 104) To provide for the inspection, safe keeping and storage of petroleum and the products thereof.

Bill read the first time.

MILITIA ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Bowell.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the Militia of the Dominion of Canada.

(In the Committee.)

MR. MILLS said he would ask the hon. gentleman to state the object of the resolutions. He thought the maintenance of the peace was unquestionably with the local authorities, and, in that case, it would not be in the power of the Government to force a volunteer corps to be taken for the purpose of suppressing a disturbance or riot in another Province. A volunteer force could only be called out in a place to which it belonged. There was nothing to prevent the Local Legislatures from creating a constabulary force to perform the functions now performed by the volunteer corps. It was perfectly obvious from the discussion they had heard in the House on this question, that this distinction was not always remembered by the members of the House, and it was much more frequently forgotten by people outside. Now, this force, if called out, ought to be provided for by the Provincial authorities. He was perfectly satisfied that, if this question was decided, they would find they had no power to legislate in this direction.

MR. DESJARDINS said it was dangerous to leave, in the hands of irresponsible parties, the power to call out the military force when they at any time judged it necessary, or it suited their feelings. The experience of last year

certainly proved that it would be better to follow the suggestions made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and leave in the hands of the Provincial Government the responsibility of providing for the necessary forces to quell any disturbances within the limits of the Province. Although the Justices of the Peace might act in a proper way, public feeling was opposed to their continuing to be entrusted with this power. They had not the necessary responsibility that ought to be imposed on those who could cause, at any time, heavy expenditure to municipalities, and they were liable on that account, to call out the troops for dangers which existed in their own inauguration, or which could be quelled by the force at the disposition of the municipality. The suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell ought to be taken into consideration, and a change made in that direction.

MR. MACDONNELL said there was a word in this resolution connected with the defray of the expense of militia, the word "municipality," which ought to be defined. It had no special signification in law or otherwise. It had different meanings in different places. There were Provinces in the Dominion in which there were no municipalities.

MR. BOWELL said the difficulty suggested by the hon. gentleman had already been experienced, arising from the calling out of the volunteer force some time ago, to suppress a riot at Cape Breton. There being no municipalities in Nova Scotia as understood by this law, consequently there was no corporate body which the commanding officer could compel to pay for the services of the volunteers, and the result was they had not yet been paid. The Nova Scotia Legislature had, he believed, passed an Act dividing that Province into municipalities, which would remedy this evil in future. The constitutional point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell, was not involved in the resolution before the House. The law, as it stood now, provided that any three magistrates, of which the head of a municipality might be one, had authority to call out the troops. This right it was not now proposed to interfere with. What the resolution proposed was to give

power to the Government to advance money to meet the expenses of transport, subsistence and pay of the volunteers when called out, so that the men would not have to wait until the money could be recovered from the municipality. It also provided that the amount of pay for the men should be 50c. per day for services, and 50c. per day for rations, and to officers the pay allowed to them when in regular service. It was not proposed to relieve municipalities of the responsibilities they assumed when volunteers were called out, the power being left for the collection of the expenses from said municipality by the commanding officer.

MR. MILLS said the Government ought to allow this resolution to stand over until next Session, as it was now too late to give it the attention it deserved. It was not desirable they should legislate further in this direction, but should rather retrace their steps to a defensible position. The whole legislation on this subject had resulted in confounding the functions of those called out to maintain the peace with the functions of a military force. They had control over the subject of legislation with regard to military forces, but not as regarded maintenance of the peace in the ordinary sense. That was a municipal matter. If the hon. gentleman had submitted resolutions providing that when any of the volunteers were called out to serve on juries, this House should provide for the payment of them in the first instance, the preposterous character of the proposition would be obvious; but because a force, when called out as a constabulary force, had functions somewhat similar to those of a military force, there was a confusion in the public mind as to the character of the duty that this force was to discharge. As early as the time of Henry II, when provision was made for the organisation of a constabulary force, the same body which was called out to preserve the peace could be called out for military purposes; but the objects were always considered as different, and this distinction became very obvious after a standing army was maintained. At the time of the Lord Gordon riots the mayor refused to call out the troops. The

Houses of Parliament were besieged, and the Government was unable to take the first step towards the suppression of the riots, until the Attorney-General advised the king that these riots had assumed such proportions that they might be called a rebellion, when the Government called out the forces and quelled the disturbance. When the Lord Mayor was subsequently tried for neglect of duty, he was convicted because it was his duty not only to call out the ordinary citizens of the country, but also the military forces, and to direct them as to what should be done to restore the peace. Lord Mansfield said then, as he had said before in the House of Lords, that a man did not lose his character of citizen by becoming a soldier. The same opinion was laid down by the Court, in the case of the Bristol riots. All legislative authority, for the purpose of maintaining the peace in any municipality, or district, was vested in the Legislature of the Province. There was nothing to prevent the Government of a Province from saying that every man, under certain named circumstances, should be called upon to serve as a constable, and assist in upholding law and order. A Provincial Legislature could pass an Act making the volunteer force a police force. It could give the officers the same rank. It could compel them to serve. It could do anything but use the arms and ammunition—the property of Canada. It was the Provincial law, and not that of Canada, which must decide by whom such a constabulary force shall be called out. Upon the Provincial authorities devolves the duty of maintaining the peace. The Government might authorise the military force to be called out, in their organised capacity—as the military force of Great Britain might be called out to assist the civil authorities in the maintenance of peace—but beyond that the Government and Parliament of Canada had no right or power to go. They had no right to authorise a military organisation from one Province to be sent into another, for the purpose of maintaining the peace there, because they were not citizens of that Province. If the Committee kept in mind that those who were acting as a constabulary force were discharging a duty on behalf of the Pro-

vince, which, by the common law, devolved upon every citizen or subject, they would see that those who lived in another Province, were, as to the maintenance of the peace, within a foreign jurisdiction. Canada, in this matter, simply lent its arms and military stores to the local authorities; beyond this it had no power. The function of maintaining the peace rested on the Government of the Province, and the people on whom it might call for that purpose were its own citizens. It was perfectly obvious, that, if they went further, they were certain to be involved in serious complications and difficulties. If that provision were to become law, in many cases, the expense which would be borne by the Public Treasury in the first instance, would not be collectable from the municipality where the difficulty occurred. The municipality is a creature of the Provincial law, and is responsible to the power which created it. That Parliament had no control over it, and had nothing to do with the preservation of the peace, no more in Montreal than in New York. Our whole system of political organisation and government was based on a theory, that every part of the community had an interest in upholding the law and maintaining peace and order; therefore, it was the duty of the municipality to see that peace and order were upheld within its own borders. A municipality might resist payment of these militia expenses, when it might be very disagreeable for a Government to have to enforce them under this law. It would be only the old system of municipal indebtedness over again, which had been found so hard to extinguish. Why should the Government interfere not only to provide local authorities with a constabulary in case of trouble, but also to provide for its payment? His contention then was this: that the preservation of the peace—the suppression of disorder—devolved upon the Local Government of each Province. The Local Legislatures could create constabulary forces for this purpose. They could declare by what persons this force, within the Province, should or could be called out. The Parliament of Canada could declare that they might so use the volunteer force with their arms and equip-

ments; but, having taken this force to the border of Provincial authority, there the power of that Parliament ended, and Provincial legislation must step in to give legal and constitutional effect to the acts of such a force in upholding law and order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, if he was not mistaken, not very long ago a force of militia was sent from Ontario to Montreal with the sanction of the Government, of which the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was a member.

MR. MACKENZIE: The Government had no business to sanction it. The only responsibility it had, was in regard to two batteries.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The magistrates, according to the doctrines of the member for Bothwell, who had summoned that force to Quebec, had no power to bring that force from Ontario.

MR. MILLS: I was speaking of what the law ought to be. The hon. gentleman is speaking of the action of parties under the existing law.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I thought that some of the militia went from here.

MR. MACKENZIE: They did not.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: It was on the 24th May they went down.

MR. MILLS: Volunteers may go anywhere for the purpose of drill, but when they were called on to put down disturbances they acted as constabulary.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he should be very much surprised if, in Canada, or anywhere else, it were decided that the doctrine of the hon. gentleman were true—that the paramount or central Government had no power to keep the peace—that the duty was promissory. No Government was worthy of the name unless strong enough, if necessary, to maintain the peace. It was true, a parish constable or beadle, in the case of a fight between individuals, was the person to be first called upon. Everybody knew that; but if an insurrection or riot broke out the central Government had power to suppress it. Here, as in England, cen-

tral power had full right, if they thought the public safety in danger, to interfere. However, that was a proposition more appropriate for discussion on some other occasion. By the present Bill, it was provided that the magistrate might, in certain cases, call on the enrolled militia to help them to maintain the peace, and that the municipality aided should pay them a certain sum as compensation. That was the law in England, and, practically, it was found to operate occasionally. In riots like those of Montreal, it might be necessary to call for a certain force, and, it might be that a riot did not arise in a municipality, but had been caused by outside influences. They knew that as regarded the riots apprehended in Montreal, a large number of persons were expected from other places to take part in them—some from Ontario and the United States. In such a case it would obviously be very unfair that the individual municipality should pay the whole expense. At all events, it would be very unfair that the volunteers should be called upon to go to it in large force from a distance, and pay their own transport, and afterwards look to the authorities for reimbursement.

MR. MACKENZIE: We pay the transport under the law of 1877.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that they had a right to recover that from the municipality. If so, the whole argument of the hon. member for Bothwell was knocked into "pi." If the General Government, by the Bill passed in 1877, which charged the General Government with the cost of transport, exercised the sovereign right of bringing troops from one Province to another, or from one portion of a Province to another, and authorised the payment of the expense, where was the argument of the hon. gentleman? He held that that hon. gentleman contended that the General Government had nothing to do with this work, that it was the provincial or municipal authorities; and yet the late Government passed a Bill authorising the General Government to pay for the transport of troops called out by a municipality.

MR. MACKENZIE: That does not affect the principle.

MR. MILLS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was paying money for a matter of Provincial or municipal concerns.

MR. MILLS said he did not hold that the law was defensible as it stood, but that they should make it intelligible and defensible.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the constitutional question was not raised at all in that matter. The hon. mover of this Bill proposed, that, in the case of the calling out of those troops, the Government should pay the volunteers and recover the cost from the municipalities. There was no necessity of making a great ado about the constitutional question.

MR. ANGLIN said the constitutional question had something to do with it, though he believed the hon. gentleman from Bothwell was mistaken. He (Mr. Anglin) thought that when the volunteers were called out for the preservation of the peace, they became a constabulary, and that it was only the Provincial or local authorities that could control them in that character. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) contended, furthermore, that the Local Legislature had power to provide for calling out organised bodies of volunteers, because they could call out and require any individual to act as a constable. He thought that the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken, and that while able to call out an individual to serve as a constable, they had no right to call out the organised volunteer force. Individuals might be called out and organised by the local authorities, but when so called out they became a volunteer force, under the order of the commanding officer. The force could only be called out by virtue of the authority given by Parliament; and, therefore, if it were desirable that the Local Legislature should be called on to provide for the payment of that force, this Parliament and the Local Legislature could co-operate. Only this Parliament could authorise the disposition of the volunteer force or any portion of it, while its members continued possessed of all the rights and duties of British subjects. Nevertheless, in their organised capacity, they were subject only to Federal law, and to such orders and duties as it imposed.

MR. BOWELL said that the resolutions before the House simply empowered the Government to advance money for the payment, transport and rations to the volunteers when called out under the Militia Act. The constitutional principle raised by the member for Bothwell, was not properly involved, and why they should have had a discussion as to whether Parliament had a right to give power to magistrates to call out the force, under certain circumstances, he could not well comprehend, and that power had existed for years under the old law. All knew that a riot might take a very general character, such as that connected with the strike on the Grand Trunk, when it was contended that that being an organised resistance to law and order, extending from Island Pond on the one side, to the Western boundary of Ontario on the other, that it was unfair to ask the particular municipality in which the men congregated to pay the whole expense. The member for Lambton was mistaken as to the power conferred by Mr. Blake's Act. The old law provided for the transport, pay, and rations of the militia, when called out by the municipalities, and that provision still continued. The law passed by the late Parliament simply enabled the Government to declare, if a general riot took place, what proportion of the expense attending the calling out of the force should be paid by the Government of the Dominion to the municipality in which the volunteers served. There was no provision in that Act, if his recollection served him, other than to pay the transport, and such proportion of other expenses the Government might think proper. If the member for Bothwell held such strong views on the subject as he now professed to hold, why did he permit the Government, of which he was a member, to advance \$10,000, contrary to law, for a purpose similar to that for which the present Government asked the power to do by passing these resolutions, or, in other words, to take power to do by law what the late Government, of which he (Mr. Mills) was a member, did contrary to law. He was not condemning that act, knowing there were circumstances in which Governments might be compelled to strain the law to maintain the peace. The view of the member for Gloucester

(Mr. Anglin) was fully borne out by the Act itself, which provided that, in case of riot, or anticipated riot, certain officials in the country should have power to call out the military force for service. But the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that they were to act as constables, not as soldiers, when called out to quell a riot. The words of the law itself provided for that, but they could only obey the orders of their officers, and were under martial law and the Queen's regulations, though termed special constables.

MR. MILLS: They are that.

MR. BOWELL said the law made them special constables, without taking the oath administered to special constables. But, at the same time, it provided that they should act only as a military force, obeying the orders of their commander, and their commander could only act on the authority of some magistrate, who would take command of the troops for the time, merely to give them authority.

MR. COURSOL said that when the volunteers were called out to aid the civil power, they had only one duty to perform, and that was to obey. There had been many occasions where the troops had been called on to repress anticipated riots—though the riots had seldom taken place, and the civic authorities had refused to pay the troops, on the ground that they were not a party to the calling out of the militia, as generally some magistrates had taken that power into their own hands, without consulting the mayor or the city authorities. The process of calling out troops in such cases was very simple. Two or more magistrates, if they fancied there was going to be a riot, got one or two witnesses into their office who swore to a statement to that effect, upon which an order was issued for a certain number of troops. Such had been the case in Montreal on several occasions. A meeting of magistrates, last July, more than 150 in number, decided unanimously not to call out the militia, but that did not prevent three or four Justices of the Peace from calling troops out in aid of the civic power, and the city authorities who had to pay the expenses were not aware of what was going on at all, and they refused to pay

MR. ANGLIN.

the troops, as the mayor did not see the necessity of calling them out. He would not say whether the law was right or wrong; but such existed. It depended upon the Government whether they would sanction the large expense entailed by sending troops from one end of the country to the other, simply on the demand of two magistrates.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. BOWELL introduced a Bill (No. 105) Further to amend the Acts therein mentioned, respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.

Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 72) To explain and amend the Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion Lands in Manitoba.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 60) To amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Pilotage Act, 1873.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 88) To amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, and reported:—

Bill (No. 94) To amend the Indian Act, 1876.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

RAILWAY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 98.]

(Mr. Tupper.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. TUPPER said he would explain to the House the reason why so large an Act as this was proceeded with under the circumstances. Of course, it was only by common consent that it could be

proceeded with at all, seeing it was not marked as printed, either in English or French, on the paper, but all of the Act that he proposed to deal with had been for a long time before the House, printed in both languages, so that every hon. gentleman had had an opportunity of becoming familiarised with it. All that was proposed by this measure was merely a consolidation of a number of Acts scattered through the Statute-book, and such a consolidation would facilitate that careful reconsideration and examination of all the provisions to which the hon. leader of the Opposition had referred the other night. There was not a word changed in the law as it now stood, nor was it proposed to change a single word except in relation to two subjects. These were found on the 19th and 20th pages of this Bill, to which he invited the particular attention of the House. These new sections related to the taking of gravel and other material for construction purposes, and the height at which bridges should be constructed, in future, over the railways, so as to avoid the injuries and loss of life which were continually occurring. These two matters were marked in the Bill (*new*) so that attention could easily be drawn to them. The first clauses of this Bill which he would invite attention, were the 38th and 39th and 40th, which read as follows :—

41

“38. Whenever stone, gravel, earth, sand or water is required for the construction or maintenance of any railway, or any part thereof, the Company may, in case they cannot agree with the owners of the lands on which the same are situated, for the purchase thereof, cause a Land Surveyor, duly licensed to act as such, in the Province or Territory, to make a map and description of the property so required, and they shall serve a copy thereof with their notice of arbitration, as in the case of acquiring the roadway; and all the provisions of this Act as to the service of the said notice of arbitration, compensation, deeds, payment of money into Court, the right to sell, the right to convey, and the parties from whom lands may be taken, or who may sell, shall apply to the subject-matter of this sub-section, and to the obtaining materials as aforesaid, and such proceedings may be had by the Company, either for the right to the fee-simple in the land from which the said material shall be taken, or for the right to take material for any time they shall think necessary; and the notice of arbitration, in case arbitration is resorted to, shall state the interest and powers required.

“39. Whenever any gravel, stone, earth, sand or water is taken as aforesaid, at a distance

from the line of the railway, the Company may lay down the necessary sidings, water-pipes or conduits, and tracks, over or through any lands intervening between the railway and the lands on which such material or water is found, whatever the distance may be; and all the provisions of this Act, except such as relate to the filing of plans and publication of notice, shall apply and may be used and exercised to obtain the right of way from the railway to the land on which such materials are situated; and such right may be acquired for a term of years or permanently, as the Company may think proper; and the powers in this and the next preceding subsection contained may at all times be exercised and used in all respects, after the railway is constructed, for the purpose of repairing and maintaining the railway.

“40. Whenever, for the purpose of procuring sufficient lands for stations or gravel-pits, or for constructing, maintaining and using the railway, any land may be taken under the compulsory provisions of this section, and by purchasing the whole of any lot or parcel of land over which the railway is to run, or of which any part may be taken under the said provisions, the Company can obtain the same at a more reasonable price, or to greater advantage than by purchasing the roadway line only, or only such part as aforesaid, the Company may purchase, hold, use or enjoy the whole of such lot or parcel, and also the right of way thereto, if the same be separated from their railway, and may sell and convey the same, or any part thereof, from time to time, as they may deem expedient; but the compulsory provisions of this Act shall not apply to the taking of any portion of such lot or parcel; not necessary for the purposes aforesaid.”

That was all that applied to the taking of land or gravel or materials or water for the purpose of constructing railways. Then, on page 21, would be found the clause referring to bridges :

“And whenever a highway bridge or any other erection or construction shall hereafter be constructed over a railway, or whenever it shall become necessary to reconstruct any highway bridge, or other erection or structure already built over a railway, or to make large repairs to the same, the lower beams or members of the superstructure of any such highway or overhead bridge, or of any other erection or structure over any railway, and the approaches thereto, shall be constructed, or reconstructed and raised, at the cost of the railway company or of the municipality or other owner of the bridge, erection or structure, as the case may be, and shall at all times be maintained, at a sufficient height from the surface of the rails of the railway to admit of an open and clear headway of not less than 7ft. between the top of the highest freight cars then running, or thereafter to run on the railway, and the lower beams or members of such bridge or other erection; and thereafter, any railway company, before using higher freight cars than those

running on their railway at the time of the construction or reconstruction of, or large repairs to, such bridge or other erection or structure, shall, after having first obtained the consent of the municipality, or of the owners of such highway bridge, or other erection or structure, raise the said bridge or other erection or structure, and the approaches thereto, if necessary, at the cost and charges of the railway company, so as to admit, as aforesaid, an open and clear headway of not less than 7ft. over the top of the highest freight car then used, or thereafter to be used, on the railway."

These clauses embraced the whole of the alterations in the Railway Act. He would like, therefore, with the permission of the House, to move the reconsideration of this Bill, and have it referred to the Committee, where it could be considered.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could have no objection to embodying in the Railway Act those provisions which should have been in it from the first, respecting the taking of gravel, and the provisions respecting the height of bridges, which was one in the interests of humanity, as many accidents had occurred from the bridges being lower than the height of a man above the top of the ordinary freight cars, which employes were obliged sometime to walk upon while they were in motion. But while he had no objection to these new clauses at all, it did seem to him an extraordinary thing to print 61 pages of Statutes merely to get four new sections put in the Act. He asked the other night, and the hon. gentleman had not yet answered the question, whether it was intended in this consolidated Act to embrace the various amendments which had been made from time to time, in their proper place. For instance, a clause might have been amended by inserting certain words; had such clauses been printed here in the amended shape, or were the several Acts merely brought together?

MR. TUPPER: They are all consolidated; they are in their natural sequence; there is not a word of alteration in the law.

MR. MACKENZIE said one had a shade of suspicion that this vast Bill, together with the Land Bill, were prepared for the purpose of making a respectable sized volume

of Statutes, because otherwise the legislation of this Session would not be any thicker than what the hon. leader of the Government characterised the late Government's Statutes, one year, as being no thicker than Scobie's Almanac. He wished to make another remark about consolidating the Land Bill. The Department of the Interior had already consolidated the Land Bill, and it was printed and distributed for general use in the consolidated shape, but still they found the Act, making of itself an ordinary-sized volume, brought in during the last week of the Session. If the Railway Act had been brought in for consolidation early in the Session, he would have proposed going over it very carefully, and considering what amendments might be made in certain parts of it. During the last six or eight years of our legislation, various points had occurred to himself and other members of the House as needing amendment, but clearly it would be utterly useless to send this large volume to the Railway Committee at the present time. We should require to read about twenty pages a day, and it would take to the end of the Session to get the Bill read through, without considering the amendments. If the Bill was to be put through, he would advise the hon. gentleman, instead of sending it to a Committee, simply to read it a second time, and take it in Committee of the Whole, instead of sending it to the Railway Committee.

MR. TUPPER said that was just what he proposed to do. He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman that it would be utterly impossible to attempt to give such a review to the Railway Act as, no doubt, it was desirable to give it—such as would embody the experience that hon. gentlemen, who had paid particular attention to it, would like to give it. There was no intention, therefore, to change a line or a word in the law as it now stood, but only to introduce these new provisions, in which the hon. gentleman had expressed his entire concurrence. Existing legislation, on that subject, was scattered through so many volumes, that it was thought desirable to bring it together as preliminary to a more thorough revision of the law on another occasion.

MR. TUPPER.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had stated, and perhaps correctly, that there had been no changes made in this Bill, except the four sections he had read; but, after all, they had to take that upon trust, unless each member went carefully into the Bill for himself and read every section and subsection of it, 200 in all. The hon. gentleman said this was a transcript of the old law, but the House would recollect that there were ten amending Acts to the old Act of 1868, and it would be necessary to examine the original one and each of the amending Acts, before they could judge how far the principle of those amending Acts had been incorporated with this Bill. It would be utterly impossible to understand this gigantic labour at this late period of the Session. Many an important change and amendments were absolutely necessary in the Railway Act, as the hon. mover of this Bill admitted. That as these changes and amendments, at this stage of public business, could not receive that calm consideration that was necessary to make their legislation perfect, it appeared to him exceedingly unwise to proceed with the proposed consideration of the amendments now, and, clearly, the hon. gentleman had neither shown the necessity nor the policy of introducing and pressing in the House this long Bill at this late period of the Session. He admitted, of course, that, for professional men, who had occasion frequently to look into and advise on railway legislation, and to the Judges of the various Courts, who were daily called on to interpret that law, it was convenient that the original Act, and all the amendments thereto, should be consolidated, but that only showed more clearly the necessity for proceeding with every care and deliberation in doing so. With respect to some of the new provisions incorporated in this Act, he found that in sub-section 39 of section 9, the hon. gentleman proposed to enact that stone, gravel or other material required for a railway, might be taken for railway purposes at any distance from the railway works, and power was further given by this section to pass over or through the land of people who lived between the railway and the place from whence the material was to be taken.

Under section 38, this power could not be exercised by the railway company until after a plan of the required works—setting forth the powers and rights which the company intended to use and exercise, had been duly filed in the proper office, and due notice thereto given—while the power and authority given by subsection 39, might be invoked or exercised without the filing of any such plan or the giving of any such notice. Parliament should be exceedingly cautious in giving to any company the extraordinary powers conferred by section 39, powers that may be exercised in defiance of and to the injury and damage of individual proprietors, and without taking the preliminary steps required by the General Railway Act. He thought they ought not to be allowed to exercise the powers conferred by sections 38 and 39, except on precisely the same conditions as were imposed by the old Railway Act before a company could take possession of the roadway or any property required for the railway. The proposed amendments went further than that, and he was decidedly opposed to them.

MR. TUPPER said he thought there was reason for that, and that was the mere laying down of a pipe or the carrying of water for a distance, was a very different thing from acquiring the fee simple of a property. Whatever injury was done to the property was to be settled by arbitration.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked if there ought not to be some limit as to the distance in the case of stone and gravel pits. He thought the distance from the line should be limited.

MR. MACKENZIE said that this was in accordance with the view of the Railway Committee. The same provision had been accorded to certain railway companies, and could not now well be refused.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On subsection 38 of section 9,

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said that this subsection seemed to convey

very extensive powers to railway companies. It gave them the power to take possession of lands for a term of years, or in perpetuity or as they might think proper. It appeared to him that if lands were only acquired for a term of years, they should be put in the same position as when originally taken possession of by the company.

MR. TUPPER said of course it was not to be expected that the railway companies were going to return the lands in the same condition, after having paid for them.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said what he objected to, was that the company should have the power of crossing a man's land without filing a claim of the piece of ground they proposed to take, and giving the necessary notice before they could exercise the powers given by this Statute. There were larger powers given under this section than was given under almost any other Statute. He found one of the Acts with respect to the Corporation of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company, that the powers only extended to the construction over the land.

MR. MILLS said the 19th section of this Bill gave a very large power, which applied to the lands situated any distance from the road, as well as those over which the road ran. This was giving to a private corporation powers of greater extent than were possessed by the Government. While it might be convenient to get lands a short distance from the road for gravel-pits, and such purposes; yet to give the company absolute powers of this sort was unprecedented, and a dangerous encroachment on the rights of citizens.

MR. TUPPER said the whole Bill was based on the principle that the construction of a railway was of public value, not like the building of a house—an advantage to the individual, but of benefit to the community at large. The hon. gentleman knew that the owner of a gravel-pit would give a large sum of money to have a railway brought into the neighbourhood of his farm, but the moment it was there, would exact enormous terms for the use of the gravel-pit, if he found the company at his mercy. If there were no means by which a quarry

of stone or bed of gravel could be utilised, except by private agreement, the company would be at the mercy of private individuals. As these works promoted the trade of the country, and were of great advantage to the parties whose property lay in proximity to the line, there should be some means by which the persons promoting the public benefit should be protected from undue exactions on the part of those whom they benefited. All experience proved that the interests of private individuals were perfectly safe as between themselves and corporations and governments. Experience had taught promoters of railway enterprises the absolute necessity of having some such means to protect themselves from undue exactions.

MR. MILLS said the parties who had property in the vicinity might be benefited, but that was a common benefit. A gravel pit might be taken possession of which was situated miles away from the railway, and where it might be nearer another railway, and might be rather injured than otherwise by the construction of the road.

MR. TUPPER: The arbitrator would take that into consideration.

MR. MILLS said the owner of the property might not want to part with it. The Bill proposed to compel the party to sell whether he wished to or not.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 6) To incorporate the South-Western Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Schults.)

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Act incorporating the Detroit Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

ELIZA MARIA CAMPBELL RELIEF BILL.

[BILL 99.]

(Mr. Macdougall.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MACDOUGALL said the House was aware that in this class of Bills it had been the practice that the enquiry and investigation of evidence should be had in the Senate. Mr. Campbell, the husband of the present petitioner, applied to Parliament in 1876, for a Bill of divorce against his wife, for the alleged crime of adultery. That petition was referred to a Committee of the House, the wife appearing in her defence, and its allegations were investigated. Evidence was taken at great length before a Committee of nine Senators, presided over by a gentleman of distinguished ability as a statesman, and a lawyer of considerable eminence. After that investigation of fourteen days, the Committee came almost to the unanimous decision that the petitioner had utterly failed to make out his charge against his wife. In the course of that investigation, on the examination of his witnesses, including the petitioner himself, and witnesses for the defence, it appeared that the husband had treated his wife with great cruelty, that he deserted her, and removed his children from her custody on a false pretence, making no charge against her at that time, but leaving her to suppose that he had gone on an ordinary visit to his relatives. On his return, he took steps to eject her from her home, by preventing her from receiving any aid from friends—giving notice to tradespeople and others not to supply her with necessaries, as he would not be responsible for them; in short, endeavouring to starve her out. For a month she maintained the unequal struggle, when finding she was not likely to give up the domicile, he proceeded with two constables, under an alleged warrant—not a real warrant at all—and those men, pretending they were officers of the law, took his wife violently from the bed in which she lay, under an attack of illness, carried her down stairs, and threw her out on the verandah, in a cruel, heartless, brutal manner. She was taken in by some of her friends in the neighbourhood, and from that time to this had been supported by them. Therefore, he (Mr. Macdougall) had felt it his duty as her counsel, at the time, to present to the Senate a petition in her behalf, charging desertion and cruelty, and demanding the usual relief in such

cases. After examining the allegations of that petition, and taking further evidence, the Committee felt satisfied that the charges of desertion and cruelty were sufficiently and satisfactorily made out. Her petition prayed that in that event the Bill which he had introduced into Parliament might be so amended as to give to her the ordinary relief given in all civilised countries, under such circumstances—divorce *a mensa et thoro*, or separation from bed and board, with an allowance for support. The Committee, after two or three days' investigation and a careful review of all the evidence, concluded that she was legally entitled to that remedy. At this point the question arose as to whether the Parliament of the Dominion had the constitutional authority, in dealing with questions of marriage and divorce, to grant such a remedy in a case of that kind. The Committee concluded that Parliament and the Senate, as a co-ordinate branch of Parliament, had that authority; and the Senate ratified that decision, after a lengthened discussion, by a decisive vote, and the Bill was passed in 1877, giving this woman a separation *a mensa et thoro*, and imposing on him the duty of paying a sufficient sum for her support, giving her also the custody of one of the children. That Bill failed, in consequence of a technical objection, raised by the Standing Orders Committee of this House, namely, that no notice had been given of the application, in that Session, although the parties were still before Parliament. The Bill had been postponed from the Session in which it originated to the next Session, which, he thought the Senate had full power to do, and that the House of Commons, as a matter of comity, ought to have taken notice of that fact. But the Committee on Standing Orders held that there was no proof of notice having been given to the husband, although he was in Court all the time. Her application was, on that ground, disposed of for that Session. Next Session the wife applied to Parliament, by petition, for a suspension of these rules in her case, when objection was taken in the Private Bills Committee of the Senate, that she had not given six months' notice of her application. The Senate had passed her Bill in the previous Session, and her petition was then before the House, asking

to be allowed to sue *in forma pauperis*, being without means; and, although she prayed to have the rules respecting notice suspended—a very common practice in both Houses—yet the Private Bills Committee, by a majority of one or two, held that the rules of the House should, in her case, be strictly enforced, and so her cause was lost for that Session. A new, and, he hoped, a juster Parliament having been elected in 1878, and notice having been given in the ordinary way, as if for a new Bill, Mrs. Campbell appeared before the Senate during the present Session to urge her claim for justice. Evidence was again taken in support of the allegations in her petition, and her husband appeared to oppose her application. He appeared by counsel, and had an opportunity of producing further evidence, but offered none. He cross-examined her and made some objections *visa voce*, but, notwithstanding his representations, the Committee again reported the preamble as proved. The Bill reported by the Committee was passed by a decisive majority, after lengthened debates on the constitutional question, and the loss of several votes on that ground which were in her favour on the merits of her case. That Bill was now before this House for its concurrence. He would move presently that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills for their examination and report. The ground upon which Mrs. Campbell was asking for the Bill which had passed the Senate was, that her husband, without just or legal cause, had deserted her, and had, therefore, made himself liable to provide for her necessities. By that desertion he had given her the right enjoyed by all married women in all civilised countries, of applying for this kind of relief. It was necessary to make this point clear, for he knew that in the House, and in the country, there was a very large number of persons who thought that it was not expedient or proper that Parliament under any circumstances should grant divorce *a vinculo*—divorce from the marriage bond. This Parliament had been in the habit of overriding that opinion in cases of adultery, and divorces *a vinculo* have been granted, though not very frequently. But he would call the

attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that this case was not objectionable on the religious or moral grounds so often urged against divorce Bills. It was not divorce *a vinculo*. It was simply separation. It was the very kind of divorce which, under the Civil Code of Lower Canada, was granted by the Courts of that Province, in a case like the present. In this case he was proposing to follow the jurisprudence and ordinary practice of their fellow-subjects in Quebec. The grounds for which Mrs. Campbell was proceeding would, in some countries, entitle her to absolute divorce; but she did not ask for that, she did not ask to be relieved from the obligation of the marriage bond. She merely demanded, what in England is called judicial separation—to be placed in the position of a *feme sole*, except that she did not ask for the privilege of marrying again. In all other respects, she claimed, by reason of the circumstances proved in evidence—and which, if necessary, could be proved again—that she is entitled, according to the law of all civilised countries, and, therefore, of this country, to be legally separated from her husband. Unfortunately, in Ontario, persons in her case were obliged to come to Parliament for this form of remedy. There were judicial tribunals in other Provinces for such purposes, but not in Ontario, and no authority was vested in the existing Courts which would enable them to grant judicial separation. The only remedy there was alimony, which might be granted or refused by a Judge of the Court of Chancery. But, in this case, he contended that Mrs. Campbell was entitled to a higher and more complete remedy. The point was raised in a paper circulated by the husband, that these proceedings were a reflection upon the Courts of Ontario—that we were making of Parliament a Court of Appeal from the judicial decisions of the Courts of Ontario. But this was not an appeal from the decision of any Court. There had been no decision in any Court which legally convicted Mrs. Campbell of the crime of adultery. He was able to produce the judicial decision of the Chancellor of the Court of Chancery on this very point, and as so much had been said about it in the other House, and might be repeated here, he would read the Chancellor's judgment. He

would here state that, notwithstanding the decision of the Committee of the Senate, and the passage of this Bill in 1877, the husband of Mrs. Campbell applied to the Local Legislature in—he (Mr. Macdougall) must say—a clandestine manner. He applied for an amendment to the Law of Dower, for the purpose of enabling him to deprive this lady of her legal right in his estates, in the event of the predecease of her husband. This clandestine amendment of the law was not observed, owing to the hurried way in which amendments were made, in what was called the “Omnibus Act” of that Session. It was not made in a Private Bill, but in manuscript, at the last stage in Committee. It had not been observed by him, although a member of the Assembly, and he was not aware of its existence until it appeared in the Statute-book. By it a husband was permitted, in any case in which his wife had lived apart from him for two years, no matter under what circumstances, provided she could not obtain alimony, to apply to the Courts for an order by which his property could be sold free from her dower. Of course it was an amendment to the existing law, for the purpose of meeting this particular case, and of course the husband promptly applied to Vice-Chancellor Blake, who, feeling no doubt that it would be an outrage to put this villainous law in force behind Mrs. Campbell’s back, and permit her husband to discharge his lands, of her claim, without her knowledge, refused to act *ex-parte*. Notice was, therefore, given to her, and it was by this means he (Mr. Macdougall) became aware of the existence of the law. The Legislature was then sitting; he (Mr. Macdougall) raised the question in the House, and an amendment of the law was introduced. While the matter was still pending before the Court of Chancery, the law by which Campbell hoped to defeat his wife even after his death, was repealed, and the repealing Act was promptly sanctioned by the Governor. It was the judgment in this case which established his contention that Mrs. Campbell had not been found guilty of adultery by any Court in Ontario. He would read a few passages :

“The exemplification of judgment in Campbell *versus* Gordon is not a matter of record

affecting the petitioner’s wife, as she was not a party to that record; and there is no other evidence before me to establish the fact of adultery. The only other evidence upon that point is that of the wife; and by her the alleged fact is denied.”—(25 Grant, p. 483.)

“My conclusion is that there is no legal evidence of the fact of adultery by the wife, and in the absence of such proof, it is not made to appear that she has been living apart from her husband, under circumstances to which the Statute would apply.”—(Ib.)

That judgment was pronounced in 1878, and he hoped he would not again hear the statement in Parliament that, by doing justice to Mrs. Campbell, we were reversing the decision of a Court. Another point was brought under the notice of that learned Judge, one of the most distinguished in the Ontario Courts, that had been the subject of discussion in the other branch of the Legislature, and might possibly be raised here. That was, whether the 91st clause of the Confederation Act, which declared that “all matters coming within the classes of subjects” enumerated as being within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, included the matters dealt with by this Bill. Among the enumerated subjects they found “Marriage and Divorce.” On that point, Chancellor Spragge, although it was not necessary to be decided in that case, said :

“By the British North America Act, exclusive legislative authority is conferred upon the Parliament of Canada, in among other matters, ‘Marriage and Divorce,’ while among the exclusive powers conferred upon Provincial Legislatures is ‘the solemnisation of marriage in the Province,’ proceedings are now pending before the Dominion Parliament, and while they are so, it would be unseemly, and, I think, improper, to make such an order as is prayed for in this petition.”—(25 Grant p. 484.)

Why “unseemly,” if Parliament had, in the opinion of the learned Judge, no jurisdiction in the case? It appeared to him (Mr. Macdougall) perfectly clear, from an examination of the clauses of the Act, both affirmatively and negatively, that the whole subject of marriage and divorce in this Dominion was placed under the legislative control of this Parliament. Then, if, as he had said, there was no power in the Courts of Ontario, nor in the Legislature of Ontario, to deal with this question, it was the duty of this Parliament, upon

general principles, to apply the remedy which it had the power to apply in a case properly before it. To refuse in such a case, was to ignore right and deny justice. All that the wife had to do, under this application, was to prove, as Mrs. Campbell had proved in the other branch of Parliament, the fact of desertion and the fact of cruelty. The Senate, on the evidence before it, came to the conclusion that there were sufficient grounds set forth in the preamble of this Bill, to justify a legal separation of these parties. He would call attention to one or two features of the Bill, not usually found in Parliamentary Divorce Bills. If the husband choose to set apart an adequate portion of his property for the benefit of his wife, he may relieve himself from this semi-annual demand, but he must do so under the approval of a Judge of the Supreme Court; and if he chose to become reconciled with his wife, the Act becomes inoperative, and the parties may live together again, and, as it were, start anew as man and wife. He (Mr. Macdougall) had seen in the newspapers, and the proposition had come to the knowledge of the Committee of the other House, that the husband, finding at last that the Senate was determined to re-affirm its previous decision, and that in all probability this House would concur, came to Ottawa and offered to be reconciled to his wife, but upon such conditions that the wife felt she could not, with due regard to her own honour, and respect for the position of her children, family and friends, accede to. What did he propose? That he should take her into his house as a sort of upper servant, to look after his table and his children, but he would not even promise that she should occupy her proper position in his household, or in any way guarantee her future happiness therein. Mrs. Campbell declined. She made to her husband what he (Mr. Macdougall) repeated in her name to the House, a perfectly fair proposition. She said to him, "Make no further opposition to this Bill. You say it is the reputation and position of our children you are anxious about, and that, therefore, you are willing to receive their mother, and forget the past. Will it not be greatly to the advantage of our children, in their

MR. MACDOUGALL.

future career in life, to have the verdict of Parliament in my favour? Will it not be a comfort and a benefit to them to have it recorded on the Statute-book of their country that your charge was not sustained; that your proof was not sufficient to satisfy that critical and dignified body? Will it not afford our children an immense advantage, when this unhappy dispute is referred to, to be able to say, 'Our father was mistaken; he was under a delusion; he was the victim of a conspiracy, and the fact is recorded in the Statute-book of our country, in the form of a solemn Act of Parliament?'" She spoke as a wise and prudent and loving mother would instinctively feel in such a case. Her reasoning was unanswerable; but her unreasoning and vindictive husband refused, and gave the lie to his proposal for reconciliation by distributing amongst the members of this House a printed paper containing copies of letters alleged to have been written by her, but which were proved before the Committee of the other House to have been extracts from writings found in her desk, which were ingeniously patched together and made to appear as if they were the actual letters written to her paramour. The evidence clearly showed that nearly all these extracts, harmless and unmeaning as such, were copied from books. She was addicted to literature, which proved an unfortunate pastime in her case, for the most condemnatory evidence—until its weakness was exposed—were extracts from a book which he (Mr. Macdougall) produced from the library. He was sorry to say that even a learned Judge drew the illogical inference that, because a letter, expressed in familiar and affectionate terms, was found in her desk addressed to one party, therefore she ought to be found guilty of adultery with another party. But Mr. Campbell forgot to mention in his paper, or petition, that his wife had recovered by the verdict of a jury, \$1,000 damages for the false charges made against her, and that was one of the most material facts in the history of this case. He moved the second reading of the Bill.

Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 98.]

(Mr. Tupper.)

THIRD READING.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. McCALLUM said he desired to see the Act amended so as to compel railway companies to keep up their fences. Under existing legislation, the cars might kill people's cattle, and there was no redress for it. The Railway Act, as it stood, appeared so as to allow the companies to evade responsibility for these losses. He hoped to see the Act amended so as to compel them to keep up their fences or be liable to a penalty if they did not do so.

MR. TUPPER said it was not contemplated to take up this Act and amend it in such particulars as hon. gentlemen might desire. It was inexpedient to introduce any new amendments now in the sense proposed by the hon. gentleman, unless they took up and went over the whole Act. All the Government proposed to do now, was to insert the two provisions he had alluded to. However, the Government would carefully consider the suggestion, and he hoped that any other hon. gentleman, who desired to see the Act amended in any particular, would give the Government the benefit of their suggestions which would be carefully considered during recess with the view of taking the matter up next Session. He could not see the necessity of the alteration the hon. gentleman had spoken of, because it was already provided that the railway company should make fences, and that, until such fences were duly made, the company should be liable for all damages occurring, by such negligence, to animals on the railways.

MR. GUTHRIE said this section rendered the company liable for damages for cattle killed, but the object of compelling them to maintain the fence was to protect the public, because, if cattle were allowed to stray on the railway track, they might throw trains off the track and injure the passengers. The object of the law was two-fold; but he took it that they

must have some penal clause by which they could punish the company if their trains killed the inhabitants' cattle, or injured the lives of the travelling public by neglecting their duty. He knew the circumstances of a railway company in the west, where the fences were burned down, two or three years ago, for five or six miles, and to this day they had not been built up. Those who lived along the railway, and had cattle killed, could get no redress, because the company were worth nothing. They were thus running their trains and endangering the lives of the public, and there was no way of punishing them.

MR. McCALLUM said, in a case he was aware of, the company had built the fences and let them go down, and, to his own knowledge, as many as five head of cattle had been killed at a time, without their owners getting redress. It was high time the law was amended that allowed such carryings on as that. The hon. gentleman said they were now consolidating the law; then this was just the time to make the necessary amendments. He hoped the Government would accept his amendment.

MR. TUPPER said he could not accept it. This was a matter that required the study of professional men to deal with it in all its bearings, and nothing could be more injudicious than hurriedly to accept amendments while the Bill was in Committee. He understood his hon. friend to say that the company had neglected to put up the fences. The law said that, until the fences were up, they were liable for damages. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) said that cattle strayed on the road and were killed. If the hon. gentleman would search the English law, he would not find any language to meet that case more thoroughly than the expression of the law which said, "that if the company were guilty of negligence in not keeping up the fences, they should be held responsible for damages." People had the best of protection under the law. He hoped his hon. friend would not press the amendment at this moment, because he could not accept it.

MR. McCALLUM said he considered it was the duty of whoever had charge of

this Bill to amend the law so as to remove the grievances he had complained of. The hon. gentleman said he had no time now, but he (Mr. McCallum) was not responsible for that. If the hon. gentleman had no time to consider the Bill why did he bring it in?

MR. DOMVILLE said the rights of the public should be guarded with respect to these fences. He could point to cases on the Intercolonial Railway where cattle had been killed, and no redress obtained by their owners.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he quite agreed with the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that it was not possible to amend this Bill at the present time. He understood that the hon. member was one of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and he desired to ask whether such a case as the one referred to by his hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) should not be referred to that Committee.

MR. McDONALD (Picton) said he quite agreed with the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that the citation which he had made from the law was strongly drawn, and if the company allowed the fences to remain down, they were answerable for damages. In the face of this provision of the law, he did not see any necessity for any amendment.

MR. SHAW said that the Courts in Ontario had frequently decided that parties could not recover for cattle killed by railways, at such points as the Statutes prescribed, if the cattle were running at large. The 79th section of this Act prescribed that cattle going at large within a certain distance of any railway crossing, or if they went on to the track, they were trespassing, and the price of them could not be recovered against the railway company. The object of the amendment was to compel the railway companies to keep up the fences, so as to avoid the decisions which the Courts had arrived at.

MR. TUPPER said that, last Session, an amendment was passed to the Railway Act, which, to a large extent, met the difficulty as to the neglect of the railway company. The complaint, then, was that, when cattle were killed, the investi-

gation was relegated to officers of the railway, who were naturally liable to decide that the claimant was not entitled to damages. An amendment of the law was enacted last year, under which the Government were authorised, where parties were not satisfied with the decision, to have one arbitrator sent to make a report to the Government. He thought, under the operation of that Act, most causes of complaint had been removed. He did not think there was any subordinate ground of complaint now.

On section 17,

MR. DOMVILLE said he was constrained at this point to ask in regard to the Intercolonial, that some justice should be done to the people of New Brunswick. When the elections took place on the 17th September, he had hoped that he had heard the last complaints in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. He regretted to say, however, that much dissatisfaction existed now. He had received a number of letters upon the subject, and he would, with the permission of the House, refer to the necessity of so legislating that the rates would not discriminate as between one man and another, and as between one point of the Dominion and another. His people thought it hard lines when they had, under the National Policy, to obtain their produce in the West, to have to pay more for freight from Montreal to Sussex, which was 40 miles nearer Montreal than St. John—that they should be compelled to pay \$10 a load more than the people of St. John, and that, under the present tariff, it cost more to take potatoes and cereals to Ontario from New Brunswick than to bring down flour, which was unjust. He said this without any feeling except the feeling that justice should be done to all parts of the Dominion. He thought if they were to have a National Policy, that this discrimination should not be made against one section of the country. He might make a reference in order to show that certain industries obtained a favourable discrimination. There was one manufactory who obtained a priority over other manufacturers, and his goods were carried at a reduced rate. In his humble opinion,

MR. MCCALLUM.

these discriminations were not justice. It was stated that railway men considered this all right; it might be so, but it was not common sense. He would not read the letters of complaint which he had in his possession, but would merely ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works if he could give him some assurance that the people of the Lower Provinces would not be discriminated against. He thought he had a right to ask this, not on personal grounds, not on party grounds, but on the ground of simple justice.

MR. TUPPER said his hon. friend from King's had raised a very important question. He regretted the hon. gentleman had raised it on this Bill, as he (Mr. Tupper) had proposed that the explanation should have been on the Estimates; however, the time was appropriate, and they might as well proceed with this discussion at this time as any other. He regretted very much that he was not able to give the hon. gentleman the assurance which he had asked. He could assure the hon. gentleman the subject had not escaped his notice. It had received the most careful consideration it was possible to give it, and he was free to confess he saw no solution to the difficulty. At first sight the ground of complaint appears to be a difficult one. The distance from Toronto to Halifax was further than the distance from Toronto to St. John, and the hon. gentleman complained that the charge for carrying freight was greater for carrying it a short distance. Every person knew that the distance from Toronto to Sussex was very much less than the distance from Toronto to St. John; yet the fact remained that the charge for carrying goods from Toronto to Sussex was larger than from Toronto to St. John. He saw no means of removing the difficulty. In the first place the hon. gentleman said they should disregard commercial principles in relation to the management of the railway; that the object was to produce an interchange of commodities, and, therefore, whether it costs the country less or more, they must make the rates of freight to suit the wishes of the people. He did not think that he or any other Minister of Public Works could ask this Parliament to spend more than half a

million a year in paying the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway. He did not think it possible for any person holding the high and responsible position he did to venture to ask the House to incur any larger expenditure for the purpose of operating the Intercolonial Railway than had previously been incurred. If that were the case, they must deal with it as a commercial enterprise. The Government was powerless in this matter, even if they were disposed to meet the difficulty alluded to. The rates on flour from Ontario to the Maritime Provinces were as low as it was possible to make them consistently with justice to the whole country, in relation to the cost of carrying it. The road, instead of paying, was run at a heavy loss, and, in order to promote traffic, the rates had been placed as low by his predecessor as he believed they could be. But he might be asked why was it they charged a larger amount for carrying the same article a shorter distance. The reason was perfectly plain. Halifax and St. John, N.B., were points at which the Intercolonial Railway had competition, and every person knew that the prime factor in cutting rates was competition. In Halifax the competition was keener with the Intercolonial than it was at St. John, because there was a line of steam communication running from Portland to Halifax in direct competition with the railway, and, in order to retain the business, the railway must reduce their rates. At the intervening stations, however, they were able to maintain their rates, because there was no competition; but if they desired to reduce the rates, in accordance with the wishes of the hon. gentleman's constituents, they were powerless to do so, because the rate was made by the Grand Trunk Railway—it was made by the parties who transmitted freight to the Intercolonial for carriage. He would tell his hon. friend that the Grand Trunk Railway Company was making a demand upon the Intercolonial Railroad of a considerable sum of money, because they allowed freight that was rated for St. John to stop at these way stations on the road, at the same charge that was made to St. John. The Grand Trunk demanded that they should be recouped, and that the Intercolonial should refund to them the

difference, consequently the Government had no power to stop at Sussex or Moncton, or any other place on the line, and deliver goods at the same rate that was charged through to St. John, without paying back to the Grand Trunk, the difference between the rates to the way stations and the point from which the traffic was taken. The hon. gentleman would, therefore, see that the rates to St. John and Halifax were regulated by competition, and that they were utterly powerless to reduce the rates to the intermediate stations.

Mr. DOMVILLE asked why should not the railroad carry the flour up to these places, which were a very little further off, at their own expense? Why these people should be thrown into the hands of large places such as Halifax and St. John, was more than he could understand. They were told that, under the National Policy, they were going to make iron for the Upper Provinces. Iron could not be freighted from Halifax to Montreal under two or three times the price for which English iron could be freighted. They were met with the argument that the English iron was through freight; admitting that, still, if through freight was to go at that rate, of what good was the duty on iron? He could not see why the English iron should be carried cheaper than native iron. Five years they had been groaning under the trouble and tribulation of that railroad, and to-day there was very little improvement. He did not blame the Minister of Public Works, because he had a great deal of work to attend to, but brought up the matter to see whether some solution of the difficulty might not be arrived at. He brought this matter before the House, the Government and the country; it was his duty to do so, and the Minister of Public Works must, hereafter, take the responsibility if the necessary alterations were not made, as it was not in his power to remedy what he considered a serious injustice to the Lower Provinces.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) asked if the Intercolonial tariff discriminated in favour of Spring Hill Mines and against Pictou Mines. He understood that an important memorial had been given to the Government by the Pictou Mining Association in reference

to this matter, and he knew that a very short time ago the tariff was that, from Spring Hill, a cargo of coal was carried 91 miles for \$16, and from Elmsdale 71 miles for \$13. He had, within the last couple of weeks, received a number of letters asking him to bring up this matter.

Mr. TUPPER said it was necessary to have lower rates to Halifax and St. John, because the railway met keen competition from steamers at those points. His hon. friend said, why not make the rate to St. John and carry it back to these way-stations for nothing. The moment that would be done, everyone would send flour to St. John by water to be distributed all over the country by the Intercolonial for nothing. With regard to iron, the Londonderry Mines were bringing all the power they could to bear on the Government to induce them to reduce the very low rates which were judiciously arranged by the late manager, Mr. Brydges, on the ground that they carried iron that came from England in the steamers at a lower rate. The Government did not make the rate on the English iron. It came in connection with a mass of through freight, which paid foreign rates. The question was, whether they should take the through rate that was made in England, and have the business come to Halifax, or put up the rate and drive that business to Portland. The statement that there was any discrimination in favour of Spring Hill Mines was entirely unfounded.

Mr. DOMVILLE said the hon. the Minister of Public Works stated he had not proved his case. He had, however, proved that English iron could be carried from Halifax to the Upper Provinces at one-half the rate of native iron. Handicapped in that direction, the native iron could not compete with the English iron. He hoped the Minister of Public Works would find means to remedy this difficulty.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) said the member for King's (Mr. Domville), did not put the matter fairly. If it were a question of English iron remaining at Halifax, and thence being shipped to the West at half the rate of native iron, there would be reason in his argument. But,

Mr. TUPPER.

unfortunately, that was not the case. The rate was determined in England, not in relation to the Intercolonial Railway, but by the rate for which that iron could be brought into any part of Canada from England. There were other ways of getting into Canada besides by the Intercolonial, and were the rate raised, the iron would be sent to American ports, and thence into Canada. It was not fair to compare the freight from Halifax on English iron with that on native iron. The comparison should be made between what it cost to bring iron from England to Montreal or Toronto, and the freight from Halifax to those cities on native iron. This question of through rates was an exceedingly difficult one to settle, and one which would always give occasion for complaint against the Government, while they retained railways under their control.

MR. DOULL said he had received a letter from the Secretary of the Pictou Mining Association which confirmed the statement of the hon. member for Shelburn (Mr. Robertson) that there was discrimination in favour of the Spring Hill Mines. He had forwarded the letter to the Minister of Public Works, who, he trusted, would see that this matter was adjusted. With respect to iron, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) was right. Iron was carried from Great Britain to Montreal at a through rate of freight of \$3 per ton, while iron from the Nova Scotia mines had to pay something like \$4. That was most unfair and should be altered.

MR. GUTHRIE said in regard to the 25th and other sections, many of their larger railways did not come under their operation, and it was desirable they should. One of these provisions was, that railways should be held liable to the public for any negligence or omission in handling goods, notwithstanding any notice, condition, or declaration to the contrary. In shipping by a railway, the shipper was often obliged to sign a contract containing a number of conditions exempting the company from liability. Under the second subsection of section 2, the Grand Trunk, Great Western, and Northern Railroads—all the great railroads—escaped liability, because not constructed under an Act of Parliament

of the Dominion. Railways subsequently constructed under this and other clauses were liable. He would suggest that those provisions of this Act be made to apply, not only to every railway built under the authority of an Act of this Parliament, but to every railway subject to its legislative authority, and as the great railways are subject to it, they ought to be governed by this Act.

MR. SHAW said the Bill should be amended so as to require sounding of the whistle as well as the ringing of the bell, or without the ringing of the bell, on the approach of trains to crossings and stations. At present, accidents occurred from the bells not being heard.

MR. TUPPER said that, with reference to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), the adoption of his amendment would involve a substantial alteration in the law. He would consider the subject, however. He did not see why the law had not been made applicable to all the laws within the jurisdiction of Parliament. It was the same with reference to the amendment of the member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw). A substantial difference would be made in the law, involving a penalty. Doubtless the amendment suggested would be a great improvement, but, as it involved penalties where they did not exist, he was not then prepared to adopt it; it would be considered, however.

MR. GUTHRIE said that, if his contention was correct, a change would be absolutely necessary, because, otherwise, there would be nothing to bind those older railway companies, who had no Railway Act referring to them. He hoped attention would be given to this matter at once. He thought that Ministers would find it to the interest of the public to make those clauses refer to all railway companies.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

MR. TUPPER moved the third reading of the Bill.

MR. MILLS said he desired it should be reported as carried on a division.

Neither he himself nor the House had had time to consider a Bill of such extent and importance at this advanced period of the Session. It should have been brought up earlier in the House, when there was little or nothing to do.

MR. TUPPER said he had resisted some proposals for amendments that appeared to be quite reasonable, because there was no intention of altering the law, except the two particular points noticed. Every possible precaution had been taken to secure the most perfect accuracy. He did not quite catch what fell from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull), but, if he understood him to refer to the accuracy of the statement of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson), he was labouring under a mistake. There had been no discrimination against the Pictou coal mines, or in favour of the Spring Hill—the rate per ton was the same in both cases. Unless there was a pretence that coal should be carried 100 miles by the Intercolonial Railway for nothing, he knew of no ground for complaint on the part of the member for Pictou. Then there was this to be considered. The Spring Hill coal mines had been giving all their business, summer as well as winter, to the Intercolonial. They furnished a vast amount of freight for the road, and at a rate which, although low, had been somewhat profitable, whilst the Pictou coal mines only used the road during the winter, when the cost of carriage was much greater than in summer. Under these circumstances, he could not see there was any reasonable claim on the part of the latter company that coal should be carried from their mine over the road for nothing.

MR. DOULL said the hon. the Minister of Public Works would see the letters that he (Mr. Doull) had forwarded to him to-day from the Secretary of the Coal Mining Association of Pictou, which confirmed the statement made by the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson). Whether it was correct or not, he was not prepared to say. So far as giving the preference to Spring Hill, on account of it giving its business to the railroad in summer as well as winter, was concerned, he did not think that was a good argument.

MR. MILLS.

MR. TUPPER said there was no preference that he knew of. The same rate per ton and mile was charged from Pictou as from Spring Hill. He had asked the gentleman in charge of the Intercolonial Railway if he had made a careful examination of the communications from the Mining Association in Pictou. He said he had, and that there was not the slightest ground for the impression that there was a discrimination in favour of the Spring Hill Mines, that precisely the same charge was made in each case.

Bill read the third time, on a division, and passed.

SUPPLY.

XXVI.—EXCISE.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

181	{	Salaries of Officers and Inspectors of Excise.....	\$175,240 00
		Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, Stationery, etc....	35,000 00
		To pay Collectors of Customs allowance on duties collected by them.....	2,000 00
		Preventive Service.....	5,500 00

XXVII.—CULLING TIMBER.

182	{	Quebec Office.....	\$62,900 00
		Montreal Office.....	4,600 00

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said he saw that the estimate for the ensuing year was \$67,500, whilst last year it was only \$49,000. He desired to ask the hon. the Minister if he was prepared to accept the suggestion he (Mr. White) made last year, that there would be a reduction in the cost of measuring charges at the port of Quebec. During the last few years this service had produced a considerable sum in excess of the requirements. This excess, which, during the past eleven years, amounted to \$40,211, as shown by the Public Accounts, had been a special tax on the trade during that period. He believed it was about time there should be a reduction in the charges at that port, to such an extent as would make the amount of collections more than would be required to meet expenses.

MR. BABY said that, instead of there being an excess, there had been, altogether, since Confederation, a deficit of some \$340.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said the Public Accounts showed an entirely different state of affairs:—

In 1868 there was a surplus of.....	\$	324
1869 do deficit of.....		4,000
1870 do surplus of.....		7,000
1871 do do		1,000
1872 do do		8,880
1873 do do		10,000
1874 do do		13,000
1875 do do		8,000
1876 do do		5,000
1877 do deficit of		1,044
1878 do surplus of.....		6,734

Adding the surpluses together, and deducting therefrom the deficits, it showed a total surplus of \$40,211. Against that, however, the returns showed an uncollected balance of \$29,981. But that uncollected balance could not be assumed as entirely lost to the country, because he knew that a number of specifications, as a general thing, upon which charges were made, remained in the office until the charges upon them were paid. In a season of depression, such as that undergone by the lumber trade during the last two years, very few of those engaged in the trade took out their specifications, for the simple reason that they were unable to dispose of their lumber. He presumed that the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue was correct, that a larger amount had been expended than was received; yet, he took it that there would be a surplus, as almost the whole amount owing to the Department would be collected. Therefore, taking these circumstances into consideration, he contended that a reduction should be made in the cost of measuring timber.

MR. LAURIER said his hon. friend, the Minister of Inland Revenue, had, he thought, referred to one class of cullers, the cullers of square timber. Under the law of 1876 or 1877, they were to be paid at the rate of \$700 per annum. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) knew as well as anybody that the cullers complained that they were not overpaid, and he (Mr. Laurier) knew, from his short passage through the Department, that they had been strongly

pressing for an increased tariff. But he did not think it would be possible to meet their wishes, unless the tariff were reconsidered both as far as the work was concerned and as far as the cullers were concerned. During the summer they had not much to do, but their whole year was lost, because they could not devote themselves to any other occupation. They had to report themselves from time to time to the office, and could not be long absent. He thought they should be better remunerated than at present. It would also be right and proper if the Minister could see his way clear to place the deal cullers on the same footing as the square cullers.

MR. CURRIER said the hon. gentleman from North Renfrew (Mr. White) had stated the fees for culling ought to be reduced. Considering the great falling off of timber, he would find it impossible to do that. This year, he was told, there would not be over 24 rafts going to Quebec, whereas last year there were from 75 to 140. Unless the expenses of the office in Quebec could be reduced, as well as the number of cullers, it would be impossible to reduce the fees charged for culling timber. He maintained that one-quarter of the cullers on the list last year could do all the work that was to be done this year. But while the present system prevailed the fees for culling could never be reduced. He thought, moreover, that the expenses of the officers might also be reduced, and if any vacancies occurred they need not be filled. He hoped the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would look into the matter and see if some way could not be derived whereby the charges for culling would be reduced. He had nothing to say against the officers in that office; they did their duty, but what he found fault with was that there was not work enough for them to do.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) concurred in what had fallen from the hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Mr. Currier) that the number of officers might well be reduced. He desired to bear testimony to the very efficient manner in which the deputy supervisor and the cashier had performed their duties. They had given satisfaction to the trade, and if the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue could

see his way to increase their salaries he would be doing them justice.

MR. BABY said that his predecessor, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) had stated that he (Mr. Baby) was mistaken in the statement he had made about the expenditure being less than the receipts in the culling of timber. He found by an official statement containing the receipts and payments of the Department in regard to the culling of timber from 1867 down to the 31st of March last, that there was a balance against the Government of \$376.72. This statement showed all the fees from the culling of the square timber, the deals, and the staves, and it applied to both receipts and payments. The arrears amounted to \$29,781. The hon. gentleman must know that the greater part of these arrears could not be collected, for he was sure, if there had been any possibility of collecting these arrears, his hon. predecessor would have done so. The arrears had not increased, he supposed, during his (Mr. Laurier's) time, and he hoped they would not during the present Administration. He did not see how the fees could be diminished. As to the deputy supervisor and the cashier at Quebec, he believed they were worthy officers, but it seemed to him that \$1,600 a year, for the work they did during seven months of each year, was a sufficient salary, under the circumstances, and when compared to the salaries of other officers.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said these arrears were not so valueless as some supposed. In 1876, the arrears were \$33,901, and in 1878, they had been reduced to \$26,880. They were thus a fluctuating account, and formed an asset that was collectable.

MR. CURRIER said he was surprised that there should be so many arrears. Whenever he had anything to do with that office, he never could get a specification for culling without paying the charges. It was a grave matter for the officers to let specifications out of the office without getting paid for them. There must be something wrong somewhere, and he hoped the hon. Minister would look into it.

MR. WHITE.

In answer to Mr. HOOPER,

MR. BABY said he found these arrears when he came into office, and his intention was to collect them. He could not tell how they came to be so considerable, but was afraid there had been a screw loose somewhere in the previous administration of the Department.

MR. LAURIER said these arrears had been accumulating during a period of ten years. Some of them were tedious claims, arising out of a difference of opinion between the Department and the parties charged. He knew that a number of suits were now pending in Quebec for the collection of these arrears.

Vote agreed to.

XXVIII.—WEIGHTS AND MEASURES
AND GAS.

183 Salaries of Deputy Inspectors
of Weights and Measures... \$40,800 00

In answer to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. BABY said he proposed to make the reduction of \$14,000 in this item by reducing the number of deputy inspectors. There had been, in Ontario, forty-four of these officers; in Quebec, thirty-three; and in the other Provinces in a similar proportion. The intention of the Government was to appoint inspectors for the different Provinces to the number of seven for Ontario, four for Quebec, three for New Brunswick, three for Nova Scotia, one each for Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia. In the large centres of Toronto, Montreal and Halifax, there would be two or three assistants. The intention of the Government was to increase somewhat the salaries of the inspectors in the large centres. Those in Quebec, Toronto and Montreal, \$1,200 each, and the assistants would receive \$500 each. In Ontario, under the new law, the number of officers, comprising inspectors and assistants, would be twenty-two; in Quebec, ten. He should retain, as much as possible, those who had performed their duties well, and discharge those who had not. He hoped that this reduction would meet the approbation of the House and country.

MR. ANGLIN said this was another instance in which the present Administration had disappointed their most earnest supporters and the people of the country. This Act was one they had declared entirely indefensible. He had hoped the Government would have introduced a measure to transfer the appointing of inspectors and regulating of their fees to the municipalities or counties.

MR. CURRIER said the law was a heavy tax on the people. It would be a great boon to have it repealed and let the people go back to the old arrangement.

MR. TUPPER said he had maintained this was one of the most important laws on the Statutes, and was always prepared to take his share of the responsibility of the measure. It had been rendered unpopular by bringing it into operation long before the Government were prepared to administer it effectually. A large number of officials were foisted on the country without having anything to do, or without having the machinery requisite for their work. The Act was absolutely necessary. The amount which had been swindled from the people through false weights and measures, was ample justification of the Act, and all that was required to convince the people of its usefulness, was a just administration of it.

MR. ORTON said he agreed with the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that this law was required; but he would have to get further information before he could exactly be convinced that all the evils complained of with regard to the operations of the Act under the late Administration, were removed. One of the principal complaints was, that the inspectors charged exorbitant rates, and when the people attempted to get their scales corrected by their own mechanics, they were found fault with, and the people were compelled to have them again examined by these men who charged exorbitant fees for their work. If that system were allowed to continue, the Act would be brought into further disrepute.

MR. BUNSTER said there was absolute necessity for this Act. In one of the collieries in British Columbia a riot took place, because the men felt they

were being swindled by false weights and measures. Representations were made to the Local Government, who replied it was a Dominion affair, and they could do nothing in the matter. Now these were facts, and he hoped the Government would not wink in seeing that this law was vigorously enforced. At present the honest trader had no chance whatever in competing with the dishonest, who could use false weights and measures. He was sorry to hear the member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier), saying that the law should be done away with. What was to be done in that case—was every householder to keep scales in his house? It was the duty of the Government to appoint officers who would do their duty, and ensure justice to all.

MR. SPROULE said that the people in his district considered the law necessary, but complained of its Administration. He could confirm the remarks made as to the charges being double or treble the proper amount. He knew of an inspector, a very courteous man, who would advise traders to sell, to the farmers, scales troublesome to re-adjust, and purchase others, which was not remedying the evil, but merely shifting it from one class to another. Defective scales and measures should be entirely excluded from business. Another defect of the present administration of the law, was the excessive cost of inspection. He knew also of an inspector advising parties to purchase from one particular dealer, thus tending to create a monopoly, and giving colour to the suspicion of a speculation. The law was considered very good, but expensive in execution. The results were not supposed to commensurate the cost of its administration. This law, with that of the adulteration of foods, was among the most important on the Statute-book, and might be much more cheaply carried out.

MR. CURRIER said he did not affirm that the law was bad, but hitherto it had been impossible to carry it out properly; besides, it was too expensive. Possibly the change made by the Inland Revenue Department, last fall, would remedy the evil, though he did not expect much improvement. How often were those officers to make their inspec-

tion? They could not be expected more than once or twice a year, and people could imagine what might be done to falsify weights and scales between their visits, and when nobody was present to watch the offenders. If this service was left to the municipalities it might be made better and cost less.

Mr. HOOPER said that the administration of the Act was universally detested not only in his, but in the adjoining ridings, and the unanimous request to him was to vote for the repeal of the Bill. Unless some other system was adopted, the people would continue dissatisfied. If the law was properly carried out, it would be beneficial.

Mr. BERGIN said there could be no doubt that the Minister of Public Works was correct in observing that that was one of the most important measures on the Statute-book; but it was equally true that the administration of the law had been made so oppressive, and in many instances so unjust, that in some localities it was looked upon with detestation. The difficulty was not that the law was bad, but it had been badly administered. He trusted there would now be a change for the better. He would impress on the Minister of Inland Revenue the importance of being very careful in the selection of officers, who should be properly qualified for their duties, not only by education, but by a freedom from the meddlesome habit or the desire to exercise their authority excessively.

Mr. ANGLIN said he did not object to a proper inspection of weights and measures, but this law had so far proved insufficient, and become so unpopular in many districts, that hon. gentlemen on the other side had found it to their interest to denounce the administration of the law, and the law itself, throughout the country. They had not been told by Ministers what the administration of the law was henceforth to be, but simply that there was to be a reduction in the number of inspectors and sub-inspectors, and that the duties were to be discharged more efficiently, without being informed how this would be accomplished. Nothing had been said to satisfy the Committee that the law would

be more efficiently administered. He thought it would be impossible to carry it out efficiently for the amount named, the country being so large, and the number of those who bought or sold by weight and measure being so great. How was the oppressive operation of the law to be remedied? The fees were fixed, and where weights or scales were condemned, they might be readjusted where the owners pleased, or better might be purchased. But, although it was absolutely necessary to get defective scales put aside or readjusted—that was what was regarded as so oppressive and troublesome—it was possible, in the cities and other large centres, to have efficient inspection. But the zeal of the officers was found fault with. They could not be efficient without becoming troublesome; they must examine and condemn when necessary. The law would be very troublesome in any way administered. They could have a system under which officers would inspect and pass all weights and measures and condemn nobody, and so satisfy all. He thought that the work could not be properly done with the proposed number of officers. Every trader should feel himself liable to be visited, at any moment, and punished were he guilty of fraud. The new would not, he thought, work better than the old system, and it would be better to empower the municipalities to appoint inspectors, and to clothe those officers with all necessary powers, including power to collect the requisite dues for their remuneration. Considering the unpopularity incurred by the late Government in connection with this Act, and all that had been said for some years past in the House and elsewhere by hon. gentlemen now at the Speaker's right, the hon. the Minister of Public Works could not reasonably imagine that he (Mr. Anglin) had gone out of his way to indulge in taunts on the subject.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Tupper) used very loud words about mal-administration of the law. It was very easy using general terms, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) would like the hon. gentleman to define more clearly where the mal-administration was. If the hon. gentleman said it

consisted in appointing too many officials, he would tell him that the matter gave the Government a great deal of trouble, and the conclusion arrived at was that one officer to about 40,000 people was as near as possible what one officer could overtake in the way of work, and the appointments were made accordingly. These appointments were not all made at once. The hon. the Minister of Public Works stated they were made too early. He (Mr. Mackenzie) believed they were, simply because the Government had reason to believe that standards were available at once. But an unaccountable, unexpected delay in procuring these standards, which it was supposed would have been here in time, took place on the part of the officer of the Department, whose duty it was to obtain them. There could be no possible disposition on the part of the Government to appoint improper officers. There was no mal-administration in that. He counted ten gentlemen appointed when the present Government came into office, who were not fit for office. The saving proposed to be effected by the hon. gentlemen opposite, was simply by appointing fewer in number and imposing a larger area upon them. If the work was to be done at all, he denied that it could be done by the number supposed. It was mere speculation. There was no intelligent conclusion in the matter—it was purely a groping in the dark. The unpopularity attaching to one measure was owing to the excessive stringency with which the rules were carried out. He was amused when he found that such orders were issued, as required inspectors to stamp and obtain fees for every measure in hardware shops. Ten cents were charged in some cases upon the three-foot tape lines used by seamstresses, and carpenters' foot rules—of which a dozen could be sold for a couple of dollars. It became the duty of the late Government to have these absurd rules rescinded and have them made moderately correct. It also became their duty in 1877, to amend the law very materially. Was that mal-administration? As time developed many evils connected with the law, they had these evils removed, and he believed the system, so far as it could be made to work, was working tolerably well when

the late Government left office. Some gentlemen mentioned that some inspectors were engaged in some way or other as agents for the owners of machines, selling them. Some accusations of this sort came under the notice of the late Government, but he was not aware of any case having been established. By comparing the original Act with the modifications made in 1877, it would be found that instead of there being mal-administration there was an honest and resolute attempt to have the law carried out properly, and in such a way as not to entail hardship. Another thing the late Government found, and that was that every manufacturer making an improved weighing machine, and putting it in his shop, had to have it stamped or he was liable to a fine, and they also found that the law justified this extraordinary rule. They, therefore, provided, in the amended Act, that a manufacturer or dealer, having weighing machines in his possession for sale, should not be bound to have the same inspected and stamped, so long as the same remained in his manufactory or warehouse. He might go over all clauses of the amended Act and point out all the modifications which the late Government made to the original law, and the ameliorations that were effected. They had to encounter all the hostility to the law, and that hostility was very great in the country. They had to encounter all the difficulty of putting the law into operation, and now the hon. gentleman, Mr. Tupper, must indulge in loud talk about mal-administration. He (Mr. Mackenzie) remembered when the hon. gentleman was sitting on the Opposition side of the House, he charged him (Mr. Mackenzie) with mal-administration of the Intercolonial Railway in imposing what he Mr. Tupper called outrageous rates, and yet, to-night, the House found the hon. gentleman endorsing what had been done by him (Mr. Mackenzie), and declaring that when he looked into it, he found the rates were very fair, and there was nothing to complain of. He was sure that anyone who looked at the position taken by the late Government in relation to the Weights and Measures Act, would find that they adopted every possible means in order to have the law fairly carried out. An hon. gentleman spoke about repealing the law.

The Government must remember that was a very serious matter. But he (Mr. Mackenzie) had to consider that, while the law, under the old Province of Canada, was under the administration of the local officers of the Provinces, this law was repealed by the superior authority of the Dominion, that the Local Parliament had no further authority to re-enact it, and that the repealing of this law would leave them entirely without any law whatever with regard to the regulation of weights and measures. No one could ask that such a state of anarchy should be introduced. It was practically impossible, and was utterly destructive of all surveillance of weights and measures, because nothing would be put in its place. He believed that, generally, under the Provincial law of Ontario, this law was fairly administered. He denied that there was, what the hon. gentleman called universal demoralisation, cheating in the administration of the Weights and Measures Law. He was bound to say that, so far as he had been able to ascertain since this law went into operation, that it had made no change whatever in the receipts, and that the weights and measures were as fairly inspected as under the old law, though not under immediate Government supervision. He could only say, with regard to this law now, that he would be bound, as a member of the House, partially responsible for putting it in operation, to give every assistance to make the law effective, to remedy the defects that might exist in it, and to assist in any legislation required to accomplish that object. But he was not to sit down quietly and hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) throw taunts and accusations of mal-administration across the House, for he utterly defied him to prove any mal-administration of the law.

MR. TUPPER said he was prepared to prove by the most conclusive evidence, before any Committee that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) chose to move for, the statement he made to the fullest extent. He charged the hon. gentleman and his Administration with having involved this important measure in the greatest and gravest unpopularity and he would state the grounds upon which he made that

MR. MACKENZIE.

charge. The Administration which preceded him (Mr. Mackenzie) had placed on the Statute-book an Act for the purpose of providing due inspection of weights and measures. The hon. gentleman had stated that he (Mr. Tupper) said there was universal cheating over the country. He (Mr. Tupper) denied it. He said he found evidence had been brought before the Government that established conclusively the fact that, either through dishonesty or ignorance, the conditions of things that existed demanded at the hands of the Government the introduction of this measure; that the evidence they had collected as to the condition of the weights and measures of this country was sufficient to show that no Government could faithfully carry out the duty imposed upon it, of providing for a just meting out of fair weight and fair measure to the masses of the people, who were being cheated, either through ignorance or dishonesty. He had never stated that there was universal cheating and swindling, and the hon. gentleman had put words in his (Mr. Tupper's) mouth he had never used. With regard to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Mackenzie's) excuse for appointing the officials too soon, he would state that the measure put on the Statute-book provided that it should not become law until the Government were prepared to see it carried into execution properly. The provision of the law that said it should not go into operation until the proclamation was issued by the Governor-General, was intended to prevent the law being carried into effect before the Government was ready to administer the law, and to prevent the country being thrown into confusion, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie), by mal-administration under that law, had thrown the country, by issuing the proclamation before he was prepared to execute the law. Why, the hon. gentleman himself admits mal-administration.

MR. MACKENZIE: No; he does not.

MR. TUPPER said yes. He (Mr. Mackenzie) admitted issuing the proclamation, and bringing the law into operation, long before he could carry it into execution, and then attempted to throw

the responsibility upon a subordinate officer of the Government. Was the hon. gentleman not able to enquire of the Minister of Inland Revenue whether he was prepared to put the law into operation, or did he put such an incompetent man in charge of the Department that the country was placed in the condition he admitted it to have been in? If he admitted that the hon. gentleman had admitted to the fullest extent all that he (Mr. Tupper) had charged, a graver act of mal-administration could not be shown. No person could formulate a more distinct act of mal-administration than that a Government should bring into operation a law, by a proclamation which was provided in the law, for the purpose of preventing it being brought into operation until the Government were prepared with means to carry it out properly. Yet, although the late Government were not in a position to put the law into execution properly, they fastened the salaries of one hundred officials upon the Treasury, at a time when those officials had nothing to do. It was soon shown, throughout the country, that this measure, which was supposed to have been framed for the benefit of the people at large, was used to find places for the friends of the Administration. That was the position of the matter, and he contended he had sustained his charge out of the evidence of the hon. gentleman's own mouth. He (Mr. Tupper) could point to several counties in the Dominion where these officials were drawing public money whom the Government had provided with no means whatever for carrying out the law. They were doing nothing except feeding themselves at the public crib, and giving nothing in return. He (Mr. Tupper) denied that he was inconsistent in reference to his statements in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. He (Mr. Mackenzie) said that he (Mr. Tupper) had charged him with having committed a great outrage; made a great blunder in fixing the tariff on the Intercolonial Railway. So he (Mr. Tupper) had, and he did it justly. After he (Mr. Mackenzie) got in power, the General Manager of the road, of course on the authority of the late Government, increased the freights some twenty per cent., and he

(Mr. Tupper) said it was a blunder and a mistake, because, instead of increasing the receipts, they would lose money, that instead of putting money into the Public Treasury, it would be taken out of it. So it proved, and the result was that the hon. gentleman, or the Manager of the Intercolonial Railway, reconsidered the tariff, and after altering it a dozen times, it was brought back to the condition the hon. gentleman found it when he got into office. He (Mr. Tupper) said in his place at the time, that he was glad to find the hon. gentleman ready to learn by experience.

MR. MACKENZIE: Where did you say that?

MR. TUPPER: I said it from the place where you are now sitting.

MR. MACKENZIE: I would like the hon. gentleman to find any place where he said that.

MR. TUPPER said he could find that, on more than one occasion, he had made the statement he was now repeating, where he showed that the hon. gentlemen opposite had changed the tariff, and that, having found his (Mr. Tupper's) statement to be correct, they altered the tariff until it was brought back to the condition in which they found it. He defied the hon. gentleman to show any exception taken by him to that tariff from the time that was done—some three years ago. But the hon. gentleman found it was much easier to derange traffic, to drive people off the railway, and compel them to find other means of carrying on their traffic than to bring it back, and the road was suffering to this hour from the mistake the hon. gentleman made when he came into power.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, during the whole time the hon. gentleman sat opposite him during the last Parliament, he never ventured one word of approval of anything he (Mr. Mackenzie) ever did that he could remember. He could remember well, however, that the hon. gentleman, in a manly way, undertook the responsibility of the Weights and Measures Act, and he could do nothing less than that, but to-night he was so unfair as to attempt to saddle on the late Administration all the odium

that was cast on Parliament in consequence of that Act. He could produce Conservative journals by the dozen that ascribed the authorship of that Bill to him (Mr. Mackenzie) and his Government, but those papers did not blame the administration of the Act but the Act itself. It was the excessive charges that made the Act unpopular in the country. If they had been decreased, as they were under the amended Act of 1877, there would have been little of that outcry. It was the Act itself that was unpopular, and hon. gentlemen opposite confessed last year it was unpopular. Now, however, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) chose to throw all the odium of the unpopularity of the Act upon the late Administration, and declared that the measure itself was all that man could do, but it only lacked the immense abilities and the great honesty of the hon. member for Cumberland to put it in operation and make it popular.

MR. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) said, if the Act was so badly administered everywhere as it was in his own county, he did not wonder it was unpopular. He could give the hon. gentleman from Lambton a case in point, on the authority of the Inspector of Weights and Measures for the county of Cape Breton, who was a well-qualified and truthful officer, that when he began to put the law into force, he did so in several districts, but when he was about visiting certain other districts, he got instructions from the Government not to do so, and the consequence was, that the law had not been administered in certain districts up to last fall. This had caused great dissatisfaction in his county. In the district of North Sydney, the Inspector informed him last fall that none of the business men had had their measures inspected, and that he had had express orders from Ottawa not to put the measure in force in that district.

MR. MACKENZIE said he hoped the Government would bring down these instructions from the Department.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) said it was important that they should have just weights and measures but, frankly, he could not see that they derived any bene-

MR. MACKENZIE.

fit from the Act under discussion. The scale was brought in to be inspected, the weights might be correct, and the man went away with the scale and commenced his operations of weighing and measuring just as before. But did that make a man honest? There was no way of making him honest, and the Act amounted to nothing. If a man was disposed to give false weight or measure, there were ways enough of doing it, and this Act would not prevent him. Take a platform scale: it might be perfectly correct, but the man weighed as he pleased, and what control could we have over him? It was well to say we should have just weights and measures, and honest men would have them, and would use them honestly, whether they were inspected or not, for the sake of their reputation. After all, the great sums formerly expended in the administration of this might almost as well be kept in the Treasury for all the good it did the country. He himself had his weights and platform scales, and he could take them to the Inspector and pay him his fee, but that did not make him an honest weigher of grain; he could arrange them in five minutes so that he could take extra weight, and the inspection amounted to nothing. The Government, however, proposed a saving of some \$40,000 in the carrying out of the provisions of the Act. All he could say was, that it was a sound procedure, and in the right direction.

MR. HUNTINGTON said it was desirable that a matter of this kind should be discussed without regard to party advantages, and he regretted that the hon. the Minister of Public Works could not have allowed it to occupy the undivided attention of the House upon its merits, instead of making it the occasion of unfair attacks upon his predecessor in the Department. The hon. gentleman said the law was all right, but what he complained of was, that the late Government issued a proclamation to give it effect. The hon. gentleman, moreover, was unhappy in his allusions to a Committee. He knew quite well that no Committee could be appointed now; he had no intention of asking for one. The habit which prevailed in this House on the part of certain hon. gentlemen of rising

and declaring what great things could be revealed by a Committee, was an empty boast and had better be dropped, as those hon. gentlemen dared not move for a Committee. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) really regarded it as important to show the malfeasance in office of the hon. gentleman from Lambton, it was his duty to move for a Committee. He talked about what he could prove by a Committee. It was unworthy the hon. gentleman in his high position to say this without putting his threats into execution. He complained that his hon. friend's (Mr. Mackenzie's) Government, issued a proclamation before the standards were ready. Supposing he did, and made a mistake; the hon. gentleman who enacted the law declared it was all right. The Conservative party at the last election sought to take advantage of the unpopularity of the law which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had passed, by trying to make the people believe it had been passed by the late Government. In all the counties which he (Mr. Huntington) had been in, this was one of the standing accusations against the late Government. It was well known that the people were accustomed to a certain way of doing things, that could not be changed without creating some unpopularity; but, sometimes, a statesman had to run the risk of unpopularity in order to accomplish a great public good. If the hon. gentleman had found it necessary to introduce a system to regulate weights and measures, he might, at least, have undertaken it with a sense of responsibility, and with a statesman's willingness to brave unpopularity for the public good. But what did the hon. gentleman do? He passed the law, and then, when he found it unpopular, he disowned it, and declared that he did not proclaim the laws, and it was all the fault of those on this side of the House. There could be no more unhappy position in which the hon. gentleman could place himself than one regarding his own child; looking into its eyes with the dear affection of a parent, he declared that he never intended to open its eyes. The fact was, the law was an unpopular one, as it would be unpopular in England to change the currency to dollars and cents. If this law was necessary, it

ought to be carried out in a patriotic disposition by both sides of the House. He hoped that the amendments which would be made to it would be successful, and that they would not be passed in a sense of partisanship.

MR. BABY said he wished to answer the hon. gentleman from Lambton, who stated that this intended reduction was not systematic, and that we were groping in the dark. He must say that he had not framed this measure entirely alone; considering himself inexperienced, from the short time he had been in office, he was obliged to ask the assistance of officers of the Department, and particularly to one appointed by his hon. predecessor. This gentleman, who had had great experience, went round the country and reported exactly what he (Mr. Baby) stated a few months ago—that the system might be remodelled, and that a great saving might be effected by grouping, as he had done, different counties into inspection districts. That gentleman was Mr. Johnson, his hon. predecessor's appointé. He was guided considerably by the report made to the Department by that officer. The hon. gentleman said the law was odious by reason of the excessive charges collected under it. His hon. friend was labouring under misapprehension; there was nothing of the kind in the law; the charges were imposed by an Order in Council passed by the hon. gentleman from Lambton and his colleagues. If the law had been rendered unpopular, it was by these charges which traders found onerous, and also by the unhappy selection made of the Deputy Inspector by the late Government. He thought his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) had a right to be proud of his child, seeing it was adopted immediately by the late Government as soon as they came into power. They had brought it up carelessly, spoiled it, and made it bad, but he hoped the present Government would manifest more interest in it, redeem it, and make it of some use to the country.

MR. ALLISON said that, in his opinion, the inspector had never visited Hants in his official capacity, but merely contented himself with drawing a good salary for nominal duty. He referred to the lumber trade in his county, which had been nearly ruined by the large

increase of tariff on the new branch of the Intercolonial through that county, and it was not until the leading organs of the late Government had drawn attention to those heavy rates that they altered them.

MR. MACMILLAN said the Inspector for the city of London and the East Riding of Middlesex, was in the pay of the Government for several months before he paid a single visit to that locality. After he had been appointed and had got a standard, it became necessary to enquire into his conduct, and it was found that there were discrepancies in his inspections in some ten or fifteen instances. He was consequently suspended. Though there were discrepancies in ten or fifteen different instances, they, nevertheless, restored him to his original position without, as far as he could ascertain, any reason in the world. He was incapable, and, besides, did not conduct affairs in an upright manner. The head of the Department knew the whole of the circumstances, notwithstanding they reinstated him immediately prior to the last general election, knowing him to be a defaulter in the way mentioned.

Vote agreed to.

184 Salaries of Gas Inspectors....	\$8,000 00
185 Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, Postage, Stationery, etc., etc.....	23,500 00

XXIX.—INSPECTION OF STAPLES.

186 For the purchase and distribution of Standards of Flour, etc., and other expenditure under the Act.	\$3,000 00
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

XXX—ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

187 To meet expenses under the Act.....	\$10,000 00
-----------------------------------------	-------------

XXXI.—PUBLIC WORKS.

Maintenance and Repairs.

188 Salaries and Contingencies of Canal Officers.....	\$32,020 00
189 Collection of Slide and Boom dues	20,545 00
190 Repairs and working expenses, Canals.....	281,700 00

MR. SHAW said that in 1874 some damage seemed to have been done to gates

MR. ALLISON.

on the Welland Canal, amounting to \$2,000, and it was supposed that the gates were defective or decayed, and therefore the sum of \$900 was deducted from that, leaving a balance of about \$1,100 to be paid by the owner of the vessel which did the damage; but, instead of that amount having been collected by the Department, \$500 more was deducted, leaving only \$600 which was collected. Was it usual, when sums had been assessed in favour of the Crown, that the Minister of Public Works should, of his own motion, and without the intervention of assessors or arbitrators, establish the exact amount to be received; if so, where was the necessity for arbitrators? He had no doubt that the reduction was made after due consideration, and properly, but there was no explanation of it in the report. He also thought it would be due to the late Administration, and for the benefit of the Public Departments, that the late Minister of Public Works should explain the reduction of this item. The amount was small, but the principle was important.

MR. TUPPER said that this was the first moment his attention had been called to the matter. He had no doubt that a reference to the Department would give a perfect explanation of it, and justify what had been done. It was not unusual, when an officer of the Department reported certain damage, to require bonds for its payment, when, after subsequent investigation, the Minister might return the amount of bonds exceeding the damage in question, on the report of a proper officer. He (Mr. Tupper) would enquire into the matter, however, if the hon. member for Lambton did not remember it.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could not remember the minutæ of the matter, but thought he remembered the case very well. A valuation was made and remained unpaid for a long time. Many representations were also made to the Government, who finally, on consultation with the Deputy Minister, deciding to reduce the amount somewhat. The assessors were not appointed to make valuations, which was the duty of the superintendent. A vessel doing damage, as in this case, had to be held until the

amount he estimated as damages was paid, or bonds given for it. Bonds were given on this occasion. But, even if the money had been paid, it was the custom in the Department to return sums when good reason could be given for it. In this instance the owner of the vessel was a poor man, ill able to bear the loss, and he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought had been absent from the country six or eight months.

MR. RYKERT said that the owner of the vessel, Mr. Battle, was worth from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

MR. MACKENZIE said he knew nothing of him personally, but was merely stating his recollection of the case. He had no doubt that the Minister of Public Works would find in the Department that his statements were correct, and that good reason existed for the action taken.

MR. TUPPER said he was bound to say that the practice in the Department was to obtain from the officer in charge of the dock gates, in cases like the present, an estimate of the damage, and, as was stated by the member for Lambton, the owner of the vessel, or party causing the damage, was bound to pay it, or give bonds for it before his property would be released. On proper reasons given, such as an excessive estimate, the Department reduced the amount claimed. He would enquire in the Department the reasons for modifying the amount originally assessed in this case. The officer in charge of the property made his estimate, and the Department gave judgment on it.

MR. MACKENZIE said, according to his recollection, the late member for Welland, Mr. Thomson, called frequently at the Department about that matter. He (Mr. Mackenzie) assumed the full responsibility for the reduction, which he believed right at the time, and did still.

MR. MCCALLUM said he knew something about this matter, and that the damage to the gate was assessed by Mr. Bodwell at \$2,000. Afterwards, it was put at \$1,100. Of course, he did not say the late Minister of Public Works did wrong in making the deduction; but

it required an explanation. Besides, Mr. Battle was well off. Mr. Bodwell's report read as follows:—

“SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE,

“WELLAND CANAL,

“ST. CATHARINES,

“October 16th, 1874.

“SIR,—I have the honour to report that, on the 7th July last, as per my telegram of that date, the schooner *Louisa*, of St. Catharines, carried away all the gates of Lock No. 21, on the Welland Canal; that in forty-eight hours thereafter they had been repaired and navigation re-opened. It was not then, and has not since been, disputed, that the accident occurred through the carelessness of those in charge of the vessel. I allowed the vessel to proceed on receipt of the enclosed bond, taken by Mr. Currie, the Solicitor to the Welland Canal, and signed by Mr. Matthew Battle, the owner of the schooner, and his brother, John Battle, of Thorold. I have assessed the damage at eleven hundred dollars.

“It was contended by Mr. Battle that the gates were rotten and nearly worthless. I find that the timber in one or two of the gates was somewhat decayed, but not so badly as to prevent their use for some years yet; while one of the gates was nearly new, the others had been in use eight years. Estimating a new set of gates as worth, at the present time, say \$2,000, I thought an allowance of a difference between new gates and the old ones, of nine hundred dollars, a reasonable allowance. I am still of that opinion. I have informed Mr. Battle of my decision, and have asked him for payment.

“I have the honour to be, Sir,

“Your obedient servant.

“E. V. BODWELL,

“Superintendent Welland Canal.”

If the hon. the late Minister of Public Works found that the gates were rotten, he had a perfect right, in the interest of this country, to make that reduction. But there was nothing before the House to show that that was the case. They only found that an official sent a letter to a member of Parliament accepting \$600 as amount in full for the \$1,100. He would not say it was for corrupt purposes; but either this reduction was made for corrupt purposes, or else it was allowed because the works were defective. There must have been some reason for it; but there was nothing to show what was the reason or what arrangements were made with Mr. Thomson. Here was the letter that was written to Mr. Thomson:

TWOROLD, February 1st, 1877.

"Hon. Alexander Mackenzie,
"Minister of Public Works,
"Ottawa, Ont.

"In the matter of
"The Queen vs. Battle,
"For Lock Damage.

"Sir,—

"I herewith enclose you certified check for \$600, being the sum agreed upon between you and Mr. Thomson, M.P. I regret not having had it sooner, but times have been very hard on shipping and money very scarce.

"I have the honour to be, sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"JOHN BATTLE."

—
"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
"27th April, 1877.

"Sir,—

"Reg. vs. Battle.

"In compliance with your request, I beg to state that the sum of six hundred dollars (\$600.00), with cost, amounting to \$36.13, has been paid by Mr. Battle, and accepted by the Minister in full of all claims in connection with this case.

"I have the honour to be, sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"F. BRAUN,
"Secretary.

"W. A. Thomson, Esq., M.P.,
"House of Commons."

There was nothing in that letter to show the grounds on which the reduction was made, except it might be that the gates were rotten. If the hon. member said they were rotten, then he (Mr. McCallum) was bound to accept the explanation.

Vote agreed to.

MR. TUPPER said he had received a telegram in relation to the Welland Canal he was sure would be heard with great pleasure. It was as follows:—

"WELLAND, May 1st, 1879.

"The Welland Canal will be opened throughout on Monday morning for the first time. It is intended to take water for the full navigation from Lake Erie.

"JOHN PAGE."

MR. RYKERT said it might be a source of congratulation that the canal was opened; but it was a matter for serious consideration that vessels could not pass in several places in the Welland Canal, for the simple reason that there was not sufficient money spent on the work. Then there were several places

MR. MCCALLUM.

in the canal where there were traces of where vessels had passed last year, and the Hon. the Minister of Public Works would find that damages would be very frequent. A short time ago the Superintendent of the Welland Canal called out sixty or seventy men to make repairs on the canal, but after working three or four days, they were discharged, because the Government would not give enough money.

MR. TUPPER said that was rather a grave statement, which, if true, should be enquired into. He would take immediate steps to ascertain whether the canal had been sufficiently cleaned out for the purpose of navigation, or whether it was requisite that more should be done. He had been assured that all that was absolutely necessary had been done.

191 Repairs and working expenses, harbours and slides...	\$	62,900 00
192 Intercolonial Railway.....		5,000,000 00

MR. HOLTON said the hon. Minister having stated that these estimates were much below those of Mr. Brydges, he ought to put Mr. Brydges in a position to produce his estimates, and explain the difference between them.

MR. TUPPER: I am quite prepared to do that.

MR. HOLTON said that, perhaps, the Committee would consent to pass these estimates now for the sake of closing, with the understanding that explanations should be given at the next stage.

MR. TUPPER said he was prepared at this moment with every detail, but, if the Committee would pass the items now, the House should have an opportunity of discussing the whole question on concurrence.

Vote agreed to.

193 Prince Edward Island Railway.....	\$230,000 00
194 Telegraph Lines, British Columbia (including subsidy).....	36,000 00
195 Telegraph Lines between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland.....	2,000 00
196 Agent and contingencies, British Columbia.....	4,000 00

XXXII.—POST OFFICE.

197	For Ontario.....	\$777,000 00
	Quebec.....	476,000 00
	New Brunswick.....	163,000 00
	Nova Scotia.....	192,000 00
	Prince Edward Island..	40,000 00
	British Columbia.....	67,000 00
	North-West Territory..	15,000 00
Manitoba.....	22,000 00	

XXXIII.—DOMINION LANDS.

198	Surveys of Lands, Manitoba and the North-West (including Commission, Staff, Land Agencies, Rent, Stationery etc., etc.).....	\$10,000 00
-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

XXIV.—MINOR REVENUES.

199	Estimate of amount for which a Vote is required.....	\$10,000 00
-----	------------------------------------------------------	-------------

MR. HUNTINGTON said, before the Committee rose, he desired to call the attention of the Government to an item which it might be well to consider before concurrence, in order to give the Minister an opportunity to make some explanation to the House. His information—he did not know how credible—was that the mail service between Kamouraska and Paspébiac, which, two years ago, was let to Mr. Carr, had been taken away from that gentleman, and the contract annulled by the hon. the Postmaster - General after it had run two years. His information was that, after the annulling of that contract, it was advertised for again, and Mr. Carr was the lowest tenderer by a considerable amount, but it was not given to him. On concurrence in these items, he would like an explanation of this circumstance.

MR. TUPPER: We will take a note of it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: According to the whispering of the little bird, which had been so frequently appealed to by hon. gentlemen opposite, there is some little irregularity in this matter.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if the despatches, to which he referred to two days ago, were to be brought down.

MR. TUPPER said that the hon. leader of the Government had told him that he had applied to Lord Lorne to

obtain information as to what despatches there were, but he had not yet obtained that information. At the next sitting of the House he had no doubt that information would be submitted.

MR. MACKENZIE said he supposed we could procure the papers by telegraphing for them. It was a remarkable thing that the Canadian Parliament could not get papers affecting their own business, that had been published in the London newspapers some days ago.

MR. TUPPER: If the Governor-General transmitted a despatch to the British Government, it is not an act of this Government at all, and he has to be applied to for permission to bring down that despatch. That application has been made to the Governor-General by the leader of the Government, and he stated to the hon. gentleman opposite that so soon as he obtained it from the Governor-General he would lay it upon the table. I do not anticipate the slightest difficulty.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes after

One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, 3rd May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

MOTION.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

“That when Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair at six o'clock p.m. this day, the House do stand adjourned until Monday next.”

Motion agreed to.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

The following Bills were severally *withdrawn*, and the fees, less the cost of printing and translation, ordered to be refunded :—

Bill (No. 68) To incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Burpee*, Sunbury.)

Bill (No. 164) To amend the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 57, respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *White*, Cardwell.)

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the safe keeping of dangerous lunatics in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *McDonald*, Pictou.)

THE FISHERIES AWARD.

RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED.

Mr. FORTIN said, in rising to propose this motion, he thanked the hon. the leader of the Government for having asked the House to set this day apart for the consideration of the important matter that formed the subject of this resolution, and he thanked the House for having consented to sit on this day. He well understood the grave responsibility that rested on him, when he undertook to bring forward before the House, and before the country, this matter of the Fishery Award, but he thought it rested on him to perform that difficult task, as he had had so many opportunities of getting acquainted with all the facts relating to our fisheries. He had, as everyone knew, no private or personal interests in the matter, but, having, after an experience of twenty-seven years, acquired the conviction that our fishing industry laboured under great disadvantages and that it was attended every year with great loss from want of proper assistance on the part of the Government, and particularly from the danger to which our fisheries were exposed of being ruined, he thought he would be guilty of want of patriotism, and of want of consideration for one of the greatest interests in this country, and for the welfare of that part of the nation which was engaged in the fishing industry, if he remained silent,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

and did not communicate frankly and correctly to the House the result of his experience and studies and give a timely warning of the great danger threatening the very existence of our fisheries in many parts of our coasts, and humbly offer what he considered the remedial agents, to stop one of the greatest evils that might befall this country. This country, in relation to this question, could be divided into two parts, the eastern part and the western part. The eastern part was inhabited principally by fishermen and mariners, and devoted to the great industries of the fisheries, and to navigation, while the western part was devoted to inland navigation, agriculture, commerce and manufactures; and, as the people of this portion were not as cognisant of the importance of the fisheries as they ought to be, he would address them in a few remarks relative to this matter. At all times, nations living on the sea-shore had understood the importance of the fisheries, and out of those nations which had developed this element of wealth had sprung nations of warriors and traders. A nation so advantageously situated as Canada was for carrying on the fisheries should go as largely into that industry as possible, because Canada would not only derive from it an important article of food and of domestic commerce, but an article which could be exported to the furthest countries—to warm as well as cold climates. Fishing had been regarded, from all time as an essential element of prosperity for the people that could prosecute it, when it was judiciously and vigorously carried on, giving the greatest benefits to the fishermen themselves, as well as being the source of many industries, such as the construction of vessels, the production of hemp for sails, etc., wherein a country situated so advantageously as Canada should reap great advantages. He would cite a passage from a work on the fisheries by Lacipede, one of the greatest of modern writers :—

“The prosecution of fishing,” said Lacipede. “preceded the culture of the fields. It is contemporary with hunting, but there is this difference between hunting and fishing, that the latter is natural to a civilised people, and that, far from being opposed to the progress of agriculture and of commerce, it assisted in multiplying their happy results. If, during the infancy of society, the prosecution of fish-

ing furnished to a half civilised people a means of subsistence at once sufficient and nourishing, if it accustomed them not to dread the dangers of the sea, if it made them sailors, it gives to a cultivated nation abundant homes for the poor, various tributes for the luxurious livers, preparations for the necessities of distant commerce, rich manures for less fertile lands. It leads men to cross the seas, to brave the ices of the poles, and bear the fires of the equator, to battle with tempests. It launches on the seas forests of masts, experienced mariners, foreign trading, and intrepid genius."

The following extracts from P. L. Simmonds, London, on the commercial products of the sea, would show also the high estimation in which the fisheries, as an industry, were held in England :—

"It is not our purpose to speak of the inhabitants of the ocean generally, but only to restrict ourselves to the investigation of those which are of some use to man. Pliny enumerated ninety-four species of fish. Linnaeus increased the number to 478; but recent naturalists have described over 13,000 species, one-tenth of which confine themselves to the fresh waters. The human race derives almost incalculable benefits from them, as is evidenced by the extent and value of the river-coast and sea fisheries of the world. The harvest of the sea has not yet been attended to and garnered to the same extent as the land. Some nations, as the Chinese, have, it is true, long given close attention to the profitable utilisation of its commercial products, and several European nations, and the Americans, have also prosecuted certain fisheries; but systematic and scientific management has only of late years been specially directed to the various branches which have been termed pisciculture, aquiculture, and ostriculture, and the transfer of fishes of one locality to those of another district. In respect of fish, no natural cause prevents their co-existence in the greatest abundance with man in his highest state of civilisation and refinement, in the midst of the greatest agricultural or manufacturing opulence. Easily scared in the first instance by unusual sights—for it has been proved by a series of curious and interesting experiments on the trout, that most kinds of fish are insensible to sound—the natives of the water are speedily reconciled to appearances, which become habitual when found to be connected with no danger. By all civilised and commercial nations, especially the Dutch, the English, the Americans and the French, the products of the sea have been accounted fully as important as those of the land; because they not only afford cheap, nutritious, and abundant food for the people, but contribute largely, moreover, to the national resources, and to the maintenance of a maritime ascendancy. The Americans and the French offer bounties to their fishermen, which, of course, tells against the fisheries in British

America. The fishery question is of urgent consequence to the people generally. Our population is increasing rapidly; cities and towns are gradually covering fields, which used to be available for agriculture; and though steam farming is increasing the efficiency of husbandry labour, it cannot possibly augment the supply of home-grown food so rapidly as the bread-eaters increase in number. Fish is among the articles of diet, which are too little familiarised among us, and any information ought to be welcomed which increases our knowledge of fishing grounds within reach of England. The fisheries are not only of importance to us in consequence of the vast amount of wealth that can be drawn from the deep, apparently without diminution, or exhausting its source, but because by this means a body of able and hardy seamen may be found to conduct the commerce of a maritime country during peace, and become its gallant defenders on the ocean in time of war. This inexhaustible source of national wealth and greatness appertains in an especial manner to the British possessions in the northern hemisphere, and has long excited the rivalry of the citizens of the New England States, who are aided by bounties granted by the general Government."

Now, he would make a few remarks on the fisheries as they were carried on at different times by different nations. On reading history we found that the most famous nations of the world were those which had sprung from fishermen. The city of Tyre, for instance, the great city of the past, was, at the commencement, nothing but a village of fishermen, who afterwards became the navigators and traders of the world, and who founded many colonies which still existed under other names. If we went further, it would be seen that in the Straits of Gibraltar towns owed their foundation to the fisheries. More recently, Venice the beautiful was founded by fishermen, who built their huts almost on the quick sands, because at that part of the Adriatic the sea teemed with fish. It was not long before that village became a town, and that town the centre of Mediterranean trade during the middle ages; and, like Great Britain, Venice had not only an influence over the sea, but over the land, and her commerce extended to the Black Sea. Byzantium, now Constantinople, was founded by fishermen who flocked to the passage between the Sea of Marmora and the Mediterranean, which was teeming with fish, and for this reason it was given the name of the Golden Horn, and soon

rose to be the highest, richest and most powerful city in the world. Further down the page of history, we saw the Dutch, the Danes, the Norwegians, the French and the English, engaging in fisheries as much as they could, and deriving from them not only food and articles of trade, but power. He would, later, cite articles from statesmen, to prove that when the fishing trade of these countries was prosperous, these countries prospered, and if the Dutch had lost their power it was because they had lost the bone and sinew of the country—the fishermen, who made the best sailors. They all remembered that the celebrated Dutch Admirals, especially Van Tromp, swept the seas; how Van Tromp carried a broom at his mast head and swept the British Channel, and entered the Thames as far as London, which he was only prevented from taking on account of the low tide. He had none but fishermen with him, but they were the greatest seamen of the time. He could not refrain from citing from the fine work of Raymond Thomassy, entitled, “History of the Fisheries of the Two Worlds,” the following interesting extracts:—

“Holland, as in former days Venice, already rises out of the waters that surround her, and the net upon her shoulder, leaps into the fisherman’s bark. She is becoming the ruling republic of the ocean, and renews in the seas of the north the wonders wrought by the Queen of the Adriatic. Towards 1582 she employed, each year, in the herring fisheries only, more than twenty thousand boats of twenty to thirty tons draught; and, in 1610, she sent to the coasts of England three thousand vessels, escorted by nine men-of-war, and manned by fifty thousand fishermen. She had, moreover, nine thousand other vessels, with fifty thousand men, engaged in carrying provisions, especially salt, and bringing back cargoes of fish, that were sold to all the consumers of Europe. What marvellous results of a labour that was sure of finding its reward in the depths of the ocean.

“This was in the days of Sully, who, too forgetful of maritime economy, looked upon ploughing and pasturing as the only two nourishing breasts of the State. But the Dutch, who had a third, still more prolific, ‘boasted that they could earn more, and with more honour, by ploughing the sea with the keel of their vessels, than the French could by ploughing and cultivating their lands.’ This confidence rendered Holland mistress of the Seas of the North and of the markets of Europe. Richelieu and Mazarin soon understood the secret of this power, and they also precluded

the restoration that Louis XIV was to render so glorious by giving encouragement to our fishermen.

“But this is not all. The Dutch had the pretension of keeping the French from the whale fisheries, although they had learned this industry from them. It is well known that our Basques were the first to harpoon the whale, and to pursue it from the Gulf of Gascony as far as the Seas of Greenland. As far back as the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, they applied themselves successfully to this perilous industry, and employed more than nine thousand sailors. The Port of Saint Jean de Luz contained not less than from fifty to sixty whaling vessels till 1636, when the Spanish seized this place. Fourteen vessels arrived at that time from Greenland, loaded with fish oil. They fell into the hands of the enemy; and this event, by destroying the Basque fleet, deprived us of this industry, that had been so prosperous.

“The Dutch, however, informed of the advantages accruing from these expectations, hastened to entice away our harpooners, who taught them, in a few years, all the secrets of this perilous, as well as lucrative fishery. Well, it is in return for this knowledge, that after our religious wars, Holland, in her selfishness, endeavoured to disgust our sailors with these rich fisheries of the North. ‘They will not allow them,’ says an unpublished memoir addressed to Louis XIII, ‘to catch the whale or to melt the blubber on the island of Greenland, which obliges them to do so on the high seas, with great danger of being lost or burnt, as it often happens. Wherein, the Dutch appear the more ungrateful, because it is the French who taught them how to pursue this industry.’ Let us add that, according to De Witt, by this industry, and especially by the herring fishery, 450,000 persons in Holland earned a living, that is to say more than a fifth of the population—a memorable example of what maritime economy can do. And thence an unparalleled glory. This little people, raised by such feeble resources to the rank of a naval power, could at one time successfully contend with the united fleets of France and England. Upon what rested, however, this supremacy of the seas that victoriously counterbalanced continental influence? That is what must now be stated, without further delay. Well, it rested upon a mere trifle, upon a detail that will never be appreciated by superficial minds, it rested upon a simple process of fishing, upon a better preparation of the products of the fisheries, upon the economical and improved manner of barrelling herring by salting them only after the gills and the entrails had been removed. A superior quality of fish obtained by this means at less cost had driven off all competition, and secured all the markets,—and the simple improvements of an article that had become indispensable by rendering all the consumers of Europe tributary to the Dutch had, by degrees, converted the commerce of fish into a sort of universal domination. A remarkable result of maritime industry, the humble beginnings—

whereof are often carried to unexpected greatness' by some common process. To worthily honour the inventor of this modest process, it required no ordinary man, it required Charles the Fifth, whose vast mind understood that the smallest means, indefinitely repeated, produce the greatest results, and that any improvement applied to an article of universal and daily consumption, must necessarily effect the well-being of immense populations. Therefore, this Emperor rendered public homage to the memory of William Beuckels, who had succeeded in improving the fisheries by a better process of salting and barrelling herring; and in August, 1536, he held it as an honour for himself to visit, at Biervliet, with all his Court, the tomb of this humble fisherman, who had carried the prosperity of his country to such a high degree."

The Basque fishermen, who lived on and frequented the Bay of Biscay, for whale fishing, because that sea was full of these mammiferous animals, were attracted in pursuit of schools of whales to the middle of the Atlantic, and even to the banks of Newfoundland where the whale were more abundant, because on these banks, and banks similarly situated, the mollusca and crustacea, and small fishes, which served as their food, were found in abundance, so that it was an opinion that rested on good foundation that the Basque fishermen discovered the banks of Newfoundland, and probably Newfoundland, before Columbus discovered America, and this led to the existence of a fishing industry carried on by fishermen from Biscay, Spain, and Brittany, in France especially, of which they had no conception, because it appeared from documents and history that those fishermen and merchants connected with them kept it as secret as possible. They knew what took place shortly after the discovery of America, that European nations tried to effect settlements in it, and also that the only settlements that were prosperous from the beginning were those where fishing was carried on. The settlements of the Eastern United States owed their prosperity and progress to the fisheries prosecuted by the early English settlers, whilst in New France the population living on the Nova Scotia coasts, Cape Breton and the Bay of Fundy derived nearly all their subsistence from the fisheries. France at the time considered this industry of such importance that she spent immense

sums in building fortresses, under which the fishermen and their vessels could shelter themselves in danger. The prosecution of fisheries in Canada, perhaps, was more ancient than was generally thought. When Jacques Cartier made his first trip into the St. Lawrence, he did not say he discovered the Gulf or the coast of Labrador; but that, sailing along the Labrador coast, he met a vessel from LaRochelle, bound for the port of Brest. In 1534, Port of Brest, which was now called the Bay of Old Fort, received 200 or 300 vessels from France every year, all the small vessels congregating there when the fishing was over, and afterwards going over to France under the escort of men-of-war, with thousands of quintals of fish. The following extracts from a diary of a journey made in 1704, by Sieur de Courtemanche, on the coast of Labrador, would show how abundant the marine animals and fish were in those days:—

"In the Bay of Ahaha, which is a few leagues below Great Mecatina, coast of Labrador, I had 200 seals shot in two days.

"The French establishment (that of the Port of Brest) is twenty leagues from there; its aspect is very gay, its harbour is very fine, and vessels of every kind can enter it; it could even contain more than one hundred vessels.

"At the extremity of the Bay, above the fort, are three very pleasant looking hills, on the top of which are small lakes, where trout and salmon are so abundant that, with two or three single hand lines or a net, enough fish might be caught to feed a garrison, even a considerable one, and half a league further down is the Esquimaux River, which abounds in salmon of an extraordinary size; eight leagues further is Spanish Bay, in which cod fishing is very profitable, as I have myself experienced, having sounded in several places and had three men to fish who caught 1,300 in a day; the cod is taken at four, three, and two fathoms and a half. In a word, the line has not the time to go to the bottom, so abundant is the cod. In this Bay there is a place where I expect to trap seal, and where I have begun a second establishment where I intend to fish on a considerable scale.

"The Spanish, according to the Indians, used to frequent this place, and would probably still be there had it not been for the bad treatment they received from the Esquimaux. There still may be seen traces of their establishments, furnaces for melting seal oil, houses, tile roof, and etc."

The Seignory of Spanish Bay passed from Sieur de Courtemanche, into the hands of a Mr. de Bouranague Pecieur,

and became the property of a company established at Quebec, called the Labrador Company. The colonists soon saw the importance of the fisheries for the future of the colonies, history stating that, when the war raged between England and France, and when the New England colonists were asked to levy troops and contribute money to invade Canada, or form a maritime expedition like those which besieged Louisbourg, and several other towns in Nova Scotia, they did so very willingly, their principal object being the acquisition of the valuable coast fisheries of the Maritime Provinces, and of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The Americans, before the revolutionary war, had been so successful in the fisheries as to excite jealousy in the Mother Country. Were he allowed the liberty to say so, he would add that some greedy English merchants then, as now, considered that the colonies should be inhabited only by consumers of British manufactures. The fishermen were so successful on the coasts of the Eastern Colonies that the British Government, inspired by those greedy merchants, prohibited the importation of their fish into England. The consequence was distrust between her children and the Mother Country, enmity, recriminations, and afterwards the revolutionary war and separation. After a long and bloody war came peace, and, in 1783, the Treaty of Ghent. What did the colonies and their Government do? What did the clever statesmen that were sent to Ghent by the now independent colonies to defend their interests do? They showed themselves ready to sacrifice everything in order to possess the fisheries of New France, then a British colony. Their best diplomatists who had been sent to Ghent argued, threatened and got the help of European nations in their enterprise. At that time England and France were in deadly rivalry, France having helped the colonies in conquering their independence. The statesmen of the new republic fought hard for those fisheries, because they saw, in their possession, a continuance of the prosperity of that industry which they had established in their own country, seeing in it power

and wealth. Unfortunately, Canada had no one to defend her in the British Councils—no friends in England, or, if so, they were powerless. Had this country had a friend to warn the English people, would England have consented to give to America the possession—that is the right to fish and to land—on about 10,000 miles of coast, or an extent equal to nearly half the circumference of the earth, whilst the Americans were not giving an inch of their coast in return? By that unfortunate treaty, Nova Scotia lost 1,060 miles of coast; New Brunswick, 485; Quebec, 1,320, and Newfoundland, 2,370, besides about 4,500 miles of coast along Cumberland Island, in Baffin's and Davis's Straits. But to the English people then, and perhaps to Canadians, those fisheries did not seem important, and even at present one would find some Canadians not attaching to them their deserved importance. What was the consequence? That the Americans went into fishing industries with renewed vigour and energy, while the Canadians found the American fishermen in their way everywhere. The Americans had not only built a fishing fleet, but also fleets of merchant vessels to carry a trade in fish all over the seas of the world. Through the assistance of those fisheries they were enabled to cope with England, in the war of 1812, vessel to vessel and man to man. Why? Because, the moment war was declared, they called in their hardy fishermen—many of whom had been all their lives in the Gulf on our coasts—to man their vessels, and were thus able to carry on a glorious war against a country with a population five or six times larger. They sent their men-of-war and merchant vessels all over the world, while the fishing trade in Canada was carried on by a few schooners that traded only with the West Indies. Had Canadians not had some English merchants and traders to settle on the coasts of Newfoundland and the coasts of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and carry on a business in fish, which they exported to foreign countries, there would have been little trade with them in that article. Then it was seen that the Americans carried on their fishing after

the Peace of Ghent successfully, and Congress passed laws to encourage it by a bounty to each vessel, which was granted during a term of seventy years, and which came to \$7,000,000, this sum being given to vessels working mostly in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Thus the world saw these very strange facts: one nation giving up this valuable right of fishing to a foreign nation, and the foreign nation encouraging its fishing by every means, even a bounty, to gather wealth in the waters of the nation that had been imprudent enough to concede that privilege. The consequence was an immense fleet of fishing vessels in the United States, whose crews had manned the war vessels which had fought so gloriously against England in 1812. At the negotiations for peace in 1812, the Americans pretended that they had a right to continue to take fish in those British waters, while England maintained that the war destroyed all former rights, and that the American fishermen had ceased to have any right to fish in British North American waters, and, as the two nations could not come to any agreement, the question of the fisheries was not included in the treaty of peace. It was only in 1818, after England had at last taken up the cause of Canada, by seizing several American vessels and selling them, that the Americans thought it best to make arrangements with England. They made a convention with her which was signed in London in 1818. We did not lose as much then as in 1783; but it was utterly astounding to think that, after the war, which was not inglorious for Canada and England, and in framing a treaty with a nation which was far from being her superior—which was, on the contrary, her inferior in many respects—England should have given away again a part of the fishing coast of the Province. If it had only been a few hundred miles of coast, and if the United States had given any return, or some kind of reciprocity, he would not have brought this question before the House. But what did they see? It was true the Americans did not insist on being permitted again to fish in common with our fishermen on the coast of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Gaspé, countries that were then inhabited.

But they still claimed the right to fish on many parts of the coast, and England was weak enough to give them the liberty of fishing on the coast of the Magdalen Islands, although they were then inhabited, and this interference with them had a very material injury on the fisheries of those Islands. On the coast of Labrador, they acquired the right to fish over a distance of 295 miles in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Straits of Belle Isle, and then from Cape Charles towards the north, on the Atlantic coast of Labrador as far as Hudson's Straits, a distance of 750 miles. They had the same right, as before, of fishing in Davis's Strait, Baffin's Bay and Cumberland Inlet, on the British coast. They also managed to keep the right of fishing over no less than 480 miles on the coast of Newfoundland—on the whole 5,000 or 6,000 miles of coast. And so we were bound by that treaty or convention, so that, on more than half of the coast of the Dominion, the Americans were just as much masters as we were. On the coast of Labrador they could line and dry their fish with the same liberty as ourselves. But we had not the right to fish nor to land on any nick of their coast, by the Convention of 1818. In the Gulf of St. Lawrence, no efforts had been made by any Government of this country to establish any kind of regulations for the protection of the sea or river fisheries before 1852, or, if some were made, they were not put into force. In that year, the Government of Canada, who had until then neglected that great interest, at last, on the repeated demands of the people who had been pillaged on the coast of Labrador, who had seen their establishments destroyed, consented to establish a protective service. But, as they were doing it unwillingly, they established it on the smallest possible scale. A common schooner was chartered, carrying 15 men, and as a stipendiary magistrate to organise that service, the Government chose himself. It was a bad choice, because he had no experience when he undertook the duties. In 1852, nearly all the river fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence were, in great part, destroyed. They were no longer remunerative, and many people who had gained their living

by them had to leave the country for want of protection against the depredations of white men and Indians. Now, with regard to the sea fisheries. The Americans, as he had stated, excited by a bounty which amounted to \$4 a ton, had already begun to visit those fisheries, although they had no right to do so. But from lack of protection by British cruisers, the Americans were in the habit of fishing on our best inshore fishing grounds, and using our best harbours, and sometimes excluding our men, because they were first in the harbours, and used the largest seines, and the greatest number of boats. Owing to the great number of these men, they soon occupied, almost exclusively, the best fishing grounds. He could name them here because he had been over them, and what he was stating now had been told to him by residents of those places, who had seen the damage done by the Americans. He would speak first of the celebrated banks of Natashquan and Kegashka. In the old times 200 American vessels used to congregate there at the beginning of the fishing season. They used to go with their seines and force our men fishing with lines to heave their anchors, and fish in other places that were not so good. He could cite many other places as far as Mingan and St. John, on the north shore of the River St. Lawrence; he could also name other places where they had no right to fish at all, and places where they had a right to fish, by the Convention of 1818, as the Dog Islands, Bonne Espérance, Belles Amours, Eradore Bay, Blanc Sablon, where the American fishermen carried on in the same way. He was not exaggerating; he had been for sixteen years in constant relations with the fishermen, not only of the Province of Quebec, but of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland, and that was the result of all the experience he had gathered from them. The experience of the Americans in fishing on their own coasts as well as ours enabled them to equip that celebrated fleet of clippers, which, for a time, rendered the American sailors so celebrated. Those fleets went all over the world, to Japan, China and Australia. They carried on an immense trade between the Eastern and the Pacific States.

MR. FORTIN.

How could they have equipped them except by means of the fishermen, who had spent their youth on board the fishing vessels, and who were the hardiest and best sailors in the world? The Canadians, on the contrary, suffering from American competition, were carrying on an indifferent trade. But, by-and-bye, came a greater blow—he meant the Treaty of Reciprocity that was made between England and the States in 1854. He was not going to attack any gentleman in this House or out of it; he was going to speak of the treaty in general. That treaty had a disastrous effect on our fishermen, although, perhaps, it enabled some merchants to sell their fish a little better in the United States. It gave the Americans the right of fishing not only on the coast, according to the convention of 1818, but in the Bay of Fundy, on the coast of Nova Scotia, Cape Breton, Prince Edward Island and Gaspé, because England did not insist on the question of headlands, and the Americans were able to fish in all our best grounds, in the Baie des Chaleurs, the Bay of Gaspé and at the head of the Bay of Fundy. It was then that we began to see that the value of our celebrated fishing banks was disappearing from the excessive takes of our own and American fishermen. But this treaty lapsed, and then, for a while, we had the licensing system which was as bad as the treaty itself. After a while the fisheries returned to us again, and we became masters at home. We hoped that our territorial rights would remain in our own hands, but some unhappy events happened between England and the United States, and a treaty was entered into between the two countries, in which we had to take part. The second treaty, he was sorry to say, was not so advantageous to us as the first one, because, by the first one, if we sacrificed the fisheries and the rights of the fishermen, we acquired, by that treaty, certain privileges of trade which enabled the farmers, the traders, and the inland population generally, to carry on a very lucrative business with the United States. If they read the papers of those times, they would find that the western part of the Dominion prospered under that treaty. But we did not, by the last treaty, acquire any rights to trade

with the Americans, except selling fish and oil; far from that, the Americans had built up a Chinese wall between the two countries in the shape of a tariff which taxed all our natural products very heavily. True, we acquired the right of selling our fish to them, but that right was of doubtful value, because, whether there was a tax or not, if there was a demand in the United States beyond what the Americans could supply themselves, it would have to be supplied here because the fish could not be procured elsewhere. There was fortunately a clause in that treaty providing for the establishment of a tribunal, by which it was proved that the value of the Canadian fisheries was much greater than that of the American fisheries, and a sum of money was awarded as a compensation to the Canadians. They knew that a Commission sat at Halifax, composed of three members, one for England, and one for the United States, and one who was neutral. The latter gentleman, Mr. Delfosse, was the real Judge in the matter, and judgment was given in our favour for the sum of \$5,500,000, representing the surplus value of our fisheries over those of the United States. Now deducting \$1,000,000 of this sum to be given to Newfoundland, the remainder formed the subject and the object of the resolutions he was about to present to the House. But, before doing that, he would allude to the American fisheries. Why was it that the Americans as early as 1873 insisted so much on the right to fish in British waters? Why was it that again in 1818 they asked for the same privileges, even threatening war if it was not granted to them? Why was it that they consented to the Reciprocity Treaty? Why was it that the Treaty of Washington was negotiated—and though the people in the Western United States contended the award was too high, the fishermen themselves knew very well that it was not, and that no sum of money could replace the advantage they had derived from fishing in British waters? Why did they insist on four occasions on acquiring possession of the Canadian fisheries? Because, firstly, they considered the fishing industry of paramount importance, and the following extracts from a report

on the principal fisheries of the American seas, by Lorenzo Sabine, would show the strong opinions some of the most distinguished statesmen and writers had on the subject:—

“The following statements of the Hon. Elbridge Gerry, a distinguished statesman of Massachusetts who, after having filled several posts of distinction in his own country and abroad, became Vice-President of the United States, made in the beginning of the century, are very interesting. He says: ‘At a time when the policy of every country is pointed against us, to suppress our success in the fisheries, when it is with extreme difficulty that it continues its existence, shall we lay burdens upon it which it is unable to support? If this important interest is injured, it will not only destroy the competition with foreigners, but will induce the people to sell their property in the United States and remove to Nova Scotia, or some other place, where they can prosecute their business under the protection of Government. * * * I will not reiterate the arguments respecting the fisheries; it is well known to be the best nursery of seamen; the United States have no other, and it never can be the intention of gentlemen to leave the navigation of the Union to the mercy of foreign powers; it is of necessity, then, that we lay the foundation of our maritime importance as soon as may be, and this can be done only by encouraging our fisheries. It is well known that we have a number of rivals in this business, desirous of excluding us from the fishing banks altogether. This consideration, of itself, is sufficient to induce a wise legislation to extend every encouragement to so important a concern.’

“Congress were not unmindful of these representations and appeals. An Act was passed in 1789, which allowed a bounty of 5c. per quintal on dried, and the same sum per barrel on pickled fish exported from, and imposed a duty of 50c. the quintal and 75c. the barrel on foreign fish imported into, the United States. The system of Protection, of bounties and allowances, is as old, therefore, as the Government itself, and was devised and adopted by the statesmen of the Revolution.

“In 1790, Washington, in his speech to Congress, remarked that: ‘Our fisheries and the transportation of our own produce offer us abundant means for guarding ourselves against the evil of depending upon foreign vessels.’

“The Senate waited upon the President and the Vice-President with an address.

“Among its topics we find the following: ‘The navigation and the fisheries of the United States are objects too interesting not to inspire a disposition to promote them by all means which shall appear to us consistent with their natural progress and permanent prosperity.’

“The additional relief desired was not long delayed. Early in 1792 an Act was passed, which abolished the bounty on dried and pickled fish exported, and granted in lieu

thereof a specific allowance to vessels employed in the codfishery.

"This allowance was graduated according to the size of the vessels. Boats between five and twenty tons burden were entitled to receive one dollar per ton, annually; those between twenty and thirty tons, 50c. per ton additional; and to those more than thirty tons, the allowance was fixed at \$2.50 per ton; but no vessel could receive more than \$175 in one season.

"By a subsequent Act the same year, these several rates were increased one-fifth, to commence in January, 1793, to continue seven years, and thence to the end of the next Session of Congress.

"We have seen that, through all the wars and territorial and maritime disputes between France and England, touching their respective possessions in America; through all the changes and chances of our colonial submission, from its commencement to its termination; through the war of the revolution, and the negotiations for peace; in the Convention that framed and in the State Conventions that consolidated the Constitution of the United States; in the First Congress, and in the negotiations at the close of the war of 1812, the fisheries occupy a prominent place, and were often the hinge on which turned questions of vast importance.

"We have seen that once entire communities seemed to believe that no way to wealth was so sure and so rapid as adventures for herrings and codfish; and that men of the highest rank, and of the most shining talents, accordingly set their hopes and fortunes on the cast of the net and the line. We have found that eminent writers, on matters of commerce and navigation, and statesmen of world-wide fame, have declared that 'the English navy became formidable alone by the discovery of the inexpressibly rich fishing banks of Newfoundland; that writers of acknowledged judgment have observed, that 'by the cod-fishery in America, the navy of France became formidable to all Europe; that our own statesmen, of the revolutionary era, considered that we also must look to our fishermen to man our navy; and that a French Minister of the present time, expressed the opinion, in 1836, 'that without the resources which were found in the sailors engaged in the fisheries, the expedition to Algiers could not have taken place.'"

And secondly, it was because there was not room enough for them on their own coast, nor fish enough and because they had ruined part of their own fisheries. Whenever the American people engaged in any industry they prosecuted it with astonishing vigour and perseverance. They prosecuted the fishing industry to such an extent that they exhausted it in a few years. And that was the reason that they were so

anxious for the privilege of using our own fisheries. But, if the Americans had exhausted their own fisheries, would they not also exhaust ours if we gave them the chance? Besides, our own fishing population now numbered many thousands, and was increasing faster than any other population on the globe; unless this fishing population were assisted to find means of subsistence they would be obliged to emigrate to the United States. We practically said to our own fishermen, the fisheries along the coast are not extensive enough for your own support, still we will allow the Americans, who are the greatest destroyers of fish, to come in and compete with you. He was not trying to hurt the character of the American fishermen. It was their nature to make as much money as they could and as quickly as possible, and if they could take all the fish in the gulf within ten years they would do so, if it paid them. He would ask the Government was it proper the fisheries should be destroyed in a year, ten years, or fifty years? Were we only to look to the present? No; all statesmen should look to the future, and if we did not look to the future of our fisheries, what had happened to other countries would happen to us. We had formerly, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the most valuable whale in existence—the black whale. It was so abundant that it could be killed easily, and fishermen from Nantucket and other harbours in Martha's Vineyard used to come every year, and, in the space of two or three months' whaling, get oil enough to support them the whole year. Those fish were now completely extinct. It was one of the mildest of whales, although one of the richest in oil and bones. The whole coast of Labrador was strewn with the remains of those whales. Would it not have been better if the Americans had killed less whales, and had left sufficient to provide from 10,000 to 20,000 gallons of oil every year for each whaling vessel, instead of slaughtering them so that now they were extinct? Not one had been seen since 1854, when the last one was killed near Kamouraska. Another valuable animal destroyed was the walrus. When the French came to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, they found the walrus in immense num-

bers. These animals used to bask on the sandbanks in the sun, and were so tame that people could drive them to land and kill them by thousands. The Acadians killed a great number, but they were not so persevering as the Americans, who, when New France became a British colony, erected establishments where the walrus could be found, and in twenty years the whole of the walrus were destroyed. Of course, the destruction of the fisheries was not all done by the Americans, but, when two were engaged fishing on the same grounds, the destruction was greater than when there was one alone. Our people had also destroyed certain fishing grounds by over-fishing, and by fishing at all seasons. His hon. friends from the counties of Temiscouata, Kamouraska, L'Islet, and Montmagny would remember the time when herring used to come up as far as River Ouelle, in the River St. Lawrence, that was to say 300 miles from its mouth, and even further up, in immense schools. Instead of protecting the fish, the people made brush fisheries into which the herring went by millions, and a large quantity became choked and died there. A certain quantity would be used as food, and some of the rest used as manure, but the greater part were left to rot. According to the best naturalists, the fish, like birds, preferred some places to others. They came to these places to spawn, and, if, during that time, they were disturbed, in the manner they had been in the St. Lawrence, they could not be expected to come there again with the same abundance. If they were continually disturbed, from year to year, a time would come when the fish would be so few that the fishing for them would cease to be remunerative. With regard to the cod fishery, the Isle aux Basques, opposite Trois Pistoles, was at one time a celebrated fishing ground. Escoumains, and the coast of Rimouski, were also much frequented by this fish, and by the halibut and sardines, but now codfish could not be taken at Isle aux Basques or at Bic, and only at Cape Chat, a distance from Isle aux Basques of 150 miles below. Formerly spring and fall herring were caught along the north shore, west of Mingan, even west of Point des Monts. This was a most valuable fish, which could be exported by thousands of barrels to Europe and the West Indies, but now

it was very scarce. A few schools might be seen one year, and none would appear for two or three years after. In former times the fisheries had a better chance to last than now. The proper way to catch codfish was by line and hook. In this way the schools of fish which were at the bottom of the sea feeding were not disturbed; but, when the Americans came with their trolling lines and seines about 600 feet long and more, with their bag seines, and their purse seines 1,500 feet long, and 80 feet in breadth, then the real danger began; and every day the bad effects of this fishing, under the Reciprocity Treaty, but mostly since the Treaty of Washington came in force, appeared. Before that treaty, there was a time when, on the south shores of the St. Lawrence, from Cape Gaspé to Cape Chat, and even as far as Matane, they could see schools of mackerel by the hundred. Our people only fished for codfish and herring, and left the mackerel alone, and when the Americans came, they slaughtered the fish indiscriminately, and after ten years sufficient mackerel could not be caught for bait. The Bay of Gaspé, in the months of August and September, used to be full of mackerel, and there was also found a fish preying on the mackerel, called, in this country, the horse mackerel, the tunny, the celebrated fish of the ancients. He would now cite authorities to prove that the modes of fishing practised on our shores were highly injurious, and that the consequence was that many of our fisheries had been injured and were now less productive than ever. He would first quote some figures from the celebrated report of Professor Baird, who wrote a history of the whale fisheries of the United States, giving the number of vessels from the beginning down to 1876. The numbers of whaling vessels sailing from American ports during the years 1875 and 1876, were as follows:—

From year	To year	No. of Vessels.	Ave. Ton.
1785	1790	76	80
1790	1800	194	112
1800	1810	324	230
1810	1820	427	259
1820	1830	1038	293
1830	1840	2149	328
1840	1850	2342	290
1850	1860	2150	285
1860	1870	1176	232
1870	1876	478	212

This table showed the rapidity of the decline of the whale trade, owing to the destruction of the whale fisheries. He could prove by statistics that the whale fisheries had diminished in as great a degree in England; while, in other countries, in France for instance, where this industry flourished under the reign of Louis XVI, and was revived after the peace of 1815, it had dwindled to almost nothing. By these extracts it would be seen how plentiful the cod fisheries and seal fisheries were in those days. In order to prove that the fisheries had not only diminished, but were in danger of being further injured on many of our coasts, owing to the injurious practices resorted to by the fishermen, especially the American fishermen, he would cite some of the testimony and evidence adduced before the Fishery Commission. At page 34 of Appendix G. they read:

"J. E. Marshall, Anticosti, fisherman, born State of Maine, U.S., carried on fishing about thirty-three years—In eleven days I stocked 7,000 in Gaspé Basin. I have seen at Godbout, about twenty-three years ago, two American vessels loaded in one haul of the seine. I believe that the practice of seining is injurious to all kinds of fish. Codfish offal should not be allowed to be thrown overboard on any fishing-ground around the shores, because it injures the small fish and drives away the large. Fishing by Americans in Canadian waters injures their fisheries."

"Daniel West, Grande-Grève, fisherman, practised fishing this forty years—The practice of throwing fish offal overboard by the Americans is a great injury to the fishery, because it poisons the water, drives away the large fish and kills the eggs. Seining, as practised by the Americans, is injurious to the fisheries, because it takes large and small fish; all the small fish are thrown away, and left to perish on the strand."—p. 126.

"Michael McGinnis, Port Daniel, fisherman and merchant for fifteen years—The practice of throwing fish offal is injurious to the fisheries, because it gluts the large fish and kills the small ones."—p. 127.

"Frank LeBlanc, Port Daniel, having been a mariner and fisherman for these thirty-six years—I attribute the falling off of halibut to the number taken by Americans with trawls; each vessel carries from four to six doreys, and each dorey had 1,000 hooks, which is an extremely destructive mode of fishing, as it kills the large mother fish. The practice of throwing overboard offals is very injurious to the fishing grounds."—p. 138.

"John M. Luce, Grande-Grève, in the county of Gaspé, for sixteen years manager for Wm. Frewin & Co., of Jersey—Halibut were plentiful all along this south coast of the St. Lawrence, especially at Grand Vallée and Magdalene River. Now, the quantity is very small. I attribute this destruction of the halibut fishery to the exhausting fishing of the Americans, with their numerous and large trawls. All these halibut and other fish are taken close along shore within the three-mile limit."—pp. 179 and 180.

"William Hyman, J. P., Mayor, Cape Rosier, merchant, and lived here for thirty-four years—The American vessels fishing cod on the banks cause injury to the inshore cod fisheries, first, by using trawl lines, they kill the mother fish; second, by the hurt caused to the cod fish, by the offals, which being swallowed by the cod, the bones swallowed destroys them."—pp. 142 and 181.

"James Rooney, of Percé, fifty-two years, keeps a fishery, always lived in Percé—The habit of the Americans of throwing offal over on the banks, is injurious to our cod-fishery. It gluts the fish, and they will not bite on the lines; it floats away with the tide, and draws the fish off after it."—pp. 147 and 187.

"Wm. Johnston, House Harbour, merchant, acquainted with fisheries these 27 years—The practice of throwing fish-offal over board is injurious to our fisheries. It gluts the fish, and, decaying on the bottom, poisons the water, driving away the large fish, and killing the young and eggs."—pp. 148 and 189.

He also cited the evidence of Alexis Noel, Fox River (p. 190), John Packwood (p. 151), Messiah Tapp (p. 152), James Samuel (p. 152), Edward Bunn, (p. 154), John D. Payson (p. 197), Philias Sirois (p. 175), John Renouf (p. 223), Julien Boudreault (p. 178), and Pierre Brochu (p. 185), to the same effect.

"George Harbour, farmer and fisherman, Sandy Beach—It was right inside of Sandy Point where the Americans swept round with their seines, and obliged my brother to go away. The effect of throwing offal overboard, the codfish eats it, and they will not take the bait; another thing is, that it makes the water impure, and kills the eggs that are deposited; it will also kill the young fry. I have passed over the water where there was a very disagreeable smell arising from this stuff rotting on the bottom. I have seen the Americans using the hauling seine; as a natural consequence it destroys the fish, that are no good when caught, but which would be good if left until later. Seining is injurious to the fishery. I have heard from Americans, and of my own knowledge I know it to be so. I have been told by themselves that if they were allowed to frequent our waters for the space of ten years our fish would be extinct.

The Americans told me their codfish on their own banks had been ruined. —App. E, p. 79.

“Gregoire Grenier, of Newport, county of Gaspé, fish-trader—I have seen Americans seining close to the shore at our place. They throw the offals overboard and this is what spoils the codfish, because at the place where they have thrown this overboard, you need not try to catch a fish for a long spell. I have proved that myself. I would say that the fish eat too much of what is thrown overboard, and I think that it makes the water in the vicinity impure.”—p. 87.

“Wm. McLeod, farmer, formerly seaman and fisherman for forty years at Port Daniel,—One fourth of the mackerel seined, at least, is thrown away. It would be injurious to all kinds of fish. If you destroy the young fish it is like cutting down the young forests. My opinion is that this sickness is caused by offal thrown overboard at these places; it impregnates the water, and makes it unwholesome for the fish, and they will die. Last year fever prevailed in the neighbourhood where the offal has been thrown out, and two years ago, Americans stated themselves that it was injurious; it was not our affair, that they would kill the goose that laid the golden egg, for the sake of the present profit.”—p. 99.

“John James Fox, Collector of Customs, overseer of fisheries at Amherst Island, lived there twenty-six years—Americans stand as near as possible to the beach and fish. I have known them to hire boats at the Island and fish in shore, the fish are all inside. I have heard Americans say that they hoped these seines would never be brought into the gulf, or else these fisheries would be very soon destroyed. They throw the offal overboard. The throwing overboard of codfish offal is very destructive. Besides, so many small fish are destroyed, it poisons the fish ground. Fishing with trolls, it destroys the mother fish, the large fish that come in to spawn.”—p. 113.

“Thomas Savage, of Cape Cove, Gaspé, merchant and shipowner, member of Legislative Council of Quebec, lived at Cape Cove about 53 years.—The Americans land their fish and draw their seines ashore. Trawl fishing has increased, and I think that it injures the fishing. Some Americans told me that although they trawl, they knew that it destroyed the fish in their own waters, and that in a few years they would have the fishing here destroyed.”—p. 262.

“T. J. LaMontagne, of St. Anne des Monts, Gaspé, fish merchant, since 1859—The effect of trawling is disastrous especially to large fish, because the large fish are considered to be the spawning fish, as far as it is to my knowledge to ascertain. Trawls take the bottom fish which are the large fish. Fishermen all agree to say that the Americans took away the halibut from our coasts.”—p. 280.

“Abraham Lebrun, of Percé, speaks of the North-Shore fisheries.—Trawling has been detrimental to the halibut fishery. I mean that the fish are not now so abundant as formerly; if fishermen desisted from fishing for a period, the fish would then increase in number. I should think the fishing would be restored in six years. If it continues it will ruin the fishery completely.”—p. 286.

Those were a few extracts from the prominent evidence brought before the Fishery Commission at Halifax, from the Province of Quebec only. He did not speak of testimony from the other Provinces, because he left that to be done by gentlemen from those Provinces who were better acquainted than he with the fisheries on their coasts, and, therefore, more competent to defend the causes of their Provinces. It was this testimony from the Province of Quebec, as well as other Provinces, which proved first the grand advantage the American fishermen derived from participation in the Canadian coast fisheries; and, secondly, the danger these same fisheries ran of being destroyed partly or wholly, by too many fishermen fishing over the same grounds, and the injurious and destructive modes of fishing resorted to, which won the case at Halifax, and secured the \$5,500,000. It was the testimony in relation to facts connected with fishing on the sea-coast during the last fifty years, brought before the Commissioners, Mr. Delfosse especially. He might cite, also, testimony of a number of other men who had been brought up on the coast, and spent their lives in fishing, who also derived means of subsistence for themselves and families, and, consequently, were interested in the welfare of the fisheries. One and all were but of one opinion, that, if such things as had been going on in the past were allowed to go on in the future, the fisheries of the Dominion would soon be destroyed. When they read a natural history of fisheries, and the way they were multiplied, of the number of millions of eggs with which the fish were loaded, they were told by naturalists that the fisheries were inexhaustible. He admitted that they were inexhaustible in one way. Why, birds were also inexhaustible, that is to say, all the varieties could not be destroyed? But what did they see in this country? Why, many years

ago, all our forests were enlivened by the singing of myriads of birds. Still, from want of protection, and oftentimes wantonly, the birds were destroyed to such an amount that the insects got the better of it, and we had to import birds to do the work which Providence had assigned to those birds that we had allowed to be destroyed. When man altered the laws of nature, he soon felt the evil consequences of it. He would now speak of the Province of Quebec. Everyone who had read history, knew that there was no valley in the world finer than the valley of the St. Lawrence; no lands more suited to all kinds of culture. The French came and took possession of that beautiful valley, prepared by Providence to be the home of a happy people; but they did what others had done before in other countries. They scorned the advice of wise men, who told them that, by the way in which they cultivated this land of milk and honey, they would in fifty years deprive it of its substance, and their grandchildren would starve. The prediction was verified, and to-day the people were obliged to get their flour from the States. He had the honour to be at one time Commissioner of Crown Lands in the Province of Quebec for a year and a half, and had seen the destruction which was going on in their forests, and had done his best to stop it, but, to a certain extent, ineffectually. Austria, although settled before the Christian era, had more and richer forests than the whole of the Dominion, because they were scientifically husbanded. When these forests would be in great part destroyed, then perhaps means would be taken, when it was too late, to restore them. The same would happen as in the case of agriculture in the Province of Quebec, where, after the lands had been forced until hardly anything was left in them, and it would take half a century to bring them back to their former position, agricultural societies were organised and premiums given at exhibitions. If the advice of the wise men had been heard with regard to agriculture, the lands would be in a state of production better than they were fifty years ago, and the Province of Quebec would not be obliged to buy

her bread from the United States, but would export wheat to England and other countries by thousands of bushels. He remembered the time when vessels could be anchored opposite Verchères and other villages, being loaded with wheat for England, but now the land was destroyed, as the forests were being destroyed, and as the fisheries would be destroyed, if means were not taken to stop their destruction. He (Mr. Fortin) was the mouth-piece, the toll-bell of the fishermen, who saw nothing in the future but emigration to the United States, nothing but the obligation to go and live under a flag they did not like. Hundreds of our people were leaving Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to go to the United States, to swell the ranks of that mighty nation—our greatest rival, not only in fisheries, but in commerce, if we did not open our eyes. He came here to-day backed by the people of this country, especially those who were directly interested in the fisheries. If this country were only like a plain along the Red River, and its people only agriculturists, it could never become a great country or have a foreign trade, by which wealth and power were only obtainable. It was fortunate for this country that it had in the east elements of prosperity different from those in the west, and thus the means of carrying on a domestic trade, which was after all the best of all trades, and which could procure food and work for the greatest number of the people of Canada. The National Policy meant the protection of every industry, and, therefore, the fishery industry should not be left to defend itself. They should not allow it to be crushed by one of the most vigilant and ambitious nations, commercially speaking, in the world. He was in favour of that policy, but, in order to foster manufactures, we must have consumers. Where were they to be found?—not in the States, where they had erected a wall against us; nor in England, where they manufactured cheaper than we could; nor in France, which had a Protective policy; and not much in the West Indies, where we had to compete with the Americans, who had more capital, and more manufacturing skill, a greater experience, and

occupied an intermediate, and consequently a better position than ourselves, in regard to the trade with these ports, and did the business there; and not in Brazil, which was nearer to England than to us. The nearest and best consumers of our manufactures were the population of the Maritime Provinces, and of the eastern part of the Province of Quebec. These people purchased nothing but what the west produced, and could, in return, supply the west with fish. The people of the west were not sufficiently acquainted with the population of the east. On account of their laborious pursuits, and the good food they consumed, in order to keep up with the work, and, also, owing to the salubrity of the country, and the healthy tone of the population, the maritime population multiplied in a greater degree than any inland people. He was afraid, if matters went on as at present, a great many would have to emigrate to the States. The people who went away were generally intelligent and ambitious, the very ones whom we should do our best to retain in the country. He would now come to the subject of the resolution. We had now the means of creating a fund, the interest of which could be devoted to protect and develop our fisheries, and renovate those which were extinct. This could be done without any injury to any portion of this Dominion, and ought to be done now, when we had the means of doing it. What the resolution asked was that the money should remain in the Treasury. If this fund were not created now, when we had the means to do so, how could it be expected, when this country was engaged in costly works, that a fund could be created with equal facility? The destruction would be consummated, and with all our resources engaged in one way or another, there would be difficulty in raising money to restore the fisheries, and that hardy population, having lost its means of subsistence, would have to emigrate in large numbers to the United States. Our manufacturers would lose a great part of their best consumers, and, come what might, our manufactures would come to a standstill; but, the most likely event was that they would begin a retrograde movement. The doctrine of the

necessity of the protection and the fostering of the fishing industries of the fisheries was not new; it had been held in England, France, Norway and the United States. The American Government had given \$7,000,000 bounty in seventy years for the maintenance of that industry, and the French Government were giving bounties to their fishermen at the west coast of Newfoundland, at Iceland, and on the banks of Newfoundland, at the rate of two millions of francs a year. They considered the fisheries of such advantage as a nursery of seamen for their war-fleets that they would not give them up on any consideration. The National Assembly of France had passed a law of the following tenor, relative to the great maritime fisheries, June 24th, 9th, and 22nd July, 1851:—

“Cap. 1.—Cod Fishery.—From the 1st January, 1852, to the 30th June, 1861, the bounties granted for the encouragement of the cod fishery will be fixed as follows:—

“1st. Bounty on the outfit.—Fifty francs per man of the crew employed at the fishery, either on the coast of Newfoundland, at St. Pierre and Miquelon, or on the Grand Bank, and possessing a drying place.

“Fifty francs per man of the crew employed in the Iceland fishery, without a drying place.

“Thirty francs per man of the crew employed at the fishery on the Grand Bank of Newfoundland, and without a drying place.

“Fifteen francs per man of the crew employed at the Dogger Bank fishery.

“2nd. Bounty on the produce of the fishery.—Twenty francs per metric quintal of dry codfish, the produce of the French fishery, to be shipped either direct from the fishing settlements, or from the ports of France, for the markets of the French colonies of America and India, or for the settlements on the west coast of Africa, and other transatlantic countries—provided always that the fish be landed at a port where there is a French Consul.

“Sixteen francs per metric quintal of dry codfish, the produce of the French fishery, shipped either direct from the fishing settlements, or from the ports of France, and destined for the countries of Europe, and the foreign states on the shores of the Mediterranean, Sardinia and Algeria excepted.

“Sixteen francs per metric quintal of dry codfish,—the produce of the French fishery, that may be imported into the French colonies of America and India, and other transatlantic countries, when said fish are exported from the ports of France, without having been there landed

“Twelve francs per metric quintal of dry codfish, the produce of the French fishery,

shipped for Sardinia and Algeria, either direct from the fishing settlements, or from the ports of France.

"Twenty francs per metric quintal of the hard roe of codfish, the produce of the French fishery, brought into France by their fishing vessels.

"NOTE.—One kilogramme is equal to 2lb. 3oz.; 220½lb. equal to 1 metric quintal."

This law was not only still in force, but the French Government was contemplating other measures to protect and develop its sea fisheries, although their products amounted, in the year 1876, to 88,990,591fr., equal to about seventeen millions of dollars. 21,263 vessels and boats, manned by 79,676 men, were employed in these different fisheries. England herself, in 1633, in the reign of Charles I., showed her interest in the fisheries by enacting the following ordinance taken from L. J. H. Young's book on sea fishing:—

"In 1633, Charles I. ordained 'an Association of the three Kingdoms for a general fishery within the hail seas and coasts of His Majesty's said Dominions.' A standing committee was named for the government of the Association, which was joined by many persons of distinction. For the encouragement of this adventure the King ordered that Lent should be strictly observed, but the breaking out of the civil war put an end to this scheme.

"In 1654, the Government, in order to give protection to the fisheries, remitted in favour of Sir Phineas Andrews, who had embarked in the same, the salt duties and Customs and Excise duties upon all naval necessaries, besides which voluntary collections were made from wealthy and patriotic individuals for building wharves, docks, and storehouses, and for defraying other expenses."

The following extracts, also from Young, would demonstrate that the British Parliament, as well as the British nation, were at one time anxious to keep up the British fisheries in a good state of production:—

"A Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed, in 1833, to inquire into the state of the British Channel Fisheries. A second Committee was appointed in 1836, to consider the state of the Salmon Fisheries of Scotland, and, in the previous year, Commissioners had been instructed to investigate the condition of the said fisheries. From each of these bodies reports have proceeded, which have been laid before the Houses of Parliament, and contain a considerable amount of information upon the subject. Taking these branches of the inquiry in the order here given, I will proceed to describe, as briefly as possible, the actual condition of the fisheries connected

with these coasts and rivers of the United Kingdom. The appointment of the Committee in 1833, arose out of the distress which was at that time said to affect the several Channel Fisheries, and, in its reports, the Committee stated that these fisheries were generally in a very depressed state, and on decline; that they appeared to have been gradually sinking since the peace of 1815; that the capital employed did not yield a profitable return; that the number of vessels and of the people to whom it gave employment was diminished; and that the fishermen who formerly could maintain themselves and their families by their industry, were in a greater or less degree pauperised. The cause of this unfavourable change, to which as being in its opinion the most readily susceptible of remedy, the Committee gave its principal attention, was the interference of the fishermen of France and Holland; but the principal cause of the distress was stated to be, 'the great and increasing scarcity of all fish that breed in the Channel,' compared with what was the ordinary supply forty years since; operating prejudicially to the fishermen, at the same time that a continual fall of prices has taken place in the markets."

Professor Baird, the celebrated American naturalist, one of the best authorities on this subject, had written as follows:—

"Extract from report of Professor Spencer Baird, United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, 1872 and 1873, pages xi., xiii., xiv.:

"6. Conclusions as to the decrease of cod-fisheries on the New England coast.

"Of all the various fisheries formerly prosecuted off the coast of New England, north of Cape Cod, the depreciation in that of the cod appears to be of the greatest commercial importance.

"Formerly the waters abounded in this fish to such an extent that a large supply could be taken throughout almost the entire year along the banks, especially in the vicinity of the mouth of large rivers. * * *

"Mr. W. B. McLaughlin, of Southern Head, Grand Manan, says:—'At that time cod, haddock, and pollock, as well as halibut, were taken in great abundance in Seal Cove Sound, between Hardwood Cove, on Wood Island, and Indian or Parker's Point, on the mainland. They were to be met with during the greater part of the year, especially from May to January; and the fishery in the channel was really more productive than on the banks, or further out at sea. * * *

"The fishery in question diminished very soon after, and in a few years ceased almost entirely, so that up to the present time there are not enough cod in those waters to repay the experiment of attempting to catch them. * * *

"Whatever may be the importance of increasing the supply of salmon, it is trifling compared with the restoration of our exhausted cod fisheries; and, should these be brought back to their original condition, we shall find within a short time an increase of wealth on our shores, the amount of which it would be difficult to calculate.

"Not only would the general prosperity of the adjacent states be enhanced, but, in the increased number of vessels built, in the larger number of men induced to devote themselves to maritime pursuits, and in the general stimulus to every thing connected with the business of the sea-faring profession, we should be recovering, in a great measure, from the loss which has been the source of so much commutation to political economists and the writers of the country."

The Professor thus declared that the United States cod fisheries were partly exhausted. He had other authorities proving this fact, which was a consequence of the stimulation afforded by a market of 40,000,000, who were great consumers of fish of all varieties and sizes. The American fishermen and merchants had large inducements in their endeavour to obtain the trade and fisheries of our coasts in the existence of such a market. They naturally wished to shut us out from such a valuable source of profit, for which they had kept us out of their fisheries, while taking possession of ours. If we did not stop them, they would ultimately accomplish their design. At present we did not find that we sold more fish to the States than before the Washington Treaty. On the contrary, even in Canadian cities, and the most distant parts of the country, our people were supplied with American fish, mostly all in a fresh state, winter and summer. It seemed to him that this was a state of things that should not be allowed to continue. Of course we could not break the Treaty, which had four or five years to run, but he should indeed be glad if the Americans terminated it, and then we should do our best to foster, protect, and renovate our fisheries, increase the prosperity of the fishermen and all connected industries. It was with that view that he and several others who took an interest in that industry, thought that the Government should seize this opportune moment to create a fund which no Government or people, adverse to our fisheries, could

destroy, for the development of the fisheries, the renovation of those exhausted, and the general revival of that interest. This question was so new that some still doubted the possibility of renovating sea fisheries by hatching and otherwise. But that was as practicable as the renewal of river fisheries by such means, and the following letter of Professor Baird, proved it beyond doubt:—

"UNITED STATES COMMISSION,

"FISH AND FISHERIES.

"WASHINGTON, D.C., April 16th, 1879.

"DEAR DOCTOR.—The experiments I made last winter in the artificial hatching of cod satisfied me that it is entirely practicable to multiply this species to any desired extent. If I had had the proper machinery I could readily have hatched out young cod and turned them into the ocean by hundreds, almost thousands of millions. I am now constructing a steamer, at a cost of about \$50,000, expressly to do this work. The methods devised by my associates are equally available for all kinds of sea fish, including mackerel. As it was, simply by way of experiment, we planted some eight or ten millions of cod. My report for the year will contain an exhaustive account of the whole business, which I think you will study with much interest.

"Sincerely yours,

"SPENCER F. BAIRD.

"Commissioner.

"DR. P. FORTIN,

"House of Commons, Ottawa, Canada."

He did not see why this Government, since former Governments had voted considerable sums for hatching for river fisheries, which had not the thousandth part of the importance of sea fisheries, should be reluctant, or Parliament either, to do what was asked, in regard to the forming of a fund for the preservation, improvement and development of the fisheries, not only for the present, but for the future, so as to enable us, on the expiration of the treaty, to supply all the demand in the States and in other foreign countries. It was not the Americans who should take all the profit of our fisheries, but ourselves and those who would come after us. He was not in the habit of taking up much time of the House, and must thank it for its kindness in listening to his remarks, which he had tried to make as clear as possible on that occasion. He had had several years' experience in connection with those fisheries. Before he had visited the Gulf of St. Lawrence, he had never suspected the importance of

that interest, although he had perused with delight, in his younger days, the adventures of those great captains and sailors, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, English and French, who had made so many discoveries in the unknown seas 300 years ago. Most of those great seamen were fishermen, brought up on the coast, who had spent their youth in small boats and coasting vessels, and were afterwards able, on setting foot on the large vessels, to learn to perform any duty confided to them in two or three months. On reaching the Gulf of St. Lawrence, he soon realised the importance of the fisheries, and particularly in 1858, when he went to enquire into the French fisheries at Newfoundland and St. Pierre and Miquelon. France, owning only two small rocks in that region, 3,000 miles from her home territory, and the right of fishing off the west, north-west and north coast of Newfoundland, with but the simple right of occupation during the fishing season besides her own coasts, was able to derive, as he had said before, 89,000,000fr. a year, in 1876 from her sea-fishing industry furnishing employment to 21,000 vessels and boats and 79,000 men. That showed the importance she attached to that industry, which would enable her to man her war fleet in a fortnight, or a month at the latest. The following statement would show the paramount importance of the fishing industry in Norway, and it must be remembered that a still larger quantity of fish was taken for local consumption, making the total value of the catch nearly \$30,000,000 :—

FISH OF ALL KINDS EXPORTED FROM NORWAY
IN 1876.

	Quantity.	Value.
Salmon, fresh, cwt.	5,622	\$ 106,245
Mackerel and other fresh fish, cwt.	29,474	90,126
Codfish, Stockfish, dried without being salted, cwt.	393,674	1,692,987
Codfish, split, salted and dried, cwt.	660,761	3,739,264
Herrings, barrels.	897,108	5,182,272
Anchovies, boxes.	167,821	115,290
Lobsters, thousands.	1,270	130,329
Fish oils, barrels.	96,494	1,431,216
Fish offals for bait, barrels.	45,203	540,675
Fish guano, cwt.	2,063	242,487

\$13,270,911

MR. FORTIN.

	Quantity.
Stockfish exported in Italy and in Austria, cwt.	166,802
Dried Codfish exported in Spain, cwt.	474,207
Dried Codfish exported in Portugal, cwt.	58,671
Dried Codfish exported in Italy and Austria, cwt.	10,620

He (Mr. Fortin) further recognised the importance of that interest when he met the fleets of United States fishermen congregating in the harbours of the north shore of the Magdalen Islands, and the estuary of the St. Lawrence and Baie des Chaleurs, or the fleet of the French fishermen at St. Pierre or Miquelon and on the coasts of Newfoundland, and when he knew that our fish went further in the markets of the world than any other products of this country, as far as the Mauritius, Greece, Naples, Portugal, Spain, the West Indies, and Brazil. Afterwards, in 1868, he visited the Maritime Exhibition at Havre, including fishery interests as well as the interests of navigation, when he saw every appliance used in the fisheries, and the boats and vessels employed in the transportation of those goods to market, and all kinds of prepared fish, not only from the United States but Canada, and every nation in Europe, especially Norway, now, perhaps, the greatest fishing nation in the world. In conversation with the exhibitors, he learned enough to convince him that this fishing industry was one of the largest and most important to Canada, if properly developed. Perhaps they would think him an enthusiast. He did not think he was; but, if he was, it was in a great cause. At any rate he was disinterested; he had no property within 600 miles of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. He had no relations, but a great many friends, in all the localities interested in the fisheries. He had never yet met an individual who did not say that the fishing interest was among the greatest of this country; and he had not yet met anyone who did not say that the matter of this resolution was equitable, and that it was just to make a fund of the money obtained by giving the fisheries to the Americans, for the benefit of the fisheries and the fisher-

men who had been injured. Was it sound policy to allow that money to be expended for general purposes, and to abandon the fisheries to destruction, when we had the means of repairing them and further developing our fishing industries? He was certain that, if the present House did not agree with him, the House sitting fifteen years or twenty years hence, would agree with him and others pleading for the same cause, but it would be probably too late. This was just the time to create a fund with this money, to be used for the protection of the fisheries. The whole country would ultimately benefit by it, for the fishing population—who were, no one could deny, the best class of consumers of the manufactures and the agricultural products of this country—would increase in number and in wealth. Under our new Protection policy, the people of the Western Provinces would, he had no doubt, become more and more prosperous and wealthy, and, as a compensation for the higher Protective duties, it was only just that the fishing interest should receive some assistance in the way he had indicated. The National Policy would encourage an interchange of goods between the eastern and western sections of the Dominion, by the route of the St. Lawrence, and thereby benefit the carrying trade. If these fisheries were fostered and developed, instead of having 26,000 people engaged in them, we would soon have 50,000. France, on her other fishing coasts, gave employment to 60,000 men; England, 100,000; and Norway, 150,000. The latter country produced annually nearly 1,000,000 quintals of codfish alone, as a result of the care and protection which that country had given to their fisheries. The fish exported from that country, in 1876, represented a value of \$13,270,000. When he was arguing for the establishment of the telegraph line on the coast of Gaspé, he cited the example of Norway, who, more than ten years ago, encircled her entire fishing coast with a wire, with a station at every prominent point, manned by a guardian and telegraph operator, who gave information at all the stations of the movements of the fish as well as the arrival of storms. The poor fishermen, who, formerly, had to go out to sea day and night,

now sat quietly in the harbour and waited for the information by telegraph. What Norway had done, this country might do. We should do what other nations had done for the development of their fishing industry, and as regarded the telegraph as an auxiliary to the fisheries, he was very glad to thank the Government for having taken the initiative in this important matter, and adopted the proposed scheme of sea coast telegraph for the Gulf and lower River St. Lawrence, and coasts of the Maritime Provinces, and the House for having voted money to carry out part of it this year, more or less. Scarcely a year passed that England did not vote sums of money to build piers and protect boats on the coast of Scotland, in the interest of the fishermen engaged in herring fisheries in the North Sea. She spent thousands of pounds, at short intervals, to build breakwaters to shelter the boats of these fishermen. Was that money wasted? Not at all. If they looked into the reports of the British fisheries, they would find that the herring fisheries prosecuted on the coast of Scotland produced last year 750,000 barrels of fish, each barrel worth \$4 or \$5. He had tried his best to establish his case. If he had omitted anything essential, the hon. gentlemen defending the same cause would be able to supply it. At all events he had spoken with earnestness and with the strongest possible convictions. If he were not convinced of the truth, he would not have dared to come before this House and ask it to sanction the measure he had proposed. In conclusion, he thanked the House for the kindness and attention with which the members had listened to his remarks. He moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolutions:—

“1. *Resolved*, That it is agreed by Article eighteenth (18) of the Treaty of Washington, by the high contracting parties, that is to say, the Government of Her Britannic Majesty and the Government of the United States, that in addition to the liberty secured to the United States fishermen by the convention between Great Britain and the United States, signed at London on the 20th day of October, 1818, of taking, curing and drying fish on certain coasts of the British North American Colonies therein defined, the inhabitants of the United States shall have, in common with the sub-

jects of Her Britannic Majesty, the liberty, for the term of years mentioned in Article XXXIII of this treaty, to take fish of every kind, except shell fish, on the sea coasts and shores, and in the bays, harbours and creeks of the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the Colony of Prince Edward Island, and of the several islands thereunto adjacent, without being restricted to any distance from the shore, with permission to land upon the said coasts and shores and islands, and also upon the Magdalen Islands, for the purpose of drying their nets and curing their fish; provided, that in so doing, they do not interfere with the rights of private property or with British fishermen in the peaceable use of any part of the said coasts in their occupancy for the same purpose; and it is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea fishery, and that the salmon and shad fisheries, and all other fisheries in rivers and the mouths of rivers, are thereby reserved exclusively for British fishermen.

"2. *Resolved*, That it is agreed by Article nineteenth (19) of the said treaty, by the said high contracting parties, that British subjects shall have, in common with the citizens of the United States, the liberty, for the term of years mentioned in Article XXXIII of the said treaty, to take fish of every kind, except shell fish, on the eastern sea coasts and shores of the United States north of the thirty-ninth parallel of north latitude, and on the shores of the several islands thereunto adjacent, and in the bays, harbours and creeks of the said sea coasts and shores of the United States and of the harbours and creeks of the said sea coasts and shores of the United States and of the islands aforesaid, for the purpose of drying their nets and curing their fish, provided that in so doing they do not interfere with the rights of private property, or with the fishermen of the United States, in the peaceable use of any part of the said coasts in their occupancy for the same purpose; and it is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea fishery, and that salmon and shad fisheries, and all other fisheries in rivers and mouths of rivers, are thereby reserved exclusively for fishermen of the United States.

"3. *Resolved*, That, inasmuch as it is asserted, in Article (XXII) twenty-two of the said Treaty, by the Government of her Britannic Majesty, that the privileges accorded to the citizens of the United States, under Article XVIII of the said Treaty, are of greater value than those accorded by Articles XIX and XXI of the said Treaty, to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, and this assertion is not admitted by the Government of the United States, it was further agreed that Commissioners should be appointed to determine, having regard to the privileges accorded by the United States to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, as stated in Articles XIX and XXI of

the said Treaty, the amount of compensation, if any, which, in their opinion, ought to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, in return for the privileges accorded to the citizens of the United States, under Article XVIII of the said Treaty; and that any sum of money which the said Commissioners might so award should be paid by the United States Government, in a gross sum, within twelve months after such award should have been given.

"4. *Resolved*, That, in virtue of the same Article, Commissioners were appointed in the following manner, that is to say: one named by Her Britannic Majesty, one named by the President of the United States, and a third by Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States conjointly.

"5. *Resolved*, That the said Commissioners appointed under Articles XXII and XXIII of the said Treaty of Washington, of the 8th May, 1871, to determine, having regard to the privileges accorded by the United States to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, stated in Articles XIX and XXI of the said Treaty, the amount of any compensation which, in their opinion, ought to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, in return for the privileges accorded to the citizens of the United States, under Articles XVIII and XXI of the said Treaty, having carefully and impartially examined the matters referred to them, according to justice and equity, in conformity with the solemn declaration made and subscribed by them on the 15th day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, did award the sum of five millions five hundred thousand dollars in gold, to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, in accordance with the provisions of the said Treaty; and the said award was signed in Halifax, on the twenty-third day of November, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, as follows:—

(Signed) "MAURICE DELFOSE.
"do. "A. T. GALT.

"6. *Resolved*, That the said sum has been paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of Her Britannic Majesty.

"7. *Resolved*, That, out of that sum of \$5,500,000, a sum of one million dollars has been paid to the Government of Newfoundland for their share of the same award.

"8. *Resolved*, That there remains a sum of \$4,500,000 which has been awarded to the Dominion of Canada, the expenses of the Commission to be deducted proportionately from that sum and the \$1,000,000 awarded to Newfoundland.

"9. *Resolved*, That the said sum of \$4,500,000 has been acquired by the Dominion of Canada by the giving to the fishermen of the United States the right of fishing, in common with British fishermen, in

our municipal waters, over an extent of coast of 3,160 miles, inhabited by a population of over half a million, who derive their subsistence almost entirely from the sea fisheries.

"10. *Resolved*, That the participation of the American fishermen in our sea coast fisheries is known to be a great injury to our own fishing population, and that besides the American fishermen have injured those fisheries in a marked degree, and even depopulated some well-known fishing grounds which formerly were very productive, as has been clearly proved by the testimony given before the Fishery Commission of 1877, and have consequently greatly diminished the products of our fisheries, lessened the chances of our fishermen, and threatened the future of our fishing industry.

"11. *Resolved*, That, if nothing is done, not only to stop the destruction of the fish, that is taking place on our shores, but to repair the injury done, by restoring in some way, as suggested by several scientists, the fishing grounds that are now almost unproductive and which were formerly teeming with fish.

"12. *Resolved*, That merchants, fishermen and traders from the Dominion, as well as from Great Britain, have established themselves on our fishing coasts, and have erected thereon costly buildings of all kinds, suitable for the fishing industry, for the purpose of carrying on the different fisheries which exist on our shores, and have erected such costly establishments, and placed so much capital in the fishing industry, under the belief that the British Fisheries of the Dominion would never be given up to foreign fishermen.

"13. *Resolved*, That the giving up of the right of fishing in our waters to the American fishermen has injured the trade of our fishermen very much for the present, and the prospects are still worse for the future, if no remedy is adopted.

"14. *Resolved*, That it is in the interest of the Dominion that such injury to the fisheries and the fish trade should be repaired to as great an extent as possible.

"15. *Resolved*, That the interior of this country was largely benefitted by the Reciprocity Treaty which was in operation from 1854 to 1866, between Canada and the United States, and that treaty was obtained by conceding to the American fishermen the right of fishing on all our sea coasts.

"16. *Resolved*, That our fisheries and our fishermen suffered considerably in consequence of that concession of our fisheries to foreign fishermen.

"17. *Resolved*, That, during the time the said Reciprocity Treaty was in operation, no sum of money was expended in improvements of any kind on our sea coasts for the development of our fisheries, or to help the fishermen in their arduous labours.

"18. *Resolved*, That it is but equitable and just that what comes from the fisheries should return to the fisheries.

"19. *Resolved*, That, for the foregoing reasons, it is the opinion of this House that the amount of the award accruing to Canada (after paying expenses) should be made a special fund, and that the interest thereof should be employed in restoring exhausted fishing grounds, and developing in every way the sea-fisheries of the Dominion."

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) said he had listened, with a great deal of attention, to the eloquent address of the hon. member for Gaspé. It showed that he was very conversant with the history of the great fishing interests of the Dominion. While he (Mr. Macdonald) was willing to assent, in general terms, to the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Gaspé, that what came from the fisheries should go to the fisheries, he was not quite prepared to say with him that the money arising from the award should be appropriated for the restocking of the fishery banks of this country, that had been depleted in the manner in which the fisheries had been carried on for many years past. Yet, he believed with the hon. gentleman, that this fund should, in an especial manner, be set apart to protect and develop the fishing interest of this country. We knew very well that our great fishing banks were becoming rapidly unproductive; that, whereas it was formerly a very easy matter to catch an abundance of fish, now, owing to the state of the banks, it required a large outlay with very uncertain results, which made the business scarcely remunerative. But while he agreed on this point with the member for Gaspé, he could not lose sight of the fact that the Province of Prince Edward Island had an especial claim to a portion of this award—that was, apart from the general claim of the other Maritime Provinces. They knew that Prince Edward Island assented to the Washington Treaty while she was still a separate Province. She always looked upon the fisheries as one of her greatest sources of wealth. She had no manufactures to fall back upon; no canals or anything of that kind, nor great public works from which she could expect to get money from the public chest. They knew that, under the Washington Treaty, this award was given on the grounds that a large portion of the fish that was taken by the Americans on our coast, was taken within the three-mile

limit. When the Province of Prince Edward Island came into the Confederation, the terms were silent as to the surrender of her fisheries, and, therefore, she reserved to herself her rights to a fair proportion of the award to which she was a consenting party before she entered into the Confederation. They knew, also, that Prince Edward Island had received no equivalent for the surrender of her fisheries, that the liberty given to the American fishermen had been a source of great injury to her own fishermen, who had thereby been deprived, to some extent, of the means of subsistence for themselves and families. In this way the Maritime Provinces could be shown to have suffered a great injury, and, therefore, he contended that, in a like proportion, they had a claim, and a first claim, on the money received under the Washington Treaty. The ratification of that treaty took place before Prince Edward Island became part of the Dominion, and they knew that the rental of those fisheries was not made by the Dominion, but by the Island, as a Province distinct from the Dominion. She never signed away her right to her share of the award, and, if she had remained, like Newfoundland, apart from the Dominion, she would have received a fair portion of the award, in like manner as Newfoundland had done. For these considerations, when the House went into Committee on these resolutions, he should take the opportunity of moving the following amendment:—

“That after the word ‘should,’ in the third last line, the following be inserted: ‘Subject to the claims of Prince Edward Island,’ and, at the end of the last paragraph, the following be added: ‘That Prince Edward Island has special claims upon the moneys arising out of the award, and that the amount of such claims should be fixed and settled at as early a day as possible.’”

MR. MACDONNELL said he had several charges to make against the hon. member for Gaspé, who had moved these resolutions. In the first place he had to complain that that hon. gentleman had allowed this very important question to be delayed until so late a period in the Session. In the second place, he had introduced the resolution on a Saturday, which was a non-sessional day, thus tacitly admitting that the subject was not

MR. MACDONALD.

worthy of the attention of the House on an ordinary day. He had another charge to make against the hon. gentleman, one in which he was supported by the hon. member who had just sat down. It was that the hon. gentleman asserted that the Maritime Provinces could not claim a share of this money as a matter of right. Such an admission was giving up the case completely. Another charge he had to make against the hon. gentleman was that, while he took the fag-end of the week, and the fag-end of the Session to debate his resolutions, he spoke and read for three hours out of the four at their disposal, leaving less than one hour to all the other members who desired to speak on the subject. This was a question of vast importance, not only to the Provinces claiming the money, but, according to the hon. gentleman himself, to every section of this Dominion from Vancouver to Cape Breton; and that he should, on this question, which other hon. members were anxious also to discuss, engross three hours of the limited time at their disposal to discuss it, was unfair to the interests involved and to the people concerned in it. The hon. gentleman could certainly have dispensed with going back as far as the days of Columbus, with giving them the history of the various kinds of fish which inhabited the Sea of Marmora and adjacent seas in days gone by. Dealing with so practical a subject in so circumscribed a time, the hon. gentleman might have dispensed with entering into a learned disquisition on these matters. There was no necessity to enlarge on the value of our fisheries. They had only to point to the five and a half millions just paid to us by the award of a just and enlightened tribunal as the evidence of that value. To corroborate that evidence they had the returns of the product of the fisheries, which, in 1878, amounted to \$12,030,000. He was satisfied with that evidence, and did not think, on the face of it, that the importance of this great resource of our country would be questioned, and he regretted that the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) had not been of the same opinion, so that more time would have been at the disposal of hon. members to treat this question as it ought to be treated. Now, there were two questions, admit-

tang the great value of the fisheries, which naturally presented themselves. Were the Provinces, out of whose waters the Americans fished, entitled to a portion or the whole of this money, and, if they were, how could this money be best appropriated? As to the first question, he hoped there was not an hon. gentleman in this House, beside the hon. member for Gaspé, who would hesitate to say such Provinces had a right to this money. The forefathers of the present inhabitants of the Maritime Provinces, who followed the fisheries as a means of livelihood, emigrated and settled in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and Quebec; many of them, fishermen from Scotland and the islands of Scotland. The rich fisheries of those countries induced them to settle along the inhospitable shores of those Provinces, which offered then, and now offered, no other means of existence to these hardworking and enterprising men. These fisheries became the just inheritance of the descendants of these people, and it was because they expected these fisheries would be owned by them and their descendants that they settled down upon the barren shores and mountain lands adjoining them. If they could have had foreknowledge of the fact that they would form a portion of this Dominion, and that Parliament would sit and legislate on their rights and properties, could they have anticipated that this Parliament would have bartered away their fishery rights, at their very doors, to a foreign nation, whose people came there, and not only carried away their fish, but by their destructive engines and means of fishing, entirely ruined and destroyed them forever. These fisheries had become the inheritance of these people, who generation after generation laboured on them as their farms, and they might as well take away the air they breathed, or render it unsafe to sustain life, as to take away those rights. That the fisheries were being destroyed there was no doubt; it had been proved most conclusively by a discussion that took place in this House early in the Session; and the hon. mover of these resolutions was right in saying that the people who inhabited these shores would be obliged to emigrate to the United States if these fisheries were not protected. The other

question was how should this money be appropriated? He did not agree with the mover of the resolution in his proposition to invest the money as a special fund, and dispose the interest towards fish-breeding establishments. It had not yet been established conclusively by experience, that the artificial fish-breeding enterprise was successful. That hon. gentleman had bestowed a great deal of time and pains on the matter, and, if he could have produced conclusive evidence that this system was a success, he would have done so. The only evidence he produced was a letter from Mr. Spence Baird, Fishery Commissioner of the United States, in reference to the artificial breeding of cod and other fish. That experiment was in its very infancy, and it was an old maxim that said:

“Be not the first by whom the new is tried,
Nor yet the last to cast the old aside.”

He had very little faith in restocking our deep sea fisheries by artificial breeding. There might be something in the system as regarded our rivers. If it were practicable thus to restore the cod and other deep sea fisheries, there would be an amount of disagreement as to which grounds should be chosen, and he felt satisfied much money would be wasted on what might turn out to be a vain speculation. There were other purposes to which the money could be applied. Many of our own fishermen never went beyond three miles from our shores, and a very great extent of our coast was without harbours. Other portions required piers and breakwaters for the protection of boats and fishing craft. The best fishing grounds were often on the most rocky shores. The county which he had the honour to represent had a sea-coast line on one side of 120 miles, without a single good harbour. There were several harbours that could be much improved by the expenditure of money, and which would benefit the fisheries. The Island of Cape Breton was adjacent to the best fisheries of the Dominion. Neither Prince Edward Island, Gaspé nor New Brunswick, possessed fisheries equal to the fisheries surrounding the Island of Cape Breton. That was apparent from the number of American and other fisher-

men from all portions of the Maritime Provinces, who resorted to the waters adjacent to that Island during the fishing season. The following was a comparative statement of the products of our fisheries in 1878, already mentioned, amounting in all to \$12,000,000, contributed by the four different Provinces: Nova Scotia, \$5,527,858; New Brunswick, \$2,133,237; Quebec, \$2,560,148; Prince Edward Island, \$763,000. It appeared that Nova Scotia produced alone, in one year, more fish than the other three principal Provinces, and about one-half the product of the whole Dominion. It was known that the best portions of our fisheries were the waters adjacent to the Island of Cape Breton. The most beneficial manner of expending this money, if it was to be specially appropriated, would be to improve our harbours, build piers, and other navigation securities for our fishermen. Every year, when autumn approached, they looked for wrecked boats and vessels of their seamen and fishermen. He was sorry to see that the Government had allowed this matter to stand so long. Various questions had been put to them as to the disposition of this money, but without satisfaction. They had assigned Saturday to the discussion of this question, when hon. gentlemen were absent from the House, regaling themselves after the week's work, and when their minds were occupied in other directions than the business of the country. It was known that last year a grant of \$10,000 was made for the purpose of commencing to build a breakwater, to protect and improve the harbour of Port Hood. The present Minister of Public Works then advocated that work, and interpellated the leader of the Government as to whether he was not going to undertake that (to use the hon. member's own words) "important public work." He (Mr. MacDonnell) had the assistance of the hon. the present Minister of Public Works in getting the Government to grant that sum. The Fishery Award was not then paid, nor was it certain that it would be paid. Notwithstanding, that the award was in the meantime paid, the hon. the Minister of Public Works cancelled that grant, although tenders were received for its expenditure the moment he got

into power, and the work was abandoned. The fishermen of Nova Scotia were interested more than any other in these public works. It was in such works as these that the money or a great portion of it should be expended. The Province of Nova Scotia came into the Confederation very reluctantly. Its people complained that, when they came into it, the duties on the necessaries of life were raised from ten to fifteen per cent. By the legislation passed in this House a few days ago, their duties had been raised again, this time to thirty and thirty-five per cent. Now, they found that their fisheries were sold, and that the money consideration of that sale was to be used for the purpose of building a railway of Ontario, through Manitoba out to across the continent through a portion British Columbia. Were the people of Nova Scotia going to acquiesce in this? It was the duty of this House to harmonise the various interests and Provinces of the Dominion, to work out the problem of Confederation in the best manner possible. This could be done only by respecting the immutable principles of justice. In taking this money, the price of the sale of the birthright of the fishermen and people of the Maritime Provinces, and in appropriating it to the works in the far West, those principles had been violated. It was iniquitous and unjust to the Province of Nova Scotia. It might be that, because that Province was small, weak in point of population and representation in this House, the Government considered it wiser to pander to the large and growing Province of Ontario. He appealed to the magnanimity and sense of justice of the people of Ontario, and that without fear of being disappointed. Was there any member in this House who had the hardihood to say that that Province had an equal right to that money with the Maritime Provinces? He thought not. There was no portion of the people of the Dominion that contributed so much *per capita* to the revenues as did our fishermen. They consumed more dutiable goods than any other class of the community. Yet they did not complain. They did not come to this House knocking at the doors as common paupers, asking for legislation to keep their nets, as the manufacturers did in regard to

their looms, from being idle. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) who so feebly advocated their rights, had not a petition from the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. The rights of these fishermen should be protected, and this money should be expended for their benefit, to enable them to prosecute, with advantage, their arduous and dangerous calling.

MR. HACKETT said he congratulated the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) on the able manner in which he had dealt with the subject before the House. While agreeing with him generally, he (Mr. Hackett) could not overlook the fact that the people of Prince Edward Island had a special claim to the award. At the time of the ratification of the Washington Treaty, it was found that the Province of Prince Edward Island had, through Sir Edward Thornton, entered into treaty negotiations with the American Minister, Mr. Fish. He found, on looking over a despatch at that time, a Memorandum of Council in reply to a letter from Downing-street with regard to the Island allowing American fishermen to participate in their fisheries, the following paragraph:—

"The Committee submit that a commercial arrangement with the United States, in consideration of the use of the fisheries, would have been most acceptable, but as the Royal High Commission were unable to induce the American Government to change its commercial policy, the people of this Island, being extremely loyal, and devotedly attached to British institutions, would be most unwilling to throw any obstacle in the way of an amicable settlement of all causes of difference between Great Britain and the United States, and would, therefore, willingly accept any reasonable money compensation, in addition to the privileges granted, as an equivalent."

Which showed that, should that privilege be surrendered, the Island would receive a money compensation therefor. This document was received in evidence before the Commission which sat at Halifax. The privilege of allowing American fishermen to fish in their waters, was, at least, taking away from the Island fishermen something that specially belonged to them. As had been stated by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell), when these people settled on the shores of the Maritime Provinces, and made homes there for themselves, they looked upon the

fisheries as the only means of subsistence for themselves and families. Now, on account of matters of State, these fisheries were taken away from them, and foreigners were allowed to come in and destroy the fish. Then, as the means of subsistence were taken away from these fishermen, the money which was obtained for these fisheries ought, in justice, to be returned to the people who suffered by the sale. He did not agree with the suggestions of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) respecting the means of developing the fisheries. The possibility of restocking the deep sea fisheries was not a demonstrated fact. It was only an experiment. This Fishery Award could be appropriated to far better advantage than by experimenting with fish hatcheries. The only authority they had on this subject was Professor Bird, who stated that he had been experimenting, and that the sea fisheries could be restocked. Supposing fish were put in the waters of the Province, within the three-mile limit, there was no means of preventing them going outside that limit, and the consequence would be those American fishermen would come along and receive a portion of the money appropriated for this purpose. Money appropriated in that way would be hard cash thrown away. Instead of indulging in any such Quixotic ideas, we should preserve the valuable fisheries we now possessed. If Americans were allowed to go on fishing by means of purse seines, the fisheries would soon become exhausted, and, therefore, this destructive method of fishing ought to be prevented. He was a little amused at the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell), who waxed so indignant when referring to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald's) remarks respecting the value of the Prince Edward Island fisheries. The value of the exports of fish was no criterion of the value of the fisheries. It was well known that the same amount of capital was not invested in Prince Edward Island as was invested in the larger Province of Nova Scotia; but that did not detract from the value of the fisheries of the former Province. The hon. gentleman knew that many vessels from Nova Scotia fished around the coasts of Prince Edward, which possessed the most valu-

able fisheries in the Gulf. If the hon. gentleman's Province had such valuable fisheries, why were not these people kept at home? But no, they were glad to come around the shores of the Island and benefit by their valuable fisheries, and it ill became the hon. gentleman to detract from their value. With regard to the general question, he would say the fishing interest was a very important one, and one to which full justice should be done. There was no product of the Dominion that commanded so unfluctuating a price in foreign markets as the article of fish. He thought it was the duty of the Government to take such steps as would protect the fisheries of the country. He hoped that, in the distribution of this award, the Province of Prince Edward Island would be considered, and that she would receive, what he considered was her just right, a fair proportion of it.

MR. ANGLIN said it was advisable first to get possession of the money, and, after that, settle how it was to be appropriated.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 5th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CORRECTIONS.

MR. COUGHLIN corrected a statement in the London *Advertiser*, in which it was stated that he voted both ways on the Usury question. He only voted once, and, though he had pointed out the error by letter to the editor of the *Advertiser*, the statement had been repeated. He called on the Clerk to state to the Speaker whether that was correct or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member voted against Mr. Plumb's amendment for the six months' hoist of the Usury Bill.

MR. COSTIGAN said the hon. gentleman's name was taken when he did not

vote, and, Mr. Thompson (Haldimand) calling attention to it, the name was struck out. What the hon. gentleman complained of was not that the mistake occurred, but that the incorrect statement was repeated after it had been denied.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said it was, perhaps, only right that he should say that, when the vote on the Usury question was taken, the vote of the hon. gentleman was taken twice, the vote one way being taken erroneously, and when the hon. gentleman did not vote.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he was not in the habit of troubling the House, but he wished to correct a statement made by the *Chignecto Post*, a paper published in his own constituency, to the effect that, when the reciprocity negotiations were going on, he left for Washington to see Mr. George Brown, that he did not get farther than Boston, and that he charged \$2,000 for the trip. This accusation was doubly false. In 1874, he went to Washington, and, on his return, he deducted his actual expenses, and also what would be deducted from his Sessional allowance, as he thought it was hardly reasonable that he should lose this allowance, as he was away on public business. Of the \$2,000 he returned \$1,515.46, as was shown in the Public Accounts, leaving a balance of \$485, which he kept for his actual expenses and Sessional allowance, to which he was entitled. He saw that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) had on the notice paper a motion for information on this point, and, as he feared that this motion could not be reached this Session, he made this explanation to the House.

MR. DOMVILLE said he thought it was very unfair that the hon. gentleman should anticipate his motion, and the bringing down of the papers by making such a statement. As matters stood, they had nothing save a mere verbal statement of the hon. gentleman, who, he thought, should produce documentary evidence on the subject.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he thought his hon. friend (Sir A. J. Smith) had the most ample right to refute a most gross and villanous attack levelled against him by a newspaper published in his coun-

MR. HACKETT.

ty. If the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville) had looked at the Public Accounts for 1875, he would have found, on page 39: "Hon. A. J. Smith, returned for expenses on account of the Reciprocity Treaty, \$1,515.46."

SIR A. J. SMITH said he did not know what the hon. member for King's meant, as to no evidence being produced. The Public Accounts were sufficient.

JUDGE POLETTE.

MR. MÉTHOT presented a petition praying for the dismissal of Judge Polette, of the Three Rivers District. He moved the reception of the petition.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, as this was an indictment of a Judge of a Superior Court, special care should be exercised as to how the House proceeded. The petition should not be received until the proper time had expired.

MR. MÉTHOT said this was a peculiar case. If action were not taken this Session, the Three Rivers District would be denied justice for another year. The Judge well knew that action was proposed. Five years ago a resolution was passed by the advocates of that district asking the hon. Judge, in view of his old age, to retire from the Bench. In February last a resolution was passed by sixteen to one of the members of the bar asking the Government to take steps for the removal of the Judge, as he was unable to efficiently perform his duties, and the assistance of other Judges had to be asked.

MR. SPEAKER ruled the petition out of order.

PRIVATE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 101) To amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Detroit River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

NAVIGATION OF THE TRAVERSE.

QUESTION.

MR. LAURIER enquired, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the following resolution adopted by the Quebec Board of Trade at one of their late meetings, viz: "That in order to secure the navigation of the Traverse earlier in the spring and later in the fall, it is expedient that a permanent crib-work be erected at the eastern entrance, upon which lights would be placed, instead of the floating lightship now in use," and if so, is it the intention of the Government to take any steps for the carrying out of the views expressed by the said resolution.

MR. POPE (Queen's P.E.I.) said the attention of the Government had been called to the subject, but it was not the intention of the Government to take the steps referred to.

SETTLERS' CLAIMS IN MANITOBA.

QUESTION.

MR. DUBUC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to recognise the staked claims of the settlers in Manitoba, particularly those followed by possession and improvements.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is the intention of the Government to recognise such claims as have been followed by possession and improvement.

SQUATTERS' LANDS ON THE RED RIVER.

QUESTION.

MR. DUBUC enquired, Whether the Government intend to concede the lands squatted upon by the settlers on the Red River, at more reasonable conditions than \$5 an acre, price fixed by the late Government in 1877.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have made enquiries into this matter, and found that there is a great competition to get those lands at \$5 per acre. Therefore we do not propose to reduce it.

STEAM FERRY BETWEEN GEORGETOWN AND PICTOU.

QUESTION.

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to insist on the Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island running a boat between Georgetown and Pictou, in accordance with the terms of the original contract.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: On the 1st June, 1876, the Postmaster-General agreed to substitute for the service between Georgetown and Pictou, a service between Charlottetown and Pictou, and no application has been made since to the Department on the subject.

ONTARIO COMMON SCHOOL FUND.

QUESTION.

MR. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the current year, to pay over to the Government of Ontario the amount due to the Province from the Common School Fund, including the Land Improvement Fund, under the award of the arbitration recently confirmed between the late Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada.

MR. TILLEY: The Government will be prepared to meet all its engagements under the arrangement between the Dominion and various Provinces.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman has not observed the form of the question. It says: "Under the award."

MR. TILLEY: The legal obligations under that award the Government will be prepared to pay.

SITTING BULL.

QUESTION.

MR. DUBUC, in the absence of Mr. SCHULTZ, enquired, Whether the Government has any official knowledge of the alleged facts contained in the following Washington telegram to the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*:—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"WASHINGTON, April 21.—It has been decided, after repeated conferences between the Secretaries of State, War, and Interior, that the troublesome individual on the northern frontier, known as Sitting Bull, is a British subject; that he, with his followers, voluntarily left the country of the United States, and placed themselves under the protection of Her Majesty, who will hereafter be held responsible for their good conduct.

"The Secretary of War has written a letter to General Sherman to this effect, and the Secretary of State will notify the British Government.

"This may become a serious International question if Sitting Bull makes a raid on the frontier during the coming summer. General Ruger, who has gone north of Dakota, four miles south of where Sitting Bull's camp lies, with the Eighteenth Infantry, who will build a military post in that locality, has been notified of this decision, and will govern himself accordingly."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the Government had no notice or information, official or otherwise, on the subject. They fancied the report must be a mere canard, inasmuch as it must be obvious that neither the Secretary of the United States, the Secretary of War, nor the Secretary of the Interior, could decide who was a British subject.

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS AND WESTERN COUNTIES RAILWAY COMPANIES.

QUESTION.

MR. LONGLEY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this Session for the purpose of settling the long pending dispute between the Windsor and Annapolis and Western Counties Railway Companies and the Government.

MR. TUPPER: The Government will not be able, I fear, this Session to introduce a Bill for that purpose.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE FISHERY AWARD.

QUESTION.

MR. BAIN, in the absence of Mr. YEO, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to comply with the memorial of the Prince Edward Island Government, in reference to the appropriation of the Fishery Award.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the whole question was under the consideration of the Government.

LAND GRANT TO VOLUNTEERS OF
1837-38.

QUESTION.

MR. HOOPER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take into consideration the services of the volunteers of 1837-38, by giving to each of them a grant of land from the the unoccupied Dominion lands in Manitoba or elsewhere.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This matter has been brought under the attention of the Government for the first time. I think it is too late for us to take it up and settle it this Session.

TORONTO POST OFFICE.

MOTION FOR ACCOUNTS.

MR. MACMILLAN moved for copies of all accounts rendered by the postmaster at Toronto, or compiled for the postmaster at Toronto, at the Post Office Department, between the first day of July, A.D., 1874, up to the first day of July, A.D., 1878, together with copies of all Orders in Council and memoranda of the Postmaster-General, or Deputy Postmaster-General, authorizing the payment of an increased salary or commission to the said postmaster within the periods above mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE OF THE STEAMER GLEN-
DON.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. DOMVILLE, in the absence of Mr. PLUMB, moved for copies of all papers, reports and accounts connected with the purchase, repairs, and seaworthiness of the steamer *Glendon*. He said that the object of the motion was to get certain papers, in order to inform the country as to the value of this steamer, and the propriety of the purchase. It had been so often mentioned in this House that almost every hon. gentleman must understand the question. The

Glendon was purchased some years ago, after she had, in a measure, been abandoned as unfitted for the purposes for which she was intended when built. She had been found so useless for the purpose intended that her owners decided it would be useless to keep her in the trade contemplated, and that it would be best to sell her. They managed to dispose of her to the Government of Canada. There had been a good deal of dispute in the House as to the desirability of the bargain. Her purchase, at \$20,000, was a dead loss to the Government, as it was alleged she could have been bought for \$5,000. She was useless, as would be seen from Captain Lavoie's report, and cost a large amount for repairs. The late Minister of Finance had endeavoured to show that that steamer's purchase was highly in the interest of the Government. On the Ministerial side they contended that her purchase was a waste of public money—they had reports that she was useless. The late Minister of Marine decided to buy that vessel, though warned it would be a bad bargain, as he afterwards admitted; for that reason the hon. member for Niagara wished all information on the subject. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) having admitted in the most unequivocal manner that she had caused a great loss to the country, perhaps he (Mr. Domville) should say a little more about it. But he thought the papers would show for themselves, as they could have shown before a Committee, that that hon. knight had bought the steamer in opposition to those who knew somewhat better. She was bought in a hurry, and he thought the report was that \$5,000 would have been a very large price. Tens of thousands had been spent to keep her in order, yet they had evidence she was able to go only a few knots an hour. He did not believe it was from the inability of the hon. member for Westmoreland that he had been induced to buy that vessel, which had entailed a public loss, but that he had been led away by the reports of others, who had interests to serve. Had any of the present Ministers ever committed such an act, they would never have heard the last of it. The hon. gentleman had admitted that the country had sustained a heavy loss. He did not

hesitate to say that, if the hon. gentleman had followed the advice of those surrounding him, the steamer would not have been purchased, and the country would have been spared the loss sustained by reason of her purchase. He would be glad to hear what the hon. gentleman had to say in his defence, and what reasons he could give why these papers should not be brought down.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he thought he could satisfy the House that this transaction was a *bonâ fide* one, and he was glad that this motion had been made, because it gave him an opportunity of making this explanation. He had been charged by the *St. John Sun*, and some other newspapers, with having concealed some reports that were made before the vessel was purchased, which reports were to the effect that this vessel was unseaworthy. He characterised that statement as an absolute falsehood and a slander. There was not a word of truth in it. Now, what were the facts of this case? There had been no fraud in this transaction; he did admit that a mistake had been made, but it was through the Inspector's report, and, if he had the transaction to do again, knowing what he did know of the vessel, he would not purchase her. He had acted throughout on the report of an officer of his Department. The report which had been referred to by the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Domville) and which he stated was made before the vessel was purchased, was, in fact, made months after the vessel was bought. This service had been performed by a schooner called *Le Canadien*, of about 150 tons. In the fall of 1874, it was discovered that this vessel was no longer fit for the service, and it was the desire of Captain Lavoie, and of some other officers of the Department, that she should be replaced by a steamer. He was reluctant to go to the expense of providing another steamer, but, after consultation with the deputy head of the Department, they concluded that if they could get a cheap steamer they would buy one to replace *Le Canadien*. He had no idea of spending \$40,000 or \$50,000 for a steamer for that service, because he did not think the service needed it, although, no doubt, Captain Lavoie would have liked one costing that

much. While they were discussing this matter an offer came from some party in St. John interested in the *Glendon*. He had never heard of the vessel before, and did not know such a vessel existed. He received an offer of sale of the *Glendon*, and, after advising with the deputy on the subject, they concluded, before having anything to do with it, to send to Mr. William M. Smith, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Inspection at St. John, and to get his confidential report on the vessel. They did send down and got his report, which was dated 10th of February, 1875. When this offer was made, he did not know who were the owners of this steamer, but it turned out that Mr. Nicholson, who was not a political friend of theirs, was interested in this vessel. He read the report of Mr. Smith; and asked any hon. gentleman if that report did not show that vessel to be a good vessel? Mr. Smith stated she had a speed of seven knots an hour, and that was all they required. After consultation with the deputy, they concluded she was quite fast enough. She was much better than the vessel which preceded her, which was nothing but a schooner. She would only consume eight tons of coal in twenty-four hours, which was a very small quantity indeed, the *Lady Head* having consumed twenty-five tons in the same period. They concluded to offer \$20,000 for the vessel, though the price asked was \$26,000. Mr. Smith, the Inspector, said she was worth \$25,000, but they did not give that sum. The hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Domville) had stated this vessel was not worth more than \$5,000, but from the exhibition the hon. gentleman had made of himself on several occasions, the House would know what dependence to place on his statement. There was no political object to be served in the purchase of this vessel. They thought the vessel a cheap one, and they did the business exactly as they would have done if they were buying a vessel for themselves. The report of Mr. Smith stated the vessel would be ready for sea with the ordinary repairs which a vessel required every spring. She was put on the slip and underwent repairs. He was in St. John shortly afterwards, and found that the repairs were costing a great deal

more than he anticipated. He had no idea, from the report, that she would cost so much. He saw the agent in St. John, and Mr. Smith, and expressed to both these gentlemen his great dissatisfaction that the repairs of the vessel cost so much more than the report gave him reason to believe. She was prepared for sea at a very considerable expense. She went round the service in the River St. Lawrence, and, after three or four months, Captain Lavoie, who he did not think was much in love with this vessel, reported to the Department that she was totally unfit for the service, that life was not safe on the vessel, and that he would not risk himself, or his crew, on board. Upon receiving this information, after consultation with the Deputy, he concluded to have a survey made of this vessel. He directed Mr. Risley, the Chairman of the Board, and Mr. Lawson, to make the survey, and send for Mr. Smith to be present. They made an examination of the vessel, and reported she was not fit for the service she was in. There was end to that vessel. He saw Mr. Smith afterwards, and expressed great dissatisfaction with him; he told him, in fact, that his conduct deserved dismissal, and he believed it did. But hon. members knew that one did not like to take an extreme measure of that kind. He did not want to take his living away from him, and did not dismiss him, although he might have been in fault in not doing so. This vessel was then sent to Halifax, where she had since done valuable service. His own report said so. If there was any blame in the matter, it rested upon Mr. W. M. Smith.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): Then there is some one to blame.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he had always blamed Mr. Smith. The hon. member for Ottawa made a speech a few evenings previously, in which he made an attack on the Department, particularly in regard to the voluminous character of their reports. He was sorry to see the hon. gentleman declare himself the enemy of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman said that the report contained too much. That might be, so far as he was concerned, but they must remember that they had, as the deputy head of the Department, a gentleman who had

been forty years connected with maritime and merchant shipping matters, and he had a pretty good idea of what would be interesting to maritime people. The report, certainly, cost a good deal of money, but there was no Department in the public service that dealt with such a variety of subjects as did the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He had no doubt that the hon. member for Ottawa would not think these subjects worthy of being read, but there was no report published sought after with so much interest by the people of the Maritime Provinces. The publication of the details connected with almost every branch connected with the service of the Marine and Fisheries, cost a good deal of money, but it gave employment to people living in Ottawa, and in that way was a local advantage. What object could he (Sir A. J. Smith) have, in publishing all these details, except the good of the public service. His successor had followed his example, and any reflection the hon. gentleman passed upon him also fell upon the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The head of the meteorological branch of the service was very anxious that his report should be published in full, but he (Sir A. J. Smith) had it condensed to about one-third. He thought he had satisfied the House, and he was sure he had satisfied the country, that his conduct, in the purchase of the *Glendon*, was blameless.

MR. DOMVILLE: No.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the hon. gentleman spoke *ex cathedra*. Anyone hearing the hon. gentleman speak in the House would think that he was the sole authority on New Brunswick matters. The hon. gentleman had spoken too much for his own good, and he thought he would find that to be the case when he returned to his constituents. He was quite willing that a thorough investigation into this matter should be instituted.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said that in the purchase of this vessel a disgraceful waste of public money had taken place, and an injury to the public interest had been effected. He thought the proper course for the hon. gentleman to have taken in this matter was to have advertised for tenders for the supplying of such

a vessel as might have been wanted for the service, instead of making in his own Province a purchase in which some of his political friends were interested, directly or indirectly. The hon. gentleman, when the matter was under discussion, a few Sessions ago, said that Mr. Smith reported her fit for the service for which she was intended. He (Mr. Pope) maintained that this vessel was proved to be unfit for that service, and that she was laid up at the time. The hon. gentleman said that the vessel was approved of by Mr. Smith. Now he would read the report of Mr. Smith, in regard to the vessel.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that the motion was for the papers, and that the papers should not be read without his having had an opportunity of seeing them.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said the hon. gentleman had referred to the report, and had made use of information which he had had access to as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He (Mr. Pope) simply put himself in a position to reply to the hon. gentleman's statements. The report was as follows:—

"For reasons explained by Mr. Simons, *Bureau Veritas* surveyor of this port, in his report herewith enclosed, we are of opinion that the hull is a bad model, is unseaworthy, and is already strained. The engine and boiler are too small to make her a serviceable boat in bad weather; altogether we believe the vessel to be unfit for her present employment. Her best rate of speed as made by trial to-day was 6-12 knots per hour, with tide and wind on the quarter, and 5½ against the tide. These results were obtained in fresh water, opposite Quebec. What could be done in salt water, on a voyage of any length, we may assume she would not do so well."

The following was an extract from a letter of Commander Lavoie, in command of the *Glendon*, dated 19th October, 1878:—

"We entered the Bay of Gaspé last night to repair the damages sustained by the steamer on our trip to the Magdalen Islands. It is through the mercy of God we were not all lost.

"In spite of my anxiety, to find some good in the bargain of the Department, it is impossible to do anything useful with her. For three weeks past, since the stormy season has commenced, it is proved that this steamer will certainly be the grave of its crew if continued in the service.

"The Captain had already told me that the vessel came near filling and upsetting, owing to its faulty construction, when crossing from Ste Anne des Monts to Trinity the other day; that she was unfit for navigation, and would surely be wrecked. I could not believe it, but during this last trial I was convinced of the truth of the Captain's assertion. The steamer is flat-bottomed, and makes more leeway in a heavy sea than headway. When leaving Magdalen Islands we very nearly drifted on the Downs, and had it been during night time, must have been lost on them, where so many men and vessels have been destroyed. We were five days at the Magdalen Islands, with gales blowing every day from all points of the compass, and we always experienced greater difficulty than the American schooners in reaching our anchorage.

"This steamer runs five knots in calm weather, three with wind and sea ahead, and her greatest speed is seven knots assisted by a tearing gale. The steamer can run only during calm weather, and fair winds. With such a vessel we cannot stir while the wind is blowing from the seaward, and continues a few hours, even if we are only at a mile's distance from shore; and this may happen fifty times during a season.

"With our old schooner there was no such danger under similar circumstances, so long as we could keep sail on her.

"The steamer goes neither under sail nor steam, and I do not believe one man among the crew will consent to embark on her for another year.

"The engineer, who is a man of superior ability and courage, is disgusted.

"The hull is strained and leaks all over.

"We sail two days, and it takes three or four men four days to repair the damage.

"The night before last, during a heavy gale, when we lost our sails, the fires were extinguished by the leakage of the boiler, consequently we could raise no steam.

"We left Magdalen Islands on the 7th, for Natashquan, with a strong breeze from the S.S.E. We steered so as to double the East Point on leaving Entry Island. With a schooner we could have doubled a point twenty miles longer, but with the *Glendon* we had to return, as we made more leeway than headway, and we would have drifted on the Downs before reaching the Point.

"We subsequently tried the West Point, which was an easier job, there being a fair wind. After passing the Point we set sail for Anticosti Island, but as the gale increased and the vessel laboured heavily, I took the advice of the Captain, who thought it was more prudent to anchor at Gaspé, owing to the imminence of the storm and the unseaworthiness of our craft. His advice proved good, for, at 6 p.m., the weather became very dark and the wind very great. Waves mountains high rose at our stern, as if to drown us. We were then about half way to Gaspé. Our foresails, the only ones which could be set, were carried away, and our fires were nearly extinguished.

"This lasted until 3 p.m. It is impossible to describe the anxiety we experienced. None but those who saw the thing can understand it. We arrived at the basin of Gaspé last night, and very tired. I believe none of the crew has undressed since last Sunday.

"I repeat it—there is no rest to be had with such a vessel. We are to-day occupied in repairing the sails, and the engineer and firemen are working at the boilers. If the engineer says we can risk crossing to the North coast, I will go; if not, I will sail for Bay des Chaleurs, and then to Quebec, to deliver the steamer into the hands of the Department forever."

The following was an extract of Captain Lavoie's Report of Progress, dated 2nd October, 1878 :—

"Our chief engineer has just informed me that another leak has manifested itself in the boiler, and may take some time to repair. He states that this boiler never could have been new or good when placed in the *Glendon*, or else has been terribly neglected by those in charge. The machinery has been a source of great anxiety and trouble to us ever since we left Quebec. Mr. Poliquin further states that it is only with great care that the boiler will carry us through this season, and that it will be necessary to replace it by a new one if the vessel is to be used next spring. It therefore may happen that our cruise will be longer than usual, as we shall have to depend a great deal on fair winds along the North shore."

The hon. member could further refer to the report of the captain :

"Owing to the very small power in proportion to the size of the ship, the least head wind or sea is immediately felt, and naturally deadens her way. Against a strong breeze, say from five to six, with the usual amount of sea caused by such wind, she would not carry steege way. It might be thought, in such case, the sails should be set, and the vessel worked to windward under steam and sail combined, but I have found by experience that she is much too leewardly for any advantage to be gained by adopting this course."

In his (Mr. Pope's) opinion, no Minister or any person entrusted with any charge of a Department had a right to go down to his own Province, amongst his own friends, and buy a trap of that kind that he never saw, and which was never properly examined. \$28,000 were paid for that boat, which no man would give \$5,000 for. The course pursued by the hon. gentleman was not justifiable. The duty of the Minister was to invite tenders for a suitable vessel, not to act upon a report which was no report at all.

SIR A. J. SMITH said it was something new, in parliamentary proceedings, on a motion made by an hon. member, that a Minister should have the papers required in his hands, and make use of them, without allowing the person attacked an opportunity of seeing them. The hon. gentleman had attacked him (Sir A. J. Smith) systematically, on every occasion, although he had treated the hon. gentleman in quite a different spirit. But he had ceased to expect anything like courtesy or fair play from the hon. gentleman. Was it reasonable, when the hon. member for King's (Mr. Donville) had made an attack on him (Sir A. J. Smith), that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should produce the papers without giving him (Sir A. J. Smith) an opportunity of seeing them, although he had not seen them for years. Why did he not send them across to him (Sir A. J. Smith)? The hon. gentleman said this vessel was no good. If so, why did he retain her in the service? In his own report it was stated she was doing good service in Halifax. This money was not wasted. He (Sir A. J. Smith) had stated before that, if he had had proper information with regard to this vessel, he would not have bought her. The hon. gentleman in quoting from reports, after the vessel was purchased, and when she was in service, was not dealing with the matter in a fair judicial spirit. It was on the report of Wm. M. Smith that she was purchased. Wm. M. Smith knew the purpose for which the vessel was intended, and he said she was good for that purpose; that she was built for a freight steamer. What was wanted was a vessel, economical in the consumption of coal, with a speed of seven or eight miles an hour. W. M. Smith said, in his report, the vessel was worth \$25,000; she was bought for \$20,000. The hon. gentleman knew this was a *bonâ fide* transaction. He (Sir A. J. Smith) supposed, and the Deputy Minister supposed, that this was a cheap vessel. In view of these facts, it was unprecedented that he should be treated in this way. The hon. gentleman, not satisfied with this subject, brought up the *Northern Light* question again. What had that to do with the subject? He (Sir A. J. Smith) challenged the hon. gentleman with regard to the *Glendon* matter, and other matters,

to appoint a Committee at any time, this or any other Session, before which he would be prepared to meet him.

MR. TASSÉ said that the hon. member for Westmoreland complained of the strictures he lately made upon the proportions of the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries which, within the last few years had become so extensive. He was entirely mistaken when he claimed that he (Mr. Tassé) did not sufficiently appreciate the importance of this report. It was precisely because he felt the importance of this report that he wished it to be reduced to reasonable proportions and pruned of all useless and incorrect matters, so as to render it truly useful and interesting. It was not necessary to dwell in the land of oysters and lobsters in order to understand that the interests connected with the Marine and Fisheries deserved the most serious attention. He had also objected to the too extensive proportions given to this report, overloaded, as it was, with details that were often insignificant, on account of the enormous expense it entailed. The printing of this report cost, last year, \$14,680, whilst it only cost \$3,000 in 1872-73, when the Conservatives were in power. That was really an extravagant expenditure, for which the hon. member was responsible, since he had been Minister of Marine for the last five years; but he had no idea that he would venture to justify the expenditure before the House. The hon. member for Westmoreland had added that, being one of the representatives of Ottawa, he (Mr. Tassé) should not complain of this expenditure, seeing that his (Mr. Tassé's) electors had profited by it. That was a very sorry excuse coming from one of the leaders of a party that at one time laid claim to the title of the party of economy *par excellence*. With such a principle every extravagance might be sanctioned. Although his electors might be interested in having the public moneys spent here, he was persuaded that they were not ready to approve of useless expenditures when these same moneys might be applied to the execution of improvements that would be much more advantageous for them.

Motion agreed to.

SIR A. J. SMITH.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN
CANADA.

RESOLUTION POSTPONED.

Notice of motion (Mr. Mousseau) for resolution declaring: "That, in the opinion of this House, the fact of submitting the advice of the Privy Council of Canada to the review of Her Majesty's advisers in England, upon questions which are purely of an administrative character, under the British North America Act, 1867, is subversive of the principles of responsible government granted to Canada," called.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would ask my hon. friend to allow that motion to stand for the present.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

MR. HOLTON said there was some novelty of asking a member who had given notice of a motion of want of confidence to allow it to stand.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is out of order.

MR. HOLTON: I have a perfect right to move that the order be struck off the paper because he did not proceed with it. I have a perfect right to speak to that, and I begin my speech by saying it is a novelty in my parliamentary experience for a First Minister to ask an ordinary supporter of his to let a notice of a want of confidence motion stand. I do not see that he can do it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: There was an understanding, at the beginning of the Session, to allow motions to stand when that was asked by some member of the Government, and, when I heard the hon. Premier asking the hon. member for Bagot to allow his motion to stand, of course I said as usual "stand;" and, in that case, I hope the hon. gentleman will respect my decision.

MR. HOLTON: I do not appeal from the Chair, I accept the invitation of Mr. Speaker to act upon the understanding made beyond the rule. The rule undoubtedly was that which was established on the recommendation of a Committee three or four years ago, of which the hon.

gentleman and myself were members, that these notices of motion should be dropped if they were not proceeded with when called; but, to facilitate business, when Ministers were not prepared to discuss questions, and to grant returns asked, the understanding come to was that notices of motion should, on application of the Minister, stand, but it was in order that they might be taken up at a more convenient season. But I never dreamed of a notice being asked to stand to get rid of a troublesome question, as is obviously the case here; and therefore I should be in my right if I were to say that it might be in the letter but not at all in the spirit of the understanding, as well as against the express letter of the rule, that a motion of this kind should be asked to stand by the Minister. But he has now got rid of a troublesome matter, and all is serene again between him and his malcontent followers.

Motion postponed.

DRAWBACKS ON EXPORTS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DOMVILLE moved for a return showing what drawback was allowed to manufacturers on goods manufactured in Canada in 1877 and 1878 and exported; to whom paid, and description of goods.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENTS TO WELLAND CANAL SOLICITORS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton), in the absence of Mr. BUNTING, moved for a return of all letters, vouchers and other papers connected with the payment of all fees, costs and charges to James G. Currie and John M. Currie, as solicitors for the Welland Canal, from the first day of January, 1877, to the seventh day of April, 1879, with the dates of such payments; and also, all instructions respecting the employment of such solicitors.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSFER OF THE PICTOU AND TRURO RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. DOULL moved for a statement of, 1st. All agreements, papers and correspondence, since 1st July, 1875, with respect to the transfer of the Pictou and Truro Railway; 2nd. Memorial of Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, and reply thereto of the Nova Scotia Government, enclosed in a letter from them dated 31st December, 1878.

Motion agreed to.

LOT 1,211 ON THE ASSINIBOINE MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CARGN, in the absence of Mr. McCARTHY, moved for a copy of the Order in Council under which that portion of land situate on the Assiniboine River, in the Province of Manitoba, and which is known as Lot No. 1,211, as kept in the Registrar's Book of the Hudson Bay Company, prior to the transfer of the North-West Territories to Canada, was granted to the said Company; and of all correspondence and papers connected with the grant, the terms on which the grant was made, the claims of the late Professor O'Donoghue and of his representatives since his death, or others, to the said parcel of land or any portion thereof, and all correspondence in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA GAZETTE CIRCULATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DOMVILLE, in the absence of Mr. CONNELL, moved for a return showing the names of all officials in New Brunswick, who are entitled to receive copies of the *Canada Gazette*.

Motion agreed to.

SALES OF LAND ON ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. DAWSON moved for a statement showing the amount derived from

the sales of land on the Island of St. Joseph up to 1st of July, 1867.

Motion agreed to.

SELKIRK ELECTION.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) moved for copies of all letters, certificates, reports and correspondence from, to, or with any Judge or Returning Officer or other person, relating to the recount of ballots at the last election for the Electoral District of Selkirk, in the Province of Manitoba, and to the trial of the contested election for the said Electoral District. He said the motion involved a matter of great importance to the administration of justice in the Province of Manitoba. He had made two motions in the present matter for this reason: After the last election in Selkirk, Mr. Morris, who was one of the candidates, appealed to Judge McKeagney, under the Statute of last Session, for an order for a recount, or readdition of the ballots of that election. An order was made by that Justice, who fixed the 3rd October for the recount. A couple of days afterwards, an application was made by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Smith), who had been returned elected by the Returning Officer, to another Judge of the same Court Mr. Betournay, for a recount only of the, ballots, and he fixed the 1st October for it. On 1st October, Mr. Betournay, in pursuance of his order, proceeded to act on it, and the parties appeared before him, when Mr. Moore objected to the Judge proceeding on the ground that Judge McKeagney was previously seized of the case. He produced the order and showed Judge Betournay that another Judge of the same Court was proceeding in the matter and had issued an order for a recount under the Statute. Judge Betournay ruled that, inasmuch as the order of Judge McKeagney was for a recount or readdition of the ballots, and his own order was for a recount only, the orders were not identical, and, therefore, he was at liberty to proceed, although the Statute specially provided for a recount or readdition, the order of Judge McKeagney was properly granted to make a recount or readdition under

MR. DAWSON.

the 14th clause of the Act of last Session. For any person to say that a recount or readdition did not cover the whole matter, and was not the same as a recount, was an insult to their intelligence. In pursuance of that decision, and against the protest of Mr. Morris, Judge Betournay recounted the ballots, and ruled that certain of them that were objected to were properly counted, and declared the member for Selkirk elected by a majority of nine. He then immediately directed the Returning Officer to transmit all the ballots and papers, with the return, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. On the 3rd October, Judge McKeagney sat on the case when the Returning Officer appeared before him. When asked where the ballots were, he said that he could not produce them, inasmuch as he had sent them all away, and Judge McKeagney was rendered powerless to proceed by the action of Judge Betournay. The report of Judge McKeagney was transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and by him sent to the Minister of Justice, and it was necessary for him (Mr. Cameron) to move that it be brought down with other documents in charge of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The report of Judge Betournay confirmed his (Mr. Cameron's) statements, being a candid confession that the only reason why he had acted as he had done was that he believed he was entitled to proceed, in spite of Judge McKeagney's order. If one Judge of a Court was to be at liberty to take a matter out of the hands of another Judge under such circumstances, there would be an end to anything like judicial propriety in the administration of justice. There could be no doubt that the action of Judge Betournay had brought the administration of justice in Manitoba into very great disrepute. It was very questionable whether it was not a matter that ought to be proceeded with by prosecution, or impeachment, in this House, especially as, in accordance with the ruling of the Court of Queen's Bench in Toronto, under this Statute, with regard to a recount of votes, he was merely acting as an officer of this House, and, if so, his conduct in the present case might properly be censured by it. As to the fact that, when one Judge was

seized of a matter, another Judge ought not to interfere, it was almost too clear to require any comment, let alone argument. He would read an extract from a standing authority on such cases, Kerr on Summary Convictions, which was simply a statement of the general law :

"It is proper here to mention that, though all the Justices of each division are equal in authority, it would be contrary to the public interest, as well as indecent, that there should be a contest between the Justices. It is therefore agreed that the jurisdiction in any particular case, attaches to the first set of magistrates, duly authorised, who have possession and cognisance of the facts to the exclusion of the separate jurisdiction of all others. So that the acts of any other, except in conjunction with the first, are not only void, but such a breach of the law as subjects him to indictment."

If a civil magistrate, acting in this matter, would be liable to indictment, there could be no question that an officer of this House, even if he were a Judge of a Superior Court, would be liable to at least the severe censure of this House for having acted in this indecent and improper manner. It had been stated in the public press, and the statement had not been contradicted, that there were strong personal reasons which induced Judge Betournay, in defiance of what was right and proper, to seize hold of this jurisdiction, in order to make a return in favour of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Smith), who he (Mr. Cameron) regretted was not in his seat in this House at present. When they were aware that this same Judge, notwithstanding the personal relations which existed between him and the hon. member for Selkirk, was now actually proceeding with the trial of this very controverted election ; when it was found that the Judge who had acted in that partisan manner had been openly charged with being heavily indebted to the hon. member for Selkirk, whose real estate and everything he owned in the world was said to be under lien to that hon. gentleman, he (Mr. Cameron) thought that, after what he had previously stated, that the administration of justice in Manitoba had been brought into the greatest disrepute by the indecent and improper conduct of Judge Betournay, it was a matter well deserving the consideration of this House. When the papers were brought down

he would be prepared to take such further action in the matter as was proper under the circumstances. Respect to the power of the House required some action, as the purity and propriety of an election to this House had been entirely violated by the course of Judge Betournay in this matter.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if the hon. gentleman was speaking from documentary evidence in making the charge of indecent and improper relations between the member for Selkirk and this Judge. It was the most extraordinary charge he had ever heard, especially from a legal gentleman, to impugn a Judge with respect to a matter now under consideration.

MR. CAMERON : I stated expressly that it had been publicly stated in the press, and that the statement had not been contradicted.

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

After Recess.

DOMINION LANDS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Tupper.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 107) to amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.

Bill read the first time.

INLAND BILLS OF EXCHANGE BILL.

[Bill 16.]

(*Mr. Doull.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

STATUTORY HOLIDAYS BILL.—[Bill 57.]

(*Mr. Domville.*)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said that there were very serious objections to the Bill. He had suffered serious inconvenience from the number of bank holidays that already existed. He thought this was a step in the wrong direction.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

MR. DOMVILLE moved the third reading of the Bill.

MR. HOLTON moved in amendment that the Bill be read a third time this day three months. He said the Bill was fully considered in the Committee, when a division took place upon the propriety of it. It was regarded as a piece of class legislation—legislation in the interest of employes of banks, giving them more recreation and rest than any other class of the community. He regarded it as a frivolous and mischievous Bill, and one that would disgrace the Statute-book.

MR. JONES said the hon. gentleman used very strong language with regard to this Bill, although it had been reported to the House by the Committee on Banking and Commerce. The hon. gentleman took what he regarded as a selfish exception to the Bill. Quebec was the only Province which objected to the Bill, which, he thought, was a good one.

MR. DOMVILLE said he thought hon. members generally would admit that the Bill was calculated to do good, and to help a class of people overworked. The question was should they create a public holiday throughout the country, in order that certain employes might obtain a little relaxation. He had no personal interest in the matter. He brought the measure in because he thought it was the correct thing to do, and he hoped the House would allow the Bill to pass.

MR. TUPPER said he was rather surprised at the course which was taken in this matter. The Bill had received an exhaustive discussion in Committee, and it was hardly to be expected, after the measure had received the support of a

considerable majority of the Committee, that the hon. gentleman would raise the question here. The evidence given before the Committee was that bank managers and directors, men most qualified to speak in relation to the matter, and most interested in it, were in favour of the Bill. He thought, under the circumstances, the House would scarcely be disposed to deal hardly with the measure.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he did not think there was the slightest impropriety in his hon. friend testing the sense of the House upon the subject. He did not think the hon. member for Cumberland was warranted in assuming that the general public and bank managers were in favour of the Bill, because they had not objected to it. He could not see that there was any use in putting on the Statute-book a provision of this kind. If it were to do the employes any good, it would be better to give them a few holidays together, at Christmas for instance, when it would not interfere with business, as he was informed these holidays would do.

MR. ELLIOTT said, in his opinion, the bank clerks had quite enough holidays already. They were less worked than any other class of people in the community. He could well remember, in his younger days, when he had to work thirteen and fourteen hours per day, week after week, as the farmers had now, through all kinds of weather; and he thought it would be injurious to the bank clerks themselves, as well as a hindrance to the commercial interests of the community at large, to grant the holidays proposed in this Bill.

Question put, and amendment (Mr. Holton) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messrs.

Anglin	Chandler
Béchar	Christie
Borden	Coupal
Bourassa	Elliott
Brown	Fiset
Burk	Galbraith
Burpee (Sunbury)	Geoffrion
Cameron (S. Huron)	Gillies
Cartwright	Gillmor
Casgrain	Girouard (J. Cartier)

Guthrie	Oliver
Haddow	Olivier
Hay	Paterson (S. Brant)
Holton	Pickard
Jackson	Rinfret
Keeler	Robertson (Shelburne)
Killam	Rogers
King	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Landry	Rymal
LaRue	Scrifer
Laurier	Smith (Westmoreland)
Little	Tellier
Mackenzie	Thompson (Haldimand)
McCallum	Trow
McDougall	Wallace (W. York)
McInnes	White (N. Renfrew)
McIsaac	Wright.—54

MAY'S :

Messrs.

Allison	Kaulback
Arkell	Kilvert
Baby	Kranz
Baker	Lane
Bannerman	Lantier
Benoit	Longley (P.E.I.)
Bergeron	Macdonald (King's,
Bill	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Bolduc	McDonald (C. Breton)
Boulton	McDonald (Pictou)
Bourbeau	McDonald (Vict., N.S.)
Bowell	Macmillan
Brecken	McGreevy
Brooks	McLennan
Bunster	McLeod
Burnham	Malouin
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Massue
Caron	Méthot
Cimon	Mongenais
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Montplaisir
Cockburn (W. Northld)	Mousseau
Connell	Ogden
Coughlin	Orton
Coursol	Quimet
Daly	Patterson (Essex)
Daoust	Perreault
Dawson	Pinsonneault
DeCosmos	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Desaulniers	Richey
Domville	Robertson (Hamilton)
Doull	Robinson
Drew	Robitaille
Dubuc	Rochester
Dugas	Ross (Dundas)
Ferguson	Rouleau
Fitzsimmons	Ryan (Marquette)
Fortin	Rykert
Fulton	Shaw
Gault	Snowball
Gigault	Sproule
Gill	Strange
Girouard (Kent, N.B)	Tassé
Grandbois	Thompson (Cariboo)
Gunn	Tilley
Haggart	Tupper
Hesson	Vain
Hilliard	Vallée
Hooper	Wade
Houde	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Hurteau	—100.
Jones	

Mr. BROOKS then moved in amendment that the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power so to amend the same, as to exempt from its operation the Province of Quebec. He said the Province of Quebec was exceptional in regard to matters of this kind. They had already twelve non-judicial days, and nearly all of them bank holidays, consequently it was desirable that this Bill should not apply to Quebec.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he voted against the Bill because he believed it was likely to prove prejudicial to the business of banking men. It had, however, been carried by a very large majority, and now the hon. member for Sherbrooke proposed to except one Province. He was entirely opposed to the exception of any Provinces in the legislation of this House.

Mr. CARON said the amendment seemed to him to be one that should appeal to the good sense of the House, and should be carried. There was no desire whatever on the part of the members from Quebec to prevent any Province from seeking legislation similar to that asked for by his hon. friend the member for King's (Mr. Domville). But the hon. member for Sherbrooke had given a reason against its being applied to the Province of Quebec, which seemed to him to be conclusive. He had shown that, from peculiar circumstances, the Province of Quebec was placed in a position different from the other Provinces, as far as holidays were concerned. It was quite obvious that, in a Province where there were thirteen or fifteen bank holidays in a year, business men in that Province did not wish to have that number increased; and he (Mr. Caron), although in favour of a Bill similar to the one introduced, extending to the other Provinces, could not but, under the circumstances, vote for the amendment.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew) said there was something a little illogical in the position taken by the mover and seconder of this amendment. They had voted that an increased number of bank holidays be fixed for the other Provinces,

but were not willing it should apply to their own Province. He (Mr. White) had the same objection to increasing the bank holidays in the Province of Ontario and the other Provinces as the Province of Quebec; and, although he considered their position illogical, he felt himself obliged to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Sherbrooke on that ground.

MR. JONES said it appeared there were thirteen holidays in the Province of Quebec, and this Bill would increase them by two, which was not a very large addition. He agreed with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) that they should not make exceptional legislation for the different Provinces when it could possibly be avoided, and he would vote against the motion of the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was obliged to vote for the motion of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, because while in Ontario the banks had too few holidays, in Quebec the banks had too many. The hon. member for Lambton was opposed to sectional legislation; then he ought to have assimilated the bank holidays in all the Provinces when he was leader of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: They were.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Act relating to the establishment of holidays in the different Provinces stated that, in Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, Sundays, New Year's Day, Good Friday, Christmas Day, the birthday of the reigning Sovereign, and any day appointed by proclamation for a public holiday, or a general fast, were to be observed as legal holidays; and in Quebec, the same days were to be observed, with the addition of Epiphany, Annunciation, Ascension, Corpus Christi, St. Peter and St. Paul's and All Saints.

MR. MACKENZIE: These are religious holidays.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it required Dominion legislation in order to make them public holidays, and, if the hon. gentleman wanted assimilation, he should have moved that they should be struck out.

MR. WHITE.

MR. COURSOL said it was quite true there were a large number of holidays in the Province of Quebec, but many of them were *fêtes d'obligation*, and not holidays for the banking clerks. The banks were opened as usual, and the clerks kept there. They were holidays kept peculiarly by Catholics, and not by Protestant institutions. He did not see why they should make special legislation for the different Provinces, and he hoped the House would not agree to this motion.

MR. HOLTON said he was glad to observe that the right hon. the leader of the Government preserved his old-time versatility. The other day, in Committee, he pronounced this a most admirable measure, applicable to the whole Dominion, and now it was to be made a great deal better by excepting the second largest Province from its operation. He (Mr. Holton) was free to vote for a better thing for his own Province than this Bill would be, and was also free to vote for uniformity of legislation, which ought to be the controlling principle of action in this House. As the motion to go into Committee would be carried, and the third reading of the Bill would be moved, he would reserve his vote until the question was reached again, which would be some time in the Greek kalends.

MR. VALIN said he was in favour of the amendment. He had sent copies of the Bill to the presidents of the various banks, who had replied that they had enough holidays in Quebec already. There were the holidays of the Ship Labourers' Society, St. Jean Baptiste Day, and the holidays of a couple of other societies, which interfered greatly with trade. Again, when a Bill of Exchange was wanted on Monday, it had occasionally to be obtained on Saturday, which was inconvenient and caused loss of interest. With thirteen or fifteen holidays in Quebec, there was no necessity for any more.

MR. ANGLIN said the speech of the member for Montreal East suggested to him an idea that the difficulty to which objection had been taken could, in some degree, be obviated, if two of the holidays especially named for the Province of Quebec were selected as the holi-

days to be observed under this Statute, and in that way a certain degree of regard would be paid to the religious feelings of a very large number of people of the other Provinces, who regarded those as holidays of obligations.

Question put, and amendment (Mr. Brooks) agreed to, on a division.

House again resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

INSOLVENCY LAWS REPEAL BILL.

[BILL 15.]

(Mr. Béchard.)

THIRD READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. GIROUARD said he wished to move a few amendments to this Bill. He accepted the verdict of this House, pronounced the other evening, as an undoubted expression of public opinion on the Insolvency Laws. He only intended to introduce a few provisions with a view of averting the dangers pointed out by the press of the country, as likely to result from the total repeal of the present Insolvency Act; he referred to preferential assignments, and priority of judgments by default. In the Province of Quebec the principles of the common law were altogether different from the principles of the common law in the other Provinces. In the former Province the property of the insolvent was the common pledge of the creditors; in the other Provinces, if he was correctly informed, the contrary principles prevailed, the first creditor, in order of time, being the first entitled to be paid. It seemed strange that in a civilised country such provisions should exist. In most of the United States these deficiencies in the English common law had been met and remedied. In considering the Bill of the

hon. member for Iberville, they ought to endeavour to provide for these same deficiencies in their own Provinces. The amendments he proposed had for their object merely the repeal of those provisions of the English common law with respect to preferential assignments and priority of judgment. The hon. gentleman explained the scope of his amendments, and went on to say that it was perfectly evident that these amendments had nothing to do with the Insolvency Bill, which the House had pronounced against the other evening. They were brought forward in the interest of those Provinces who were not benefitted by the provisions of the Civil Code. It might be said that this matter should be left to the Provincial Legislatures, but they had no jurisdiction in a matter of this kind. Insolvency matters belonged to this Parliament exclusively, and the moment they had to deal with insolvent traders, or the laws relating to them, the Provincial jurisdiction ceased. He had voted for the second reading of the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville, although he supported the Bill presented by the Committee. He was now endeavouring to amend the former Bill, because it seemed to him fraught with danger to the country in repealing the Insolvent Act altogether. If the Committee was of opinion that these amendments should be accepted, he hoped that no proceedings would be taken to prevent the third reading of the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville; and when that third reading came he should certainly vote for it whether amended or not. The majority of this House was pledged to the repeal of the existing laws.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said the effects of the amendments of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if accepted, would be to destroy effectually the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville. Those hon. members who were in favour of the unconditional repeal of the Insolvent Law, were bound to vote against these propositions. In addition to that, he did not think his hon. friend, if honest in his desire to repeal that law, should have submitted these propositions to the House at all, because if accepted by the House the present Bill could not possibly pass this Session, and the effect would be

that the old law would exist for another year. By an overwhelming majority this House affirmed the other night the proposition that it was desirable to repeal the Insolvent Law, without condition. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) in the course he was now pursuing, was acting an inconsistent part. When this matter was formerly up for discussion, that hon. gentleman voted for the principle, affirming that it was expedient that the law should be unconditionally repealed. That principle was affirmed by the House, and he voted for the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard)—the logical consequence of the general principle so affirmed—and yet, he must now introduce a set of resolutions which made the repeal of that Act subject to certain conditions, and, in fact, made the immediate repeal of the Act impossible. The hon. gentleman, to justify himself for this extraordinary course, said he was looking to the interests of Ontario. The hon. gentleman need not concern himself about Ontario, the members from that Province were quite capable of taking care of their own particular interests in this respect, and were quite willing to let the hon. gentleman look after the interests of his own Province. The hon. gentleman introduced what he was pleased to call amendments to the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville. His propositions were really new enactments—a new Insolvent Bill by way of amendment to a proposition for the absolute repeal of the law. In fact the hon. gentleman's proposition contained an entirely new enactment without a single good quality, without a single merit, and without a single workable provision, with all the defects of the old law, and without any of its meritorious provisions. If he were disposed to support any proposition at all in lieu of the repeal of the Insolvent Law, pure and simple, he would have voted for the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), because it had some merit, and was based on a sensible and easily understood principle, though a principle to which he was opposed. The proposition of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) had no merit whatever in it. It was one that could not be worked out and would serve no prac-

tical purpose, but would complicate every transaction and involve every estate in expensive and endless litigation. Of all the crude and undigested pieces of legislation submitted to any Parliament for adoption, this was the crudest and most ill digested; in fact, it was utterly unworthy of the hon. gentleman, and he was surprised that a gentleman of the reputation, ability, and learning of the hon. gentleman should wish the House to assent to any such proposition. The proposed amendments contained some twelve or fourteen legal propositions, and the violation of any one of them would make an individual insolvent, and his estate subject to the provisions of the Bill, and yet there was no machinery provided by the hon. gentleman by which a single one of his propositions could be carried into effect. He (Mr. Girouard) provided that, on the happening of certain things, and in the violation of certain provisions of the law, a trader should become insolvent and his estate be placed in liquidation; and yet he did not provide that any official, or, in fact, anyone, should take possession of the estates of such insolvent. He did not provide for collecting the assets, for realising the estate and distributing the proceeds of the estate. And not only that, the amendment declared that, under certain circumstances, a dealer would become an insolvent, but it did not state upon what evidence the fact of insolvency should be established. Under the present law, when it was alleged that a man became an insolvent, that fact must be established by the evidence of a creditor; whilst, under this extraordinary proposition of the hon. gentleman, there was no such wise provision; and a man might be declared an insolvent without the fact being established in any way, upon a mere allegation, unsupported by any proof. There was another objection to the proposal of the hon. gentleman. He proposed that on the occurrence of certain events a man might be declared an insolvent, but if a man were improperly or maliciously put into insolvency, as was often done, there was no way by which the debtor could be relieved from such illegal and improper proceedings. He had to submit, and that without redress. The House should pause before committing itself to any

such legislation. The Insolvency Law was bad enough; the proposed amendments were worse than the law they proposed to improve. There were many other objections, but he would not trouble the House with an extended reference to them now. If hon. gentlemen would take the trouble of reading the amendments, they must come to the same conclusion that he had arrived at, after a careful consideration of all the clauses, that of all the extraordinary propositions ever submitted to Parliament those propositions were the most extraordinary. The hon. gentleman admitted there was no machinery provided by this Bill, by which effect could be given to the changes which he proposed making; but he said that the Courts in the various Provinces had the power of making the necessary rules and regulations for carrying the law into effect. But, according to the proposals of the hon. gentleman, these rules and regulations could not be put into operation until Parliament pronounced upon and considered them. The effect of this would be that, even if Parliament assented to the hon. gentleman's proposition, they could not go into operation for twelve months, that is, until after the next meeting of Parliament. In the interest of the country, and in the interest of the entire trade of the country, it would be much better to leave the old law in force for twelve months, than accept these propositions with their effect suspended for twelve months. Apart from the merits of the proposed amendments, and on a pure question of order, he did not think the proposition of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) could, under any circumstances, be accepted as an amendment to the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard). The proposition of the latter hon. member, which was assented to by the House, and to the provisions of which it was committed, was that the Insolvency Law should be repealed pure and simple, and the House had resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider that proposition. The proposition of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was, that there should be an Insolvency Law—that there should be a repeal pure and simple of the existing law, but

that the repeal should be conditional, not unconditional, as the House had already agreed. It was not in the slightest degree relevant to the former proposition, a proposition to which Parliament was committed, nor was it germane to the main question now before the Chair, and could not, therefore, be submitted as an amendment to it. If the propositions of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier were agreed to, it would have the effect of defeating the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville; and the result would be that the present law would remain on the Statute-book for the next twelve months, and that the House had already pronounced against it. He submitted, therefore, that this proposition could not be put, and was clearly out of order, and therefore asked the ruling of the Chair on the point. He would put a case, taken from English *Mirror of Parliament* for 1838, vol. 6, page 4,729, and which appeared to him to be a case exactly in point:—

“MR. WILLIAMS moved the order of the day for the House resolving itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain Bill, called the Freeman's Admission Bill, and Mr. Hutt moved in amendment that,

“After the passing of this Act, no person whose name is or shall be on the register for the time being, is entitled to vote in the election of a member of Parliament for any city; or in England, shall be required, in order to entitle him to have his name inserted in any list of such voters for that city, or for the following year, to have paid any poor rates, or assessed taxes, except such as have or shall have become payable from previously to the 10th October in the year previously.”

It would be observed that the object of the Bill was to abolish the payment of stamp duties then payable on the admission of freemen as a condition to having their names inserted on the register, and that object was clearly expressed in the title of the Bill. The amendment moved by Mr. Hutt, it was contended was wholly irrelevant to that object, and therefore out of order. Mr. Williams, mover of the Bill, said, in raising the point of order:

“It will save the time of the House if I at once take the opinion of Mr. Speaker as to whether the amendment contemplated by the hon. member can now be offered to and entertained by the House. The Bill is strictly confined to the abolition of stamp duties,

now payable on the admission of freemen, and the proposition of the hon. member does not go at all to that matter, but goes to amend a very important part of the Reform Act. Now, I desire to know from the Chair, first, whether such a clause as that proposed can be incorporated in the Bill; and, secondly, whether, if adopted, it will not be inconsistent with the enactment of another measure which has already been sent up to the House of Lords?"

Now, he (Mr. Cameron) desired to know whether the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville could be properly incorporated with the Bill; and secondly, whether, if adopted, it would not be wholly inconsistent with the title of the Bill, wholly irrelevant to the object of the Bill, and wholly inconsistent with the solemn resolution of Parliament, that the Insolvent Act should be repealed unconditionally. According to the authority of the case just referred to, both propositions must be answered adversely to the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Mr. Speaker, in delivering his decision on the points submitted to him, said:

"The same question occurred in the course of last Session, and the opinion I then expressed was that, if a clause was inconsistent with the object of a Bill, it was contrary to the usual practice of the House to incorporate it. That opinion I still retain, particularly as it has been confirmed by the House; and, therefore, the point is, I conceive, set at rest."

He submitted that that decision governed the case now before the House. May, in his Parliamentary practice, lays down the same rule. He says: "An amendment may be made to a clause in a Bill, provided the same be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill." Within the title of the Bill, and not inconsistent with the object of the Bill. Here the object of the Bill was the unconditional repeal of the law, the object of the amendment was exactly the opposite—not the repeal of the law, but its continuance in a modified form, and clearly the motion cannot be put in amendment to the Bill. If, however, the Chair should otherwise rule, he (Mr. Cameron) would strongly urge on those who favoured the repeal of the Insolvent Law, to vote down the propositions of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) said the hon. member for South Huron

(Mr. Cameron) found his (Mr. Girouard's) propositions to be the most crude piece of legislation he ever had occasion to read; but the hon. gentleman appeared to ignore, or to forget, that they were not of his (Mr. Girouard's) own invention. The provisions which he had the honour of submitting for the consideration of the Committee had been reproduced from the Roman laws. He defied the hon. member to produce a piece of legislation that contained more equitable and reasonable principles; it was certainly not the English law which, in this respect, at least, was admitted by all as iniquitous, and had been abandoned by the English people for years, almost centuries. The principles he (Mr. Girouard) was now advocating had been reproduced in the commercial codes of Europe and America.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron): Oh.

MR. GIROUARD said the hon. gentleman might laugh or appear astonished, but he defied him to quote better laws. These Roman principles have been pronounced as most perfect by English jurists of higher authority than the hon. gentleman; they have been highly lauded by the best legal minds of Europe, and have, finally, in their favour the experience and sanction of ages, and he did not hesitate to say that the amendments embodying these principles were far superior to any that the hon. member might produce. These amendments had been put before the House after mature deliberation by more than one hon. member—and he might mention that amongst them were the hon. members for Stanstead and St. John—and he regretted that they were not in the House to support them, as they intended to do. The hon. members from the Province of Quebec have been gravely told by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) that they had no interest in the commercial laws of the other Provinces. Was the House not to consider this legislation simply because the hon. gentleman would, and, in fact, could, not produce a better measure himself? Was it to be said that the Montreal representatives especially were strangers to the commercial interests of the other Provinces? Was the hon. gentleman not aware that

the Montreal importers supplied, to a great extent, the dealers of the other Provinces, and for that reason they were exceedingly interested that no preferential assignments and judgments should be allowed to favour the resident friends of debtors, and thus defraud the Montreal creditors?

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he certainly agreed, to a certain extent, with what had fallen from the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), in relation to his proposed amendments; but he must say, without some machinery by which they could be put into operation, they were not exactly what were required. This was a matter of very great importance to the commercial community of this Dominion. He held in his hand some letters and telegrams received from several leading merchants, expressing regret at the action taken by this House the other night. There had not been more than one petition presented to the House, asking for the repeal of the Insolvent Law, pure and simple. He was told there was one, but certainly there was not more than one. Every petition, excepting that one, had prayed that the law might be improved. The reason was very obvious why it should be so. Supposing the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville was to become law, what would be the result? They would find that every person who had a claim against another doing business would do his best to get the first judgment, and the consequence would be that the sharpest creditor would be able to get payment in full, whilst the others would have no way of recovering a shilling. He repudiated the idea expressed by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) that Ontario should merely look after its own interest, and accept no advice from the representatives of other Provinces. He was always willing that the Ontario members should receive suggestions from the members of any other Province, in relation to legislation for the whole Dominion. There should be some machinery whereby the provisions of the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), if agreed to, would be carried into effect, and he would suggest that the procedure pointed out

by the Absconding Debtors Act in force in Ontario, should be utilised in connection with these amendments. That Act, he thought, could be made to work under these provisions. If a creditor had absconded from Upper Canada, or remained concealed therein so as to avoid being served with process, and that fact was made manifest by an affidavit made by two disinterested persons, then the Judge could make an order for the issue of a writ of attachment against the debtor's estate, both real and personal. That writ would be placed in the hands of the sheriff, who would take possession of the estate and sell it, if it were perishable property, or hold it, in case it was not, until an execution was placed in his hands. The Statute made a provision that the perishable property should be converted into money, but the sheriff held it until the person issuing the writ of attachment obtained through the ordinary course of the Courts a judgment against the absconding debtor. With reference to the other creditors, they had a right, within six months after the issuing of the first writ, and the placing of it in the hands of the sheriff, to prove their claims, and their executions were then placed in the hands of the sheriff, who, under the Statute, divided, *pro rata*, the whole proceeds of the estate among the creditors. By utilising the procedure provided by that Statute, they could work the proposed amendment to the Act. He would ask that the following amendment be added to the ones proposed:—

“The provisions of any code, law, Statute or Act respecting absconding debtors, in any of the Provinces, and any procedure authorised under the same, may be resorted to for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act; and particularly a writ of attachment and all subsequent proceedings may be had upon any of the grounds for which a debtor may be deemed insolvent.”

By adding this amendment to those propositions, the law could be worked out for the benefit of all the creditors. It would certainly not give the debtor his discharge, and would prevent any one creditor getting an undue advantage over another. He could not understand why an hon. member should be so carried away with the idea of repealing this Insolvent Law as not to give one creditor a fair chance with every

other creditor. It appeared to him that that important point had been lost sight of, and he hoped, therefore, the proposition introduced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) would be considered and adopted by the House, and that the House would also adopt this suggestion, which he would propose in due time.

MR. MACDONNELL: Before framing that amendment, did the hon. gentleman enquire into the laws of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island with regard to absconding debtors?

MR. ROBERTSON said his amendment was made to apply to all the Provinces, if they had laws which would apply to it. If they had not, he hoped the hon. members would suggest some provision for themselves. He understood that Quebec had got such a law, and that was the reason why Ontario stood in such a very unfavourable position if the Insolvent Law was repealed. He did not know what the law in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick might be with respect to absconding debtors, but he made this amendment wide enough to cover it if there were such laws.

MR. MACDONNELL said the hon. gentleman ought to have ascertained what the laws in those respective Provinces were on this subject before introducing an amendment which extended to those Provinces as well as to Ontario.

MR. MOUSSEAU said that this Insolvent Law was one of the grievances which the people of the Province of Quebec had against the late Government, and the hon. members from that Province desired to put in operation the principle they had enunciated. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) had denounced that law during the late elections. Both the hon. member and himself had, in the county of Jacques Cartier and elsewhere, complained against the laws in existence on bankruptcy. At the opening of the Session, his hon. friend was strongly in favour of having those laws repealed, but after having attended the Insolvency Committee the hon. gentleman came here with this strong Bill, which comprised the best principles of Insolvency Laws for the last 2,000 years. In the House the feel-

ing was so strong against laws on Insolvency—even the most perfect, even those amended and purified by the hon. member—that they rejected that Bill without even answering the able speeches made by its two promoters. His hon. friend took it very coolly. The second reading of the hon. member for Iberville's Bill was carried by 57 of a majority, among which was the name of his hon. friend. To-night, what did the hon. member do? He wanted this House to stultify itself. He wanted this House, after having voted that it was opposed to any law on insolvency, to accept that famous and perfect Bill, those principles which were so respectable and aged—2,000 years. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier knew very well that, by introducing those amendments to-night, he was playing into the hands of the wholesale traders of Montreal. He knew, after what had happened to the hon. member for King's, that if this amendment was introduced, that of the 60 who voted against repeal only one would ask that it should come up to-morrow, and then the old, bad laws would continue to exist. He knew that this amendment would kill the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville. How could the hon. gentleman claim to be consistent, after having argued before the electors that these laws were bad, and now he was doing his best to prevent their repeal. His hon. friend was grandiloquent on the score of the principles, so old and respectable, which the Bill contained. Any copyist upstairs could copy those famous principles, but the machinery was wanted to put them into operation, and there was no machinery in this Bill. It would be impossible to work it if it were passed, so that he hoped his hon. friend would think more of his electors and less of the merchants of Montreal, and, coming back to a sense of duty, withdraw his amendment.

MR. HOUDE said it was useless to enter into the merits of any amendment. It was the duty of all those who were opposed to the existing law to vote down all amendments to the motion of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard). If they considered, in Committee of the Whole, any amendment, the course of pro-

ceedings would be deferred until to-morrow, and at this late stage of the Session, to-morrow meant until next Session. Every amendment against the motion of the hon. member for Iberville must be voted down, otherwise the existing law would continue with its official assignees, and all its other deficiencies.

MR. CAMERON : I rise to a point of order. The amendment is irrelevant to the Bill, and should not be put.

MR. CHAIRMAN said, as there was no regulation in our own rules of practice, he must refer to May to decide the point. May said, on page 473 :

" Amendments were formally required to be within the scope and title of the Bill, but by Standing Order, 19th July, 1854, any amendment may be made to a clause, provided the same be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill, or be otherwise in conformity with the rules and orders of the House."

In his opinion this Bill was to repeal the Insolvency Act, and the amendments proposed would make of this Bill a partial repeal. They were, therefore, not irrelevant or inconsistent with the Bill, and might be put.

Mr. RYKERT said, if the result of voting from time to time would keep in force the old law, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Honde), he hoped they would go on voting until midnight. It would be a great calamity, if the present Insolvent Law were repealed—more especially if it were repealed pure and simple—to commercial interests ; but he would prefer to vote for the repeal, rather than for such amendments as those before the House. The amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) did not provide a proper remedy. The remedy was worse than the disease. If that was carried, no creditor would get a single dollar ; the estate would all go into the hands of the sheriffs and lawyers. The amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton would impose on the Statute-book a cumbersome piece of machinery, such as would not accomplish the object desired. Neither were the amendments introduced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, in his opinion, such as this House ought to endorse. He fully

appreciated the efforts of the members of the Committee, but the Bill introduced by them was too cumbersome and too complicated. He would much rather have the old law, than have the Bill presented by the Committee. As pointed out by the hon. member for South Huron, these amendments did not provide any machinery by which this law could be carried out. It was true, provision was made for the Judges to make rules and regulations, but were the Judges to say that the sheriffs or official assignees were to wind up the estates? This was a power which this House should never delegate to Judges, viz., the appointment of sheriffs and official assignees. If the law in Lower Canada wound up the estates economically and satisfactorily to the creditors, as has been repeatedly alleged in this House, then, by all means, give us that law for the whole of the Dominion. If these amendments should be adopted by the House, in lieu of the present Insolvent Act, we would have a law on the Statute-book which would be entirely inoperative, and practically deprive both creditors and debtors of the power of winding up estates, unless the machinery was provided for carrying it into effect. If the House was determined to repeal the present law, he would rather vote for its absolute repeal, than for amendments which would be utterly useless. He hoped the House would let the present Act remain for another year, by which time the Government could be prepared with a measure which would be of a simple and inexpensive character.

Mr. BÉCHARD said if these amendments were adopted they would have the effect of killing his Bill, because it was well known that if this Bill was to pass Parliament this Session, its third reading must take place to-night. If it had not been sooner proposed it was not by his neglect. It was in accordance with an agreement come to with the Government, when the Committee was appointed to investigate the whole matter, that it would be fair to let it stand on the Orders until the House had an opportunity of seeing the report of that Committee. It had stood on the Orders ever since the second week of the Session. If the third reading was not reached to-night it would be postponed until next

Monday, when it would probably be too late.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said it was not for him to question the propriety of the decision at which the House had arrived the other night, in voting the second reading of the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville, respecting the present Insolvent Law; but he might venture to suggest to the House before they again divided, that, as far as he had been able to scan public opinion, through the ordinary channels by which they derived a knowledge of the sentiment of the country, the vote given that evening was not the vote of the people of this country. We were accustomed to receive the utterances of the press on all great questions as representing the public sentiment of the country, and in that view he had scanned, most carefully, all the great organs of public opinion, as well as the local journals in the various counties, and so far as he was able to see those papers, he could say that, with scarcely an exception, the vote on the Bill he had referred to was deprecated as a great misfortune to this country. Every member of this House, who took the trouble to look over the papers, would come to the same conclusion. He should be sorry to say that newspaper opinion ought to control the opinions of members of this House, but he did not say that if hon. gentlemen voted for the repeal of the present law because they supposed it was the sentiment of the country, that sentiment did not find expression in the ordinary channels of public thought. The organs of public opinion went further, and declared, almost unanimously, that, in their opinion, it would create great disaster to the trade of this country. The repeal of the law would affect injuriously every branch of trade and commerce, and notwithstanding the vote given the other evening, it was well for members of this House to reconsider the question submitted to them, and to ask themselves whether there would be any inconvenience to the country in suffering the present law to remain another year on the Statute-book. It was idle to suppose that the press did not represent, at any rate, the large and overwhelming commercial sentiment of

Mr. BICHARD.

this country. On the division, the other evening, he thought the members opposed to the law, would not deny the fact that the vote in favour of the continuance of the Insolvent Law represented the great commercial thought of this country. The representatives of almost every great commercial centre in the country voted in one direction. He did not say it was universally so—there were a great many gentlemen on both sides of this House who represented large commercial interests in the country, and for whose opinions he had the greatest respect—but the division, the other evening, showed the large preponderance of the commercial sentiment, both in the House and in the country, to be in favour of the continuance of the Insolvent Law. This was a fact worth the serious attention of the members of this House, before, by a last vote, the Committee pronounced definitely on this subject.

MR. MÉTHOT said the newspapers represented the opinion of the towns, but the opinion of the country at large was opposed to the Insolvent Law, and the members from the rural constituencies knew the feeling of the country as well as the newspapers.

Mr. McDONALD said he, himself, represented a county of over 30,000 inhabitants, a large proportion of whom were farmers. But with all due deference to his hon. friend, he thought the commercial people of this country were better qualified to pronounce a sound judgment on the desirability of a law of this kind, than were the farmers. If his hon. friends opposed to this law would carefully examine the question, they would see that it was desirable they should retain on the Statute-book some kind of bankrupt law. If this law were repealed who would suffer? Not the farmers, not the mechanics, but the large trading classes of the country, the importers and the wholesale dealers of the Dominion. With his strong view as to the desirability of the law, it was not necessary to use strong language, but he endorsed to its fullest extent the expression of opinion by the hon. gentleman from Chateaugay the other evening. On the eve of a change in our fiscal policy, it would be most unfortunate if Parliament were

to repeal, at this juncture, a law that had woven itself into every commercial transaction in the Dominion. Credit had been framed on the basis of this law, trust had been given and contracts had been entered into on the same basis, and it was impossible to strike it down without affecting, more or less, the whole commercial policy and transactions of this country. He only expressed these views in the hope that some hon. gentleman would feel that, although opposed to the law, and although he dared say, pressed by the obligation of promises given, or opinions expressed, previous to the election, nevertheless, in the present condition of the country, the House would do well to allow the law to stand for another year; at any rate, with the combined exertions of gentlemen on both sides of the House, some means could be found to retain what was essential and necessary in the law, while rejecting what was immaterial or objectionable, and what the members of the House appeared to think objectionable. With these views he should sustain the amendments of the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier, because he felt that he must vote for them as against the simple question of repeal. It was, doubtless, true that these amendments did not afford machinery for their own enforcement, but they did this much at least, they declared preferential assignments to be a fraud, and that a man should not make a present of his property to a friend or relative, or favour one creditor to the exclusion of the other. An important difficulty was, whether we had a constitutional right to declare in this House, irrespective of an Insolvent Act in its true sense, that propositions such as these should become law. In his own opinion, however, the propositions of his hon. friend were in the direction of what he conceived to be the interests of the country, and in the direction of sound legislation. They were not, certainly, all that was desirable, but they were largely preferable to the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) said his hon. friends from the Province of Quebec were willing to do away with the Insolvent Law because they had other provisions which could replace it; but, if

this law were repealed, it would result in great hardships in the other Provinces, who had no such provisions to fall back upon. He (Mr. Macdonald) did not think that the farmers were affected by a bankrupt law or the want of one. It was the wholesale merchants and jobbers who profited by it. He thought that the tone of the public press seemed altogether in opposition to the total repeal of the Bankrupt Law. Therefore, he would support the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard.)

MR. McCUAIG said he had voted for the absolute and unconditional repeal of the Insolvency Law, because he understood, that, if it were repealed, they would have time for the passing of a law against preferential assignments, which had been the curse of the country. If it be shown that a Bill could yet be introduced that would prevent those assignments, he was yet willing to vote for the repeal of the Insolvent Law, but not otherwise. Those preferential assignments led to a great sacrifice of property, and unless security against them could be assured, he would be obliged to reverse his vote.

MR. SHAW said that the question now was not the repeal of the original Act, proposed by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), but the amendments which the hon. member for South Huron had described as very crude. The original law, from which they might have been copied, was all right, but they were simply copied out of some sections of the old Insolvent Act, and introduced here for the purpose of defeating the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville. Under that Act, so far as Ontario was concerned, it would be quite impossible to work the law, and any one might be made an insolvent, if there was any machinery, or an affidavit, on which an order of a Judge might be obtained. The Absconding Debtors' Act would only apply to those who had left the country, and no judgment could be obtained against an absconding debtor until assessed before a jury. So, in the different counties, assessments could only be made at the June or September session of the County Court, or before the Assizes. Therefore, all the insolvency cases would

have to be decided at those Courts twice a year. The law was utterly unworkable. Not one cent would ever reach the creditors, under the amendments of the members for Hamilton and Jacques Cartier (Messrs. Robertson and Girouard). The frank and honest way of placing those amendments before the Committee would be to ask that the question go before the House and have the Insolvency Act repealed, but not to come in force till the lapse of a year. The idea of throwing the whole commercial legislation of this country into confusion by the introduction of those amendments, should not be entertained, and the Committee should not stultify itself by adopting them. He denied that the desire for repeal was confined entirely to the farmers and mechanics, as every solvent merchant in the rural districts desired the repeal of the Insolvent Act. It was only those who feared they might not be able to pay in full, who were anxious to take advantage of the Insolvent Act. He believed its repeal would be useful. On the introduction of the National Policy, the Legislature ought to take a new course in this matter, and young men entering business should understand that they had better be honest, and earn a reputation for honesty and integrity, when they would get the credit wanted.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said there was no necessity for the claims to be proven before a jury. He was rather surprised to hear the hon. members for Lincoln and South Bruce (Messrs. Rykert and Shaw), crying out against the extraordinary expenses that the creditors would be put to in proving their claims. There must be some means of doing so. Without that, any claims might be accepted as *bonâ fide*, even the dishonest. But if the hon. gentlemen were very much alarmed about trying such cases before a jury, he (Mr. Robertson) was ready to provide that it was not necessary to prove any case before a jury, as a jury, under the practice now in vogue, might be dispensed with. It was all very well for certain members to find fault with suggestions or amendments; they should show their inventive genius by offering something better. There would be no difficulty whatever with his

amendment. The procedure was indicated by the Absconding Debtors Act, which could be meted out as cheaply as possible, at this late stage of the Session. He did not say that this was the best scheme possible, but was strongly convinced that the Bill introduced by the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) was better than the present law. But, if they were not to have that Bill passed, the existing law should be amended so as to provide for a fair division of debtors' estates among the creditors.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said he realised very thoroughly the responsibility of the vote he gave the other night, and which was in accordance with the decision of the majority of the House. There were in this country, at this moment, a great many merchants of high standing, doing a very large business, who viewed that vote with considerable alarm. He knew that telegrams had been received by hon. members of the House using expressions such as that the passage of the resolution, repealing the Insolvency Law, had created consternation amongst the merchants of the country, and especially amongst those of Montreal. But, in spite of that, he saw no reason to regret the vote which he gave. He had given the subject, since that time, as much consideration as he possibly could, and he was bound to say that, in the peculiar position of affairs in this country, he believed that the failure to pass this Bill would be a greater calamity than the repeal of the Act itself. The House must recollect that the vote of this House settled the fate of the Insolvency Act next Session at any rate. No one could look at the vote and realise the public expression of sentiment which it indicated without feeling that the public sentiment of the country, at this moment, was strongly adverse to the continuance of the existing Insolvency Act on the Statute-book. There was no doubt, whatever, that the Insolvent Act had been a source of utter demoralisation to the commerce of the country. He ventured to say that, during the last few years, numbers of men had gone into business in Canada with the Insolvency Act as their principal capital, believing and intending, if the event should occur—as they undoubtedly had reason to

believe it might occur—believing and intending that if misfortune overcame them, that they, at least, would have the Insolvent Act to fall back upon—that they could go to their creditors and offer a composition of ten shillings, or five shillings, instead of twenty shillings in the pound; that they could go back and advertise bankrupt stocks, and ruin the honest trader alongside them, who was endeavouring to pay twenty shillings in the pound. He remembered a prominent merchant of Toronto, talking about this matter, and gave, as an illustration, a country merchant whom he had supplied with goods. The country merchant called to see the Toronto merchant, who expected that the former had come to order a bill of goods. He was astonished, however, to find that he had come to offer a composition of 10s. in the pound. When he asked how it was that his affairs were in this condition, he asked how could it be otherwise. There was John Jones on one side of him, and Peter Smith on the other, who had paid respectively 5s. and 10s. in the pound. He, at that moment, was compelled to ask his creditors to take 10s. in the pound, as he had taken it in regard to the others. And that had been the experience of a large number of merchants, who, rather than go through the trouble and difficulty of managing an insolvent estate, had consented to any composition offered. Men had literally traded in Canada upon the existence of this Insolvent Act. Now, he quite realised, while that was the fact, danger might accrue from the repeal of this law. He quite understood, while that was true, if they repealed the law they might have another condition of things. They might have, instead of the assignee taking possession of the estate, a lawyer taking possession of it. They might have one favoured creditor getting a preferential judgment or assignment, and in that way secure possession of an estate. To a large extent, that, undoubtedly, was the danger they had to face; but if the Act was not repealed every man in Canada would have the fact before him that he had only twelve months within which to arrange his affairs. Every man who was in the slightest degree shaky would inevitably go through insolvency during the next twelve months,

and they would have a condition of general insolvency during that period. Recognising that it was a choice between two evils, and believing that the interests of the country would be best subserved by passing this Act, he hoped it would pass through this Session. There was another reason. They could not ignore the fact that during past years a great deal of the depression they had had in this country had been due to the conduct of the merchants in pressing goods on unwilling buyers throughout the country. They sent their drummers out pressing people to buy goods they did not want, with a consciousness that even if a difficulty occurred they would be able to get a composition or a portion of the assets. The passage of this Bill would stop that kind of thing for a while. Credit would not be so general, and that fact instead of being a disadvantage to the country, would be an unmixed advantage to it. After all the thought he had given to this subject, and all the responsibility he felt in relation to it, and he could assure the House he felt the deepest responsibility in regard to it, he was satisfied they would best subserve the interests of the country by passing this Bill for the total repeal of the Act.

MR. VALLÉE said that he was opposed to the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, for several reasons. With regard to donations between living persons, the present law provided that a creditor must wait a year before he can file his complaint, but these amendments limited this delay to three months. He considered this an undue interference with the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. He believed, also, that the eighth and ninth amendments were unconstitutional, and that the Federal Parliament had not the right to interfere with legislation respecting agreements. This Parliament had not the right to say that such and such agreements were fraudulent. This right belonged exclusively to the Local Legislatures. The Minister of Justice, seeking to influence the House had stated that the representatives of the rural districts had hardly the right to vote against the Insolvent Act. He would say that

those members represented a great many merchants, and that they represented the commercial opinion of a large portion of the community. It had been stated that the press had spoken against the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville. He begged leave to say that he had also followed the opinion of the press, and he had noticed that there were hardly any editorials in the leading papers censuring the vote given the other evening in this House. He held in his hands a letter from Mr. Jean Baptiste Renaud, of the city of Quebec, one of the foremost merchants of Canada, who stated that he was quite satisfied with the vote of the House repealing the Insolvency Act. He had met several other influential merchants of Quebec, who expressed their satisfaction at seeing this Act repealed. Before there was any Insolvency Law the country had been prosperous, and he did not see why it could not be dispensed with again.

MR. BRECKEN said it was a matter of regret the Lower Provinces had not such wise laws as the Province of Quebec. In the absence of insolvent laws in the Lower Provinces, the creditor who levied the first attachment would have the debtor's whole property. He admitted the amendments of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier were incomplete, because they provided no machinery for their own enforcement. In Ontario, if a man absconded, an attachment was levied on his property by the sheriff who took charge of it, and every creditor who went within six months and put in his claim was entitled to a share of the estate. If a man absconded in Prince Edward Island, a creditor attached his property, if it was perishable, and got an order from the Judge to have it sold. If it was not perishable, it remained in the custody of the sheriff, and the creditor went in the usual way and proved his claim. Suppose a man was worth \$1,000 and had twenty creditors; if one creditor, to whom was owed that amount, came in one hour before the other creditors, he could attach the property and seize the whole of it, not a cent being left to the other creditors. He hoped the advice of the hon. the Minister of Justice would be taken by this House, for it would be a great misfortune to

large sections of the country if the Insolvent Act were entirely repealed. A law of this kind should not be framed more in the interest of the creditor than of the debtor, or *vice versa*. It should be equitable. If this law were entirely swept off the Statute-book, it would immediately result in one creditor being benefitted at the expense of the rest. He hoped some means would be taken to devise a measure that would prove satisfactory to the country at large.

MR. GIROUARD said he had been charged with representing a constituency which would not approve of the action he had taken on the question. He admitted he had promised the electors of Jacques Cartier to vote for the repeal of the existing Insolvency Laws; but he contended that he had kept that promise. When the Bill of the Committee was rejected the other night, he had voted without hesitation for the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) repealing the existing law. He was far from considering the amendments he (Mr. Girouard) had introduced as equivalent to an Insolvency Bill. As he had already stated, if these amendments were to have the effect of causing the rejection of the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville, he would withdraw them because he did not desire that result. After listening to the discussion that had just taken place with regard to them, he saw there was no doubt they were incomplete. He had been, and still was, under the impression that under powers intended to be conferred by the Bill as amended, rules and regulations could be made by which Judges would be enabled to provide the necessary machinery to put his propositions into effect. Perhaps he was mistaken. He had never been in favour of the existing Bankruptcy Laws, and he had no wish that any action of his would result in their continuance on the Statute-books. Therefore, unless the House was willing that the Bill of the hon. member for Iberville should receive its third reading to-day; or, unless he had the promise of the Government that it would receive its third reading sometime this week, he would withdraw his amendments. He believed the provisions of his amendments were a step in the right direction, and that they would

MR. VALLÉE.

and to prevent preferential assignments and judgments. Nevertheless, if they should have the effect of defeating the proposition of the hon. member for Iberville, as was feared by certain hon. gentlemen, he would not, as he had already stated, have the slightest hesitation in withdrawing them, and he begged for leave to withdraw the same.

MR. MOUSSEAU said he regretted very much the interference of the Minister of Justice in this discussion. The House had been led to believe that this question was an entirely open one. They had many reasons for thinking so. Every Session that the Insolvency Law came before this House during the last Parliament since 1875, the Minister of Militia and Defence, and Inland Revenue, and the Postmaster-General, were opposed to it. During the partial elections which took place in the years 1875, 1876 and 1877, the Conservatives had always reproached the late Government with not having abolished that law. He thought the reasons given by the hon. the Minister of Justice did not justify the position he took in favour of that law. He (Mr. McDonald) said, first, that the vote given on the second reading of the Bill, of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), did not represent the opinion of the country. He (Mr. Mousseau) contended that if ever a vote had been a faithful echo of the feeling of the country, it was the vote referred to. It was the vote of public opinion. It was a vote recorded in favour of legislation, supported by a large majority of the members of the House, and given against both the leader of the Opposition and of the Government. There must have been some reasons for such a large number of members leaving their leaders, and he (Mr. Mousseau) thought that the principal reasons were to be found in the wishes of their constituents. Their constituents had suffered for many years from this law, and had always been against it. Their constituents, during the last election—that of 1878—told them that if they elected them, they wanted them to vote against this particular law. The hon. the Minister of Justice thought it was not the proper opinion of the country. He thought that the principal papers in the large cities were the real

organs of public opinion. He (Mr. Mousseau) begged leave to differ from the hon. gentleman. The large organs represented say the ten or fifteen principal traders in the great commercial centres, but they did not represent the opinion of the large body of traders throughout the country, or the farming and working population. The great commercial feeling was spoken of as if there was nothing else to consider. During the last fifty years the public men of Canada had made a great mistake. They had been legislating not for the farming and working population, not to develop the industries of the country, but only to increase importations, and during that time the youth of Canada had been leaving for the United States and elsewhere. It was about time to put a stop to such legislation. They were beginning a new fiscal policy, and they ought to inaugurate a new policy in regard to this Insolvency question. They were told that they ought to reconsider this law. He thought if the hon. the Minister of Justice had followed closely the debates and proceedings of the last Parliament, he must have known that that law had been considered in the Sessions of 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878, under one form or another, so that the country—especially the farming community—was prepared for the repeal of these laws. The remarks of the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw) told very heavily about the evils of over-trading. It was exactly the position of affairs in the Province of Quebec. There was nothing so damaging to the prosperity of a country than this over-trading which had existed during the last twenty-five years, and more especially in the last five years. Bankrupt stocks were thrown upon the market through the want of experience or capital on the part of young men—sometimes men who had heretofore been carpenters or farmers, who rushed recklessly into trade, knowing that if they did fail, they had the Insolvency Law to fall back on to enable them to escape serious consequences. The result was, that the honest trader had to compete with these bankrupt stocks, which were often purchased at a nominal figure, and, therefore, could be sold at prices entirely beyond the competition of traders who bought their

stocks from the wholesale men at their regular value. There was no doubt whatever that public sentiment was clearly against the continuance of the Insolvency Law. That was sufficiently proven by the discussions that had taken place in this Parliament during the last five years, and in the press of the Dominion—not, perhaps, in the great organs of cities, but certainly in the greater part of the valuable country newspapers. They found that even the Dominion Board of Trade at their meeting in Ottawa, in January last, expressed the opinion that some extensive alteration should be made in the existing Insolvency Law, and the following letter from Messrs. Patterson and Greene, members of the Committee on Insolvency, appointed by that Board, was read at the meeting :

“While we concur in the alterations and additions to the Insolvency Act, recommended in the report of the Committee, if it is decided to retain the Act in its present form, we would prefer its repeal.”

It was the well-known opinion of the vast majority of the people of this country, that the repeal of the law, pure and simple, was far preferable to the retention of the law as it now stood. He thought it would be rendering a great service to the country to try, at least, one or two years of honest trading without the Bankruptcy Laws.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said there were one or two remarks which had been made by the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, to which he desired to respond. One of the arguments of the hon. gentlemen in favour of the repeal of the Insolvent Law was that the merchants of this country had been in the habit of pressing their wares on their customers. So far as his (Mr. McDonald's) reading extended, he did not know of any period in the history of the world where people having wares to sell did not press them on those who wished to buy, and, as far as his knowledge of trade extended, that was one of the first principles of all active, energetic business men. He sold his goods wherever he could so long as the goods were in safe hands. Otherwise, he would be like a Turk or a Jew, and squat on his hands and knees, and merely pray to Allah for customers. An active and intelligent

MR. MOUSSEAU.

business man sold to whoever in good standing commercially wanted to buy. Sometimes the merchant sold to the wrong man, but this was one of the accidents of trade. Another reason of his hon. friend was that evils arose from the law not being properly administered. This was no reason why the administration of bankrupt estates should not be left in the hands of the creditors, but put into the hands of paid officials, whose duty would be to see that the administration of the law was effectively carried out for the benefit of the people and the country. In England they had taken the administration of the law out of the hands of the creditors, and had placed it in the hands of officers duly appointed for the purpose. He felt quite satisfied that the repeal of the law was a foregone conclusion, but, feeling as he did upon the subject, he could not allow this opportunity to pass without making the last remark he wished to make upon the subject.

MR. SHAW said he would like to correct what appeared to be a misapprehension in regard to the law of Ontario. Without the Insolvent Law, they had a law in Ontario that was against preferential assignments.

MR. GUTHRIE said the hon. member for South Bruce had undertaken to read an Act of the Ontario Parliament, with the view of catching some votes. Anyone looking at that law would see that the interpretation was not a sound one, and it was not the one which had been put upon it by the Courts. If the Insolvent Act were repealed, it should be distinctly understood that they had no better Statute than the Statute of Queen Elizabeth, and they had no protection against judgment by default or against preferential assignments.

MR. GIROUARD said he would withdraw his amendments, as they could not be considered this Session; and he preferred the law should be repealed, than that it should continue to exist.

MR. MACDONNELL said the hon. the Minister of Justice was right in saying that the sentiment of this Dominion was not in favour of an unconditional repeal of the Insolvency Law. He would like

as evidence of this from the speech of one of the strongest supporters of repeal, the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), delivered a few evenings ago. The hon. member stated that, although this House was petitioned in connection with this subject from various parts of the Dominion, from the metropolitan cities of the Dominion, not a single petition asked for an unconditional repeal of the law. Of the various Provinces, only one was prepared to meet such a disaster as the repeal of this Act. He would, therefore, move in amendment, that the following clause be added to the Bill :—

“This Act will not come into operation until after the expiration of one year after the passing of the same.”

This would be a notification to every Province of the Dominion that had not a law for the distribution of Insolvent Estates at present upon their Statute-book, and thus give them an opportunity, before Parliament met again, to enact laws to meet the repeal of this law.

Amendment *negatived*.

Bill *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Bill *reported*.

MR. BÉCHARD moved that the Bill be read the third time.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved that the Bill be read a third time this day six months.

Question put, and amendment (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) *negatived* on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messrs.

Anglin	Flynn
Arkell	Gault
Bowell	Gillies
Brocken	Gillmor
Burnham	Gunn
Burpee (St. John)	Guthrie
Cartwright	Hackett
Casey	Haddow
Cannell	Hay
Castigan	Hesson
Dawson	Hilliard
DeCosmos	Holton
Elliott	Hooper
Fleming	Killam

Kranz	Richey
Lane	Robertson (Hamilton)
Laurier	[P.E.I.] Robinson
Macdonald (King's,	Rochester
MacDonnell	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Mackenzie	Ryan (Montreal Cen.)
McLennan	Rykert
McLeod	Scriver
Merner	Snowball
Mills	Strange
Ogden	Thompson (Haldim'nd)
Paterson (S. Brant)	Tilley
Platt	White (N. Renfrew) —55
Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)	

NAYS :

Messrs.

Allison	Hurteau
Bain	Jones
Baker	Kaulback
Béchar	Keeler
Benoit	Kilvert
Bergeron	King
Bergin	Landry
Bill	Lantier
Bolduc	LaRue
Borden	Little
Bourassa	McDonald (C. Breton)
Bourbeau	Macmillan
Brooks	McCallum
Brown	McDougall
Bunster	McGreevy
Burk	McKay
Burpee (Sunbury)	McQuade
Cameron (S. Huron)	McRory
Caron	Malouin
Casgrain	Massue
Chandler	Méhot
Christie	Mongenais
Cimor	Montplaisir
Cockburn (W. Northbld)	Mousseau
Coughlin	Oliver,
Coupal	Olivier
Coursol	Orton
Currier	Ouimet
Cuthbert	Patterson (Essex)
Daly	Perreault
Daoust	Pickard
Desautniers	Pinsonneault
Desjardins	Rinfret
Domville	Robertson (Shelburne)
Doull	Robitaille
Drew	Rogers
Dubuc	Boss (Dundas)
Dugas	Bouleau
Dumont	Routhier
Farrow	Ryan (Marquetté)
Ferguson	Eymal
Fiset	Shaw
Fitzsimmons	Smith (Selkirk)
Galbraith	Sproule
Gill	Stephenson
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Tassé
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Thompson (Cariboo)
Grandbois	Trow
Haggart	Valin
Houde	Vallée
Huntington	Wallace (S. Norfolk)

Wallace (W. York) Williams
 White (Cardwell) Wright.—107.
 White (E. Hastings)

Bill read the third time and passed.

House adjourned at
 Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 6th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

HIS EXCELLENCY'S DESPATCH ON THE SUBJECT OF THE TARIFF.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

"LORNE.

"The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a Despatch and of its enclosures which he addressed to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on the subject of the Tariff, recently introduced to the Legislature.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"OTTAWA, 5th May, 1879."

BELLECHASSE CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

JUDGE'S REPORT.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice McCord, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a report relating to the election for the Electoral District of Bellechasse.

MANITOBA ADDITIONAL GRANT BILL.

FIRST READING.

Order for House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider a certain resolution respecting a temporary annual grant to the Province of Manitoba, read.

MR. TILLEY: As the Order in Council and the communications from the Government of that Province have been laid upon the table of the House, and hon. members are in possession of the facts connected with it, it is scarcely necessary for me to enlarge upon the subject further than to say that, in 1876, the leader of the then Government submitted to the House a proposition by which the subsidy of Manitoba, for reasons stated, was increased \$25,000 a year. This Province is in a very exceptional position. Its position was exceptional at that time, and warranted an increase, in the opinion of Parliament. That exceptional state of affairs has increased owing to the influx of population and the necessarily increased expenditure of that Province. Under the terms of the Union, no increase of subsidy could take place until the census had been taken in 1881. From the papers on the table, it will be found that the population, the present spring, was estimated at 55,000, and it is supposed that at the close of the year it will have reached 70,000. After giving the whole subject the most careful consideration, the Government considered it but fair and just to that Province, under these exceptional circumstances, that the population, until 1881, when the census will be taken, should be estimated at 70,000, the number that it is supposed the population will reach at the close of the year, and the Government felt themselves warranted in asking the House to increase the subsidy, and base it on a population of 70,000 until 1881. This will make the annual appropriations \$105,654, or an increase of \$15,635.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, although he was quite aware that the circumstances of Manitoba were exceptional, and it might, perhaps, be necessary to comply with the demand, he regretted very much it had been found necessary to propose a second addition. The House would remember that, when, with very great reluctance, the late Government brought down a proposition to add \$25,000 to the allowance to Manitoba, they deemed it necessary that the Manitoba Local Government should make strenuous efforts to meet that expenditure, which they did in several ways, notably by abolishing their

second chamber, and very considerably reducing their expenditure. He did not propose to object further to this, but, at the same time, it was quite obvious that it was to the last degree unadvisable that any of these Provinces should be coming here, at intervals of two or three years, for additional grants. It would be almost impossible to say where that might stop. If this went on in the cases of the other Provinces, this Parliament would be in the unenviable position of acting as a sort of tax collector for the benefit of Legislatures over which it could exercise no control. He would almost deem it better, under the circumstances, to make provision for the taking of the census at more frequent intervals, than to have every two or three years fresh demands made upon the Exchequer for sums which, if not large in themselves, might become dangerous from their frequency.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he agreed with the remarks of his hon. friend to a certain extent, but the answer was that the position of Manitoba was quite exceptional. It had not the ordinary sources of revenue which the other Provinces had. It had shown a praiseworthy desire to practice economy in the administration of its affairs. In the views of some, it might have gone still further, but, whether large or small, certain expenses could not be diminished, and the expenditure was much larger in small Provinces than in large ones. It had no public lands, nor the resources of revenue that the older Provinces had, and was latterly in a permanent state of poverty. This was merely introduced from absolute necessity, just as it was by hon. gentlemen opposite when they took the same step. He hardly thought it would be well to have a quinquennial instead of a decennial census in the small Provinces. It was better to make an advance in this way, up to a certain time, and, after the next decennial census, they could deal with this subject in a comprehensive manner, and settle the future relations of Manitoba with the Dominion on a basis on which any new Provinces established in the North-West might be treated.

MR. MILLS said the condition of Manitoba might be relieved by transfer-

ring to it the management of the public lands and school lands. This would take the burden of management from this Government, and the lands, being under the direct control of the Local Government, could be more economically managed than at present, and considerable revenue be derived from them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was glad to see his predecessor's line of thought ran in the same direction as his own with respect to the manner of treating Manitoba. It would not be well to hold out anything like an implied promise to convey the Dominion lands to that Province until Parliament dealt with the whole subject. The hon. gentleman would find that there was an attempt to deal with the school land matter in the Bill before the House to which he would invite attention to-night.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) said it was too late to adopt the suggestion of the hon member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). If it had been adopted when the Province was admitted this Parliament would not be troubled with applications for increased subsidies. Most of the lands within the limits of that Province had passed out of the hands of the Dominion Government. There was very little land left in the Province that the Government had control of, and, therefore, it was too late to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell. Of course, it was very unpleasant to have their Province continually appealing for assistance, but it was one of the necessities of their situation. They had all the machinery in the North-West for the government of a population a dozen times as large as the present. The true remedy would be found in the extension of the boundaries of the Province, and the re-arrangement of the terms of union, so as to avoid the necessity of continual applications of this nature.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said he was very glad to find that the Government would take into consideration the representations of the people in the North-West. It was certain that the revenue of the Province was very much under that required for the maintenance of the roads and other works, which, at this

moment, it would be well to have administered by Government.

MR. ANGLIN said there were many obvious reasons why the Local Government should not have received additional lands in Manitoba. It was absolutely necessary to extinguish the Indian title in that Province, and settle other matters that could have been settled only by the Dominion Government. Yet it was evident that, as soon as possible, the Dominion Government should transfer to the Local any lands that could fairly be disposed of. He would suggest that this Province, being so ridiculously small, should be made three or four times its present size. Its 11,000 square miles formed scarcely more than the area of some counties in the older Provinces. It should be enlarged at the earliest opportunity.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the suggestion, of course, was worthy of all consideration. The hon. gentleman from Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) quite understood, no doubt, the reason why the boundaries of Manitoba were made so limited—that that Province had no revenue. To administer the affairs of justice to a larger population, and larger Province, would cost the Government more, while their means would not increase in proportion to the area or population. There must be some means of adding to the population of the Province before its bounds could be properly enlarged.

House resolved itself into Committee on the resolution.

(In the Committee.)

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 108) To provide for the payment of an additional temporary grant to the Province of Manitoba.

Bill read the first time.

MR. TILLEY moved the second reading of the Bill.

MR. SMITH.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would like to know if the hon. the Premier could inform the House what proportion of the population in the North-West was outside Manitoba—he meant the districts immediately contiguous. He understood a very large proportion of the emigrants to that region had not settled in the Province, and those people would have no expenditure of any kind made among them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would endeavour to get information on that subject.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) said that the voters' list, from which the number of votes in Manitoba was computed, did not contain the name of a single person settled outside the boundary. The 9,000 or 10,000 referred to by the hon. member for Lambton, were resident in the Province.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was a very large population outside its boundaries, and these people had to continue to govern themselves the best way they could under the North-West Territory Act, without any cost to the Dominion. His own impression was that it was a great mistake to give a Provincial Government or Parliamentary system to Manitoba at all, and that the small number of people in that Province could have governed themselves much more economically under some such plan as the North-West Territory Act provided. He feared that, unless the whole subject was carefully considered with a view to prevent difficulties in future, they should have a succession of such demands as this, before a firm system of government was established in Manitoba or the contiguous territory.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he quite agreed with the hon. gentleman that perhaps the present Constitution of Manitoba was premature; but the hon. gentleman would, doubtless, remember the exceptional circumstances under which it was granted. It was a Bill or measure of peace after a measure had been passed to make Manitoba a Crown Colony, somewhat after the fashion of the North-West Territories beyond. But, to quiet the

somewhat disturbed state of the country, it was necessary, somewhat prematurely, to introduce the system that obtained.

MR. MILLS said he thought that the returns brought down would show that there was a mistake of 20,000 in the addition of the population of Manitoba—that it was 33,000 instead of 53,000. That made some difference as regarded the appropriation, and took away the ground for additional grants to that Province. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan) would require a new reason for asking that additional amount. Before the late Government went out of office, they were asked for an appropriation for bridging the Little Saskatchewan and other streams, where 9,000 to 10,000 people had settled. He had some communication with the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West as to the possibility, out of the \$17,000 granted, to appropriate sums towards making some of those improvements, and as to whether the people were ready to contribute to the work considerably in the shape of labour, but required some monetary assistance, but he (Mr. Mills) thought they had received no answer up to the time of their leaving office. But, as nearly the whole of the population of the North-West was between the border of Manitoba and Fort Ellice, he had no doubt that it would become desirable to aid them in bridging some of the streams, which were, at seasons, nearly impassable, and doing something to facilitate communication between the settlements and the interior. He thought the Government would find that necessary, and that he should mention those facts before the Supplementary Estimates were brought down.

Bill read the second time.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

RESOLUTION WITHDRAWN.

MR. TILLEY said that, since he laid on the table the resolution on that subject, he found that in 1874 an Act was passed by Parliament almost in the terms of the resolution on the Orders for the purpose therein mentioned, except that the amount was fixed at \$250,000 instead of £50,000 *stg.*, towards the construction of

a dry dock in British Columbia. Under those circumstances, and as the legislation in British Columbia on the subject referred to \$250,000 instead of £50,000, he would let the resolution drop.

Resolution, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

NEW BRUNSWICK SUPREME COURT ADDITIONAL JUDGE BILL.

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

FIRST AND SECOND READING.

Order for House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider certain resolutions for the appointment of an additional Judge in Equity in the the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, read.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that the Local Legislature of New Brunswick, last Session, passed an Act authorising the appointment of an additional Judge. He was of opinion there was no necessity for any more, there being now five Supreme Court Judges and five County Court Judges for a population of less than 300,000. In some portions of New Brunswick, lawyers had got into the habit of increasing and protracting litigation, and, in cases not involving over \$40, days would be spent on the trial. He believed that the business could be despatched as in Ontario, in which case there would be quite sufficient Judges to perform the business. He referred mainly to the County Courts, but his objection applied with considerable force to the Supreme Court also. In Nova Scotia he thought there were seven Supreme Court Judges, and seven or eight County Court Judges, or about the same proportion, considering population, as in New Brunswick.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said it was difficult sometimes to determine exactly where to draw the line in reference to these matters, but, in a Province like New Brunswick, he thought it was safe to rely upon the sentiment of the Local Legislature. He held in his hand, not only the Act which was passed authorising the appointment of a Judge, but the report of Mr. Fraser, the Attorney-General of New Brunswick, going fully

into details, and, if his statements were well founded, they afforded ample justification for the appointment contemplated. He understood Mr. Fraser to be, not only a man of ability, but a man of high character, who would not make such a report to the Parliament of the Dominion unless the facts were as he stated. If it were a fact that people were being deprived of their rights from want of more Judges, this Government would not be doing its duty if it did not submit to Parliament the measure asked for by the Legislature of New Brunswick. It was, undoubtedly, a fact that the greatest difficulty was experienced, and that the Judges had been unable to keep down arrears, either because more time was occupied in the trial of causes, or because the amount of business was abnormally increased. Within his own recollection the business in the Courts had increased to such an extent, at any rate in Nova Scotia, as to make an increase of judicial strength absolutely necessary, and he did not doubt the same state of things existed in New Brunswick. In reference to the salary, it would be observed that the Judge to be appointed was called a Judge in Equity, although a Judge in the Supreme Court, following in that respect the example of Nova Scotia, which, before the Union, appointed a Judge in Equity. At that time the salary of the Judge in Equity was \$5,000, being the same as that of the Chief Justice in that Province. The Government had thought it right not to make a distinction in the case of New Brunswick. It was the intention of the Government, however, to reduce the salary of the Equity Judge in Nova Scotia, as soon as they were able to do so, which would be on the next appointment to that office. Of course it was out of the power of the Government to withdraw from the present Judge in Equity the salary he enjoyed when he was appointed, but, whenever that office had again to be filled, the salary would be equalised to that of the other Puisne Judges of the Court.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said it seemed to him an extraordinary proposition to submit to Parliament, that a Province with a population of only 300,000 should require so many Judges. The Province of New Brunswick already had

MR. McDONALD.

five Superior Court Judges, and now the Minister of Justice was asking this House to sanction the appointment of another one. In Ontario, with a population of about 2,000,000, the Superior Court consisted of nine Judges exclusive of the Court of Appeals, three for the Court of Chancery, three in Common Pleas, and three in Queen's Bench. That New Brunswick, whose judicial strength was now very large considering its population, should have an additional Judge, appeared to him to be simply outrageous. The hon. the Minister of Justice justified his proposition on the ground that the Legislature of New Brunswick desired this additional Judge, but, if the Minister of Justice, on the recommendation of every Local Legislature, proposed to increase the strength of the judiciary in each Province, there would be no end to such appointments, and the annual burdens thus imposed on the country would be enormous. They had already seen, this Session, the Government introducing and passing a Bill adding two Superior Court Judges to the judicial strength in British Columbia, entailing an annual expenditure in the Dominion for all time of about \$9,000, and now they were asked to add to the strength of the judiciary of New Brunswick to the tune of \$4,000 a year more, while, by another proposition, still before the House, they were asked to add to the salaries of the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island a sum which would increase the cost of administering justice in that Island, by \$1,500 a year. He understood that the hon. gentleman's proposition was based solely on Acts of Local Legislature, and on the recommendation of the Attorney-General of New Brunswick, who stated that large arrears of business had accumulated in the Courts of that Province, and that the judicial strength of the Province could not successfully undertake the work; but the hon. gentleman should have inquired into the cause of the arrears himself, and not have rested satisfied with the mere recommendation of a local official, perhaps directly interested in the appointment, before he submitted this proposition. The arrears might have accumulated from other causes than the want of numerical judicial strength in that Pro-

vince. It was well known that, before the appointment of the late Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench in Ontario, there was a vast accumulation of business in that Court, solely because the judicial strength had not been put forth in the proper direction and with the proper energy. There were arrears in that Court alone of about 100 cases, and they were all disposed of by that Judge in a very short time after his appointment. If the hon. gentleman had made the necessary enquiries, he would, no doubt, have found that the accumulation of business complained of in New Brunswick was entirely the fault of the Judges, and was not attributable to the paucity of their numbers. Judging by the population, the size of the Province, and its commercial transactions, he was quite satisfied that the Superior Court Judges could easily and satisfactorily administer the laws in New Brunswick, and that no additional Judge was required. He believed the judicial strength all over the Dominion was in excess of the necessities of the country, and the hon. gentleman would find that, if he pursued his present course, and acted solely on the recommendation of the local authorities, he would have a Superior Court Judge for every 10,000 of the population. In some of the Provinces they had that state of things now. In Prince Edward Island they had six Judges to a population of 90,000. The sooner the hon. gentleman stayed his hand on this kind of legislation the better, and before committing the country to these constant increases in judicial appointments, he should make the most thorough and diligent enquiry as to the necessity of the proposed additions.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had stated to the House, in answer to the hon. member for Westmoreland, that his information as to the state of the Courts was founded on the statement of the Attorney-General of New Brunswick, that the difficulty arose not from an unwillingness to work on the part of the Judges, but because it was impossible for them to overtake the work. The hon. member for South Huron, in the face of that allegation, stated that he was satisfied that, if the Judges worked as they ought to work,

they could overtake the arrears. He (Mr. McDonald) would leave that question to be settled by gentlemen who knew the Judges of New Brunswick better than he did. The hon. gentleman had drawn a comparison of the expense of the judiciary of New Brunswick with that of other parts of the Dominion. He did not think that question ought to enter into a discussion of this character. The administration of justice in every part of the Dominion, whether the Province were large or small, should be adequate to all the wants of the people. But the hon. gentleman's argument did not apply here; for, if he had taken the trouble to inform himself, he would have seen that, compared with the expense of the administration of justice in other Provinces of the Dominion, the *pro rata* outlay in New Brunswick was no larger than in Ontario or Quebec—indeed, he did not think it was so large. The administration of justice last year in Ontario amounted to about \$215,000, and in New Brunswick to \$37,000. That included all the Courts in both Provinces. But, even if this argument was a sound one, it would not affect the main fact, that there was an undoubted necessity in New Brunswick for the appointment of another Judge.

MR. ANGLIN said he was pretty well acquainted with the business of the Courts of New Brunswick, and was perfectly satisfied that another Judge was not required. Some years ago they had a Chancery Judge called the Master of the Rolls, and four Judges of the Supreme Court; all five were afterward made Judges in Equity and Judges in Common Law. He did not think this had worked very well, and a good deal of dissatisfaction existed because all the Judges were liable to be called on at any time to hear causes in Equity. He believed it was now proposed to go back to the old system, and create a Judge in Equity. In that way some time might be saved, but the only instance in which any delay was caused, was in the hearing of final motions on appeal before the Supreme Court sitting *in banco* in the Circuit Court in the city of St. John. Unless some means were taken to facilitate the progress of business in the full Court, it

was evident that an increase in the number of Judges would not enable them to get on any faster than at present. He understood that this Bill proposed to divide the full Court, so that one set of Judges could hear one set of causes, and another set of Judges hear other causes, and this might be an improvement. The increase in the number of Judges, unless there was some such readjustment, would not enable them to perform their duties any more rapidly than at present. It was stated that twenty-six Circuit Courts were held, but some of them lasted sometimes scarcely more than a day, and very few more than a week. For many years past, there had been, or there seemed to be, great arrears of business at the St. John Circuit. It was the fashion for young lawyers to enter a great number of cases on the docket in order to make a display, sometimes without any intention of taking them to trial. It was true, as stated by the hon. member for Westmoreland, that lawyers had got into the habit of wrangling over every little trifling cause, so that many days were spent on what, to any person of ordinary common sense, would appear to be a case that could be disposed of in an afternoon. The chief cause of this waste of time, on the part of lawyers, was that they were paid by the day. In St. John, in the Circuit Courts, it frequently happened that, even when there was a large docket, the Judge could find no business to do, because the parties interested, or the lawyers, were not ready. The Court might sit four or five weeks, and yet not do more than try four or five cases. Up to 1866 they had only there five Judges. In 1866, prior to coming into Confederation, it was deemed advisable to create County Court Judges. Five were created, and they had very large criminal and civil jurisdiction. They could try criminals for any but capital offences, and relieved the other Courts of a large amount of work. They had also small Courts to try small debt cases, and, altogether, they had an enormous judicial staff. Of these Supreme Court Judges, four resided in the little town of Fredericton, while, in the large city of St. John, only one of these Judges resided. He had a great deal to do in Chambers. The lawyers thought it very desirable, no doubt, to have another

judicial prize created, but he was perfectly satisfied they did not want another Judge. A good deal might be done to facilitate the transaction of business by the redistribution of work amongst the Judges. The appointment of another Judge would, without such readjustment, do very little to reduce the number of untried cases.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they must look at this from a constitutional point of view. The responsibility for the administration of justice must rest somewhere. It rested by the Constitution in the Legislature of the Provinces. If the Legislature of a Province declared that it was necessary, for the due administration of justice, that a Court should be constituted in a particular manner and have a certain number of Judges, it would be twisting the Constitution for the House to assume the responsibility of saying to the different Provincial Legislatures that they were wrong in the matter. They ought not to suppose, or allow themselves to believe that any Province would be actuated by a sordid desire to get a small sum out of the Dominion revenue in the shape of an additional salary for a single Judge. The Legislature had solemnly declared, by an enactment, that it was necessary for the due administration of justice that a certain number of Judges should be appointed. He thought they must accept the decision of the Legislature whatever might be their private opinion. If an Act was passed by the Local Legislature, it was only on very strong grounds, such as the Act being *ultra vires*, that the Government could recommend its disallowance. The Act in question was clearly within the power of the Local Legislature, and would any Ministry be justified in recommending its disallowance because it put a small additional charge upon the revenue? By the Constitution, the Local Legislature had the right of increasing their judiciary, and the provision of the salary was thrown upon the Dominion. That was a constitutional duty of the Government. He thought the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) had, by his remarks, shown the necessity of the increase of the judiciary, and he (Sir John

A. Macdonald) was of opinion that the measure should be allowed to pass.

MR. MILLS said he did not subscribe to the constitutional doctrine the hon. gentleman had laid down, and, in fact, the friends of the hon. gentleman did not subscribe to it. It was not long since the Legislature of Nova Scotia passed a Bill for establishing County Courts, and the late Administration asked Parliament for an appropriation to make the necessary provision for the payment of the salaries of these Judges. The friends of the hon. gentleman then took a wholly different view of the constitutional obligation of the present Parliament, from that which the hon. gentleman at present expressed. They rejected the Bill in the Senate, thereby declaring that the appropriation should not be made.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I did not vote against the Bill.

MR. MILLS said he did not know how the hon. gentleman voted, or whether he voted at all; but he did know that gentlemen, who were now the colleagues of the hon. gentleman, opposed the measure and secured its defeat. They did not act upon the constitutional theory now propounded. He (Mr. Mills) held that, if the Local Government wanted to increase the number of their Judges, or alter the constitution of their Courts, they ought to enter into correspondence upon the subject with the Dominion Government, pointing out why they believe additional Judges or additional Courts to be necessary; and the Government, in asking for the appropriation, ought to be able to justify the appropriation on its merits. He held that it was quite as appropriate for the Minister of Justice to make suggestions to the people of New Brunswick, in regard to the conduct of business in their Courts, as it was for the late Government to say to Manitoba, when she asked for an additional subsidy, that she ought to do away with the second chamber. If they accepted the doctrine of the hon. gentleman they might have their obligations increased indefinitely, without their having, in the slightest degree, any power over this portion of their expenditure.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) said his

(Sir John A. Macdonald's) friends had voted against the appropriation for some County Court. Well, his friends must defend themselves in the Senate or elsewhere. He thought he had given the stronger proof of his adhesion in the most extreme cases to the principle that each Province was responsible for the administration of justice, and that the Dominion Government should provide the salaries. And for that reason, though he held that the establishment of the Court of Appeal at Toronto was unnecessary, he voted for its establishment. He expressed the opinion at the time that the Court was not wanted, and that it would impede justice instead of assisting it. But, as the Province of Ontario took the responsibility of saying it was required, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not take the responsibility of opposing it in any way whatever. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) spoke about a joint concern between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments. Well, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) thought there were to be no joint concerns, no entangling alliances of any kind.

MR. MILLS: There ought not to be, but there are.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there were. He had known of several. There had been joint concerns in every way; and, therefore, he assumed that the responsibility of the establishment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, and of the appointment of three additional Judges, was expected—was an arrangement made between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government. Was it a fact that the Dominion Government settled beforehand that these additional Judges should be appointed, that the additional salaries should be paid out of the Dominion Treasury, on their own responsibility, before it was submitted to Parliament, and the Provincial Government was merely acting as the mouth-piece of the Dominion Government in establishing that Court, to afford an opportunity to the Judges to get these additional salaries?

Some HON. MEMBERS: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) stated so. That was the legitimate result of his

argument. He asked the hon. gentleman if there was any communication, direct or indirect, respecting the appointment of seven County Judges in Nova Scotia before the Act passed—whether there was any arrangement, direct or indirect, between the Dominion Government and the Government of Nova Scotia, before the seven Judges were appointed? He would pause for a reply.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman should address his question to some person else. He (Mr. Mills) was not a member of the Government at the time, and did not know what the practice was. He was pointing out what the practice ought to be under the Constitution, that this House had the right to determine whether this was a proper appropriation or not to make. It was the business of the hon. gentleman, when he brought down a proposition of this kind to the House, to be in a position to defend that proposition upon its merits.

MR. ANGLIN said, if there had not been any correspondence between the two Governments, regarding the Judges, there should have been some. There should have been an understanding. If the doctrine laid down by the Premier were accepted, any Province of the Dominion could, hereafter, increase the number of its Judges at pleasure, and saddle additional burdens on this Dominion for all time to come. There was no question but that the increase in the number of Judges must be made by joint action. The co-operation of the Local Legislature and Dominion Parliament was necessary to complete a reconstruction of the Provincial Courts. For his own part he would prefer to see this whole power of constructing and reconstructing the Courts vested in the Dominion Parliament. He entirely disented from the extraordinary doctrine of the leader of the Government that, if a Provincial Government chose to declare that additional Judges should be appointed, this Parliament must necessarily accept that decision, approve of the appointments, and pay the salaries attaching thereto. He had not, as stated by the right hon. gentleman, charged the Judges in New Brunswick with dereliction of duty. He

(Mr. Anglin) had said that, of the five Judges referred to, one or two did not devote very much of their time to the judicial work. Nevertheless, he was not prepared to charge these with any neglect of duty. It would not be possible, by any mere increase of the number of the Judges, to overtake the arrears of work of the Supreme Court at Fredericton and the St. John Circuit Court.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was surprised to hear what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin) had stated. He desired to call attention to the fact that when, early in the Session, reference was made to the delay in disposing of election petitions in New Brunswick, the hon. gentleman had said that the Judges of that Province were overworked, whilst, to-day, he stated they had nothing to do. Therefore, he trusted the House would attach very little importance to the statement of the hon. gentleman.

MR. BRECKEN said it would be an extraordinary course for this Parliament to pursue, if they refused to provide the necessary salaries for these Judges.

MR. TILLEY said, though not a member of the legal profession, he had, during the last five years, an opportunity of forming an opinion with reference to the work done by the New Brunswick Judges. He denied that—as stated by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin)—with the exception of one or two, the Judges of the Province had very little to do. He (Mr. Tilley) did not hesitate to say that, in his judgment, there were no gentlemen in any branch of the Civil Service whose time was more fully occupied in the discharge of their duty than the Judges of New Brunswick, and he expected that, if the Insolvent Act were repealed, the amount of litigation would be double what it had been, and there would be a corresponding increase of the duties devolving upon these Judges. As hon. gentlemen knew, there were eight or nine election cases pending in the Province of New Brunswick, which had been standing over for over six months, on the ground that the Judges had not time to take them up and consider them, and he did not hesitate to say that the necessity of disposing of these pending cases was a sufficient

justification for the appointment of an additional Judge.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman might be right; but it proved either that there was more litigation in New Brunswick than anywhere else, or that the Judges were not as capable as anywhere else.

MR. TILLEY: Not at all.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman was mistaken. The Minister of Justice stated that the rate *per capita* was as small in New Brunswick as any other Province.

An HON. MEMBER: He said as small as Ontario.

MR. MACKENZIE said, well, take Ontario. The hon. gentleman made the statement without looking at the figures. The fact was that the cost *per capita* of the Administration of Justice in Ontario was only a little over eleven cents, and in Nova Scotia it was twelve and a-half cents. In New Brunswick it was fourteen cents, including this increase, and in Prince Edward Island it was a fraction over fifteen cents per head of the population. He could easily understand that, in the smaller Provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba, the expense would be exceptional. But the expense of the Administration of Justice in a long settled Province like New Brunswick, where they had a complete judicial system, with a fair population, should not exceed the average of the other Provinces. He protested against the doctrine advanced by the hon. the leader of the Government. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had repeated conferences with the Premier of Nova Scotia, and one or two of his colleagues, who had come to Ottawa as a deputation upon that and other business, in the winter of 1874. He recollected very well discussing with these gentlemen, and the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Dorion, the advisability of the appointment of these County Judges. Those gentlemen urged the necessity of the appointment of these Judges, and the late Government coincided in the existence of that necessity. It would be observed by the Estimates that the salaries of the County Judges of New Brunswick were ex-

ceptionally high. There were few higher in the Province under the old law; but the whole five had a maximum salary of \$2,400 each; whilst many of the county Judges did not get more than \$2,000. In Prince Edward Island, and in Nova Scotia also, the salary was only \$2,000. Therefore, in New Brunswick they had the advantage of disposing of judicial matters in the County Courts with the best talent the Province was likely to produce, as they gave salaries which seemed higher than those of the other Provinces. It was tolerably clear, from the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) and the other legal gentlemen from the Province of New Brunswick, that there was no real justification for the creation of this additional Judge.

House resolved into Committee on the resolutions.

(In the Committee.)

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) introduced a Bill (No. 109) To provide for the salary of one additional Judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.

Bill read the first and second times.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND COUNTY COURT JUDGES BILL.

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider certain resolutions respecting the salaries of the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island.

(In the Committee.)

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the clause in the Act 37 Vict., relating to the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island, left a discretionary power in the Governor in Council to fix the salary at any sum not less than \$1,000 and not over \$2,000. The salaries of

the County Judges in New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, were fixed by law at \$2,000, for the first three years, and \$2,400 thereafter, being the same as the County Judges in Ontario. The salaries of the Judges of Prince Edward Island were fixed by Order in Council at \$2,000, so that as regarded the amount on which they entered office, they stood upon the same ground as the County Judges in the other Lower Provinces, but why there should have been an invidious distinction made between them and the County Judges of the other Provinces, after the three years' service, he did not understand. So far as the income was concerned, he fancied, whatever might be the views of laymen, that no professional man in the House would think that these gentlemen were overpaid.

MR. BRECKEN said he was glad the hon. the Minister of Justice had moved this resolution. But he regretted that the resolution did not extend to the salaries of Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of Prince Edward Island. Under the Act regulating those salaries, the Chief Justice was allowed the small salary of \$3,000, the Assistant Judges \$2,500, an addition to which they were each allowed travelling expenses of \$2,000 per year. He had been given to understand that the reason why these salaries were fixed so low by the Dominion Act was that, while the Judges were officers of the Provincial Government, they were paid smaller salaries. True, the salaries were then very small, but they were the outcome of the agitation attending the introduction of responsible government, when the popular idea was that a public man should serve his country for nothing and find himself. Since then, the Provincial Government, owing to the increased cost of living, had increased the salaries of the other officers of the Civil Service. He could understand that Judges of the great Provinces of Ontario and Quebec should be remunerated at a higher rate than those of the other Provinces; but, when he remembered that the Chief Justices of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick received \$5,000 a year, and the Puisne Judges \$4,000, that the Chief Justices of British Columbia and Manitoba received \$5,000, and the Assis-

MR. McDONALD.

tant Judges \$4,000, besides expenses, he could not see on what grounds the late Government, led by the hon. member for Lambton, thought proper to fix the salaries of the Judges of Prince Edward Island at so low a rate. The population of that Province was somewhere about 100,000. He did not know that in British Columbia there was anything like half that number of white people, and in Manitoba that there was over one-tenth of that number. Each of the Chief Justices in those Provinces received \$5,000, and the Assistant Judges \$4,000; while in Prince Edward Island the former received but \$3,000, the latter \$2,500. The duties of those Judges were very onerous. They held three circuits in two of the counties twice a year, and in Queen's County four terms a year, and only three Judges constituted the Supreme Court. The cases they were called to adjudicate upon were, no doubt, more numerous and much more intricate and difficult than, in all probability, those which engaged the attention of the Courts of British Columbia, and certainly those of Manitoba. A Prince Edward Island journal, the *Patriot*, which represented the Reform party in that Province, had just been put into his hands, and which contained the following remarks concerning the representatives from the Island Province.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Is not the authority a good one?

MR. BRECKEN said, not at all. The statement respecting the Island members was largely inaccurate, as much as the editor of that paper generally indulged in when commenting on the conduct of his political opponents; and he (Mr. Brecken) could assure the hon. member for Westmoreland that meant a good deal, for the publisher of that paper was an adept at the business of misrepresenting his political opponents. The extract was as follows:—

"Then the Minister of Justice moved for a Committee of the Whole on a resolution relative to the judiciary of British Columbia. The Bill which the Minister of Justice is about to submit to Parliament, provides for two additional Judges of the Supreme Court, and gives each of them a salary of \$4,000 per annum. It does seem singular that a Judge in that Paradise of the Dominion should get \$4,000 a year, while just as good, and, perhaps, better, men in Prince Edward, are allowed not

a great deal more than half the money for their services. The Minister of Justice can hardly be entitled to his title as long as he permits such a manifest injustice to continue. The Prince Edward Island Judiciary should, in common justice, be placed on the same footing, as regards remuneration, as the judiciary of the other Provinces. Since there is no chance of the Judges of the larger Provinces being levelled down to the Island level, it is but fair that the salaries of the Island Judges should be levelled up to those of their brethren in the other parts of the Dominion. There was a good deal of discussion on the resolution, but none of the Island supporters of the Government had the courage to direct attention to the difference between the salaries proposed for the British Columbia Judges and the salaries paid the Prince Edward Island Judges. The poor fellows, I suppose, did not get leave to say anything on the subject, and it would never do for them to move in any direction without special instructions."

It was the latter part of this extract that he charged as being largely inaccurate. He had no doubt that the gentleman who wrote this article, and he (Mr. Brecken) knew him very well, had not forgotten the impression that the political tameness of the members who misrepresented the Island during the last Parliament had made upon his mind, he had forgotten that they had been displaced, he was measuring the present representatives by his own party standard. He (Mr. Brecken) claimed to be the free representative of a free people, and would never so far forget what was due to the people who sent him to Parliament, to ask permission either from Government or Opposition as to when, or in what manner, he should express himself on any question under the consideration of this House. When the resolution providing for the salaries of two additional Judges for British Columbia was submitted by the Minister of Justice, he (Mr. Brecken) could not, without being guilty of a breach of the rules of debate, have alluded to the matter of the salaries of the Judges of the Province of Prince Edward Island; the gentleman who undertook to direct public opinion ought to have known this. When he (Mr. Brecken) asked to allude to this matter when the resolution providing a salary for an additional Judge in New Brunswick was just now before the House, the hon. the member for Lambton very properly objected, that it would be irregular and inconvenient. He repeated he never could understand

upon what principle it was that the late Government fixed the salaries at such a paltry rate, nor did he understand what the other representatives from the Island were thinking about when they quietly submitted to such a stigma being cast on the Province they came from. If there were any class of men that the public interests required should be well and liberally paid, it was the Judges of the land. It was a principle well and long recognised in the Mother Country. Judges should be placed in such an independent position that they should be placed above and beyond the suspicion of partiality and being influenced by sordid motives. It was a case in which the amount of labour should not be the sole measure of the remuneration. They were the custodians of our lives, our reputations, and our property, and everything that we held dear to us. There was every reason why they should be placed in an independent position. He might say that this matter had been brought under the consideration of the Government, and that he had pressed the matter upon the consideration of his hon. friend the Minister of Justice. He hoped and believed that next Session the Government would see their way clear to remedy this injustice.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) introduced a Bill (No. 110) Respecting the salaries of the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island.

Bill read the first time.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved the second reading of the Bill.

MR. ANGLIN said that one of the Judges in the County Court of New Brunswick, Judge Watters, of St. John, did as much work as any of the Supreme Court Judges, and work of a high character, for which he received only \$2,400 per annum. He (Mr. Anglin) would suggest that it would be a simple act of justice to increase the salary of that hard working Judge.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that he fully admitted the high character and learning of that Judge. His salary had been fixed at \$2,400 at first. The same observation would apply to the Judges of the same Courts in Halifax and Toronto, who received the same salary, and performed very important services with a great deal of work. But he thought it would be better to deal with the present question, and, if it should be found desirable, at some other time, to reconsider the salaries of the County Court Judges, he was free to say that not only the case of Judge Watters, of St. John, but the Judges of the other cities mentioned, would be entitled to reconsideration.

Bill read the second time.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. TILLEY delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

"LORNE.

"The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1879; and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"OTTAWA, 6th May, 1879."

ANTICOSTI AND MAGDALEN ISLANDS TELEGRAPHS SUBSIDY BILL.

(Mr. Tupper.)

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider a certain resolution respecting the granting of an annual subsidy towards the construction and maintenance of telegraphic communication between Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands.

(In the Committee.)

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

MR. ANGLIN.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 111) For granting an annual subsidy towards the construction and maintenance of telegraphic communication to and upon the Anticosti and Magdalen Islands.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would like to know what the Bill provided—whether a permanent or temporary grant for that object?

MR. TUPPER said the Bill was to authorise the payment of \$15,000 a year in perpetuity for the purpose of securing submarine cables to Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands, and connect with the lines of communication on those Islands. He had stated already that he expected the expenditure for those lines would reach or require a capital of \$200,000, and it was proposed not to give the whole of the subsidy if the object could be attained for less. It was proposed to provide 6 per cent. on the amount invested, and leave \$3,000 over for contingencies. It would be quite impossible to make a contract for the performance of a work of that kind without power on the part of the Government to guarantee a subsidy while the service was well performed.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he hoped the Government would be cautious in that matter. If the grant were to be an annual one, it would be something serious—interest on \$300,000. He had a strong conviction that the beneficial results from the establishment of those lines would not be for the people. At certain seasons, when shipping accidents, with casualties, happened, even with the telegraph, they could not procure the assistance wanted. He did not intend to oppose the scheme, but requested the Government to be careful in regard to it. Had the Government any correspondence with any telegraph company with a view to the accomplishment of that work?

MR. TUPPER: No negotiations have taken place. All that is proposed by the Bill is to take power to make a suitable contract for this work on a fitting opportunity:

SIR A. J. SMITH said that the matter would involve much enquiry as to the cost of the enterprise, which should be known to the Government before action was taken.

MR. FORTIN said he was glad the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) was not opposing the Bill, but was surprised that he expressed the opinion that connecting the Island of Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands with the main land by means of electric cables would not do the good that was expected or would do no good at all; and he was the more surprised, as the navigation of the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, which the telegraph scheme was intended to assist and benefit, formed the main, he should say the only, outlet by water for the trade of this country, and the most important factor in the development of the navigation and the fishing industry of this country. As one of the originators and propagators of the sea-coast telegraph system which this country was about to establish, he (Mr. Fortin) would say, if the hon. gentleman who held the high position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the last four or five years had taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the progress that had been made in this respect in France, Spain, Portugal, and England, he would have seen that the sea coasts of these countries had been girdled with a system of telegraph lines, with which the signal and meteorological systems were connected, so that at every prominent point, whether there was a lighthouse or not, there was a signal or semaphorical station and a guardian or two watching day and night, so that the moment an accident occurred they were ready to assist the distressed mariners themselves, or call in the assistance of the life-saving stations, and of the wrecking steamers from the nearest ports. It was the bounden duty of the Government of this country to make provision for the lives and health of crews and passengers in distress on our sea-coasts, and also for the saving of wrecked vessels and cargoes. And this telegraph relief system was more necessary on the Gulf coasts than on the coasts of the maritime countries of Europe, which possessed an abundance of sea-ports and

towns, from which steamers could come out and render the necessary assistance even without the existence of a regular telegraph signal system. In the Gulf and Lower St. Lawrence, it was quite the contrary, for, as it was now, very little assistance, if any at all, was given to shipwrecked crews and passengers, and to the vessels and cargoes which had the misfortune of being stranded on these distant, desolate, and thinly inhabited shores. In summer, the communication with these parts was difficult and unreliable, while, in winter, it was utterly impossible to communicate with Anticosti, the Magdalen Islands, and Labrador. But the connecting of the above-named islands with the mainland, and also the extension of the telegraph system to the lighthouses situated on the most prominent points of the sea coasts of the Maritime Provinces, for which \$20,000 had been voted this year, were only parts of the telegraph and signal systems which the Government had engaged itself to build and complete in the space of five years, and which embraced, among others, a land line from Murray Bay, on the north shore of the lower River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, to the furthest fishing and trading establishments, and, in the course of time, reaching Forteau, in the Strait of Belle Isle, and connecting the St. Paul and Sable Islands with the mainland. But the connections about to be established this year were, without any doubt, the most important and essential, as Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands were on the track and in the way of vessels bound to and from the ports of Quebec and Montreal, other ports of the Province of Quebec, some of the sea ports of New Brunswick and several important ports of Nova Scotia. To show the importance of that navigation, he cited extracts from the evidence he had given in 1876 before a Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons of Canada, to enquire into the possibility of establishing a submarine telegraph system, and into the advantages and the necessity of such a system of telegraphy in the waters of the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence. If this country was to become as rich and as great as they expected it would be by the proper use of the St. Lawrence for the purpose of

foreign commerce, the people of Canada must become, by means of this beautiful, and he might add unrivalled lake and fluvial route, the carriers of the greatest part of the Western produce; if not, then the destinies of this country were blighted and the hopes of the Canadians unfulfilled. But, in order to accomplish this national end they must carry as cheaply, or more cheaply by that route than the rival routes, especially that of New York could do. To cheapen to the lowest minimum the rates of carrying, either by steam or sail, through the St. Lawrence, was then the great desideratum that they should try to attain. He had already said that Canada expected from this magnificent water-course, which took its source in the very heart of North America, a large part of the carrying trade of the great West. But, in trying to carry out that idea, they had a formidable rival in the port of New York, which took by far the greatest part of this trade. We had been trying to compete with that port for the last thirty years, and if we were to succeed in the struggle, how was it to be done? By carrying cheaper than our rival. What was the charge in the cost of carrying that could be reduced? We could not cut down the expense of building a vessel or the wages of a crew to a lower figure than at present, but we might attempt a reduction in the cost of insurance upon our goods and our ships, and this, it seemed to him, was what the Government should try to bring about, by giving greater protection to vessels, when afloat, but no less so when stranded. The best means to be adopted for this end, was, he believed, the construction of the system of telegraphy in question. He cited the evidence of Mr. Murray, the President of the Montreal Assurance Company, on the subject, extracted from the Committee's report, and also a memorandum prepared for the same Committee of the House of Commons, by Messrs. Henry Fry & Co., Lloyd's agents at Quebec. The friends of this scheme deserved and expected through it also a reduction of insurance on the St. Lawrence route. On the New York route it had been reduced materially the last year.

MR. FORTIN.

Would the shipper think of sending his goods by the St. Lawrence if it were dearer than the New York route? Within the last five or six years the change accomplished by its great rival, New York, was most dangerous to the future of the carrying trade of Canada, trade returns showing that the New York was gaining on the St. Lawrence route. Was it not the duty of the Government and Parliament to do everything possible to change that state of things? If the St. Lawrence route were partly abandoned or materially injured, a great portion of the Dominion, that is to say, the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, would suffer much; indeed, would lose their greatest element of wealth and prosperity. Among the means of improving the St. Lawrence route was this coast telegraph system and semaphore signals, with every provision possible that could reduce losses to shipping to a minimum, and thereby reduce the rates of insurance on ships and their cargoes to a minimum. As it was now, with no system of telegraph communication at all, with receivers of wrecked goods being named according to their political creed, some of the most incapable being sometimes chosen, and with our lighthouses in the hands of persons, some of whom were unfit for the work, was it any wonder that rates of insurance were so high through the St. Lawrence, especially in the fall of the year, say in October and November, when navigation was, it must be conceded, more dangerous than in summer? The system would immediately procure assistance to vessels wrecked or in distress, so that the vessels and their cargoes could, in many instances, be saved, and thereby the main object, which was to reduce the rate of insurance to its minimum would be attained. As might be seen by Mr. Murray's memorandum the Cunard steamers' rates from New York to Liverpool were the lowest, $\frac{1}{4}$ to 3-8 per cent. and other steamers paid by the same route $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while the first-class sailing vessels never paid more than $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., and wooden ships $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 per cent. In the St. Lawrence, the rates were much higher, because the underwriters of a vessel going up the St. Lawrence knew that, if she got wrecked there, she would get little or no help at all, or, perhaps, fall

into the hands of persons who would not do their best to save the property. How, then, could the insurance be otherwise than high? We never paid in Canada less than one-half per cent. on steamers, and that in midsummer, and one per cent. on clippers, while in the fall the rate ranged from four per cent. upwards, sometimes even reaching 10 per cent. It was true that the rates on steamers were considerably lower than on sailing vessels, particularly last year. It was the sailing vessels, however, that did the greatest part of the trade of this country. How could a remunerative trade be carried on when we had to pay such high rates. Insurers in every part of this country, and many other persons acquainted with navigation, had stated that the establishment of a telegraphic system would result in materially diminishing the rates of insurance. Something must also be done to keep our route open. The ports of Montreal and Quebec were visited yearly by a diminishing number of vessels, while the number visiting New York was constantly increasing. This was one of the means that could be adopted in order to attract commerce through the St. Lawrence. The telegraph in question would also have the most beneficial results in the development of the fisheries, and would assist materially in enlarging the sphere and usefulness of our meteorological system. In respect to the fisheries, it was true that they required assistance in many ways, but especially in the way of establishing speedy communication between the different fishing coasts on the islands, and on the coast of Labrador, and the trading centres, where the fishing expeditions were served with supplies, that, when the telegraph and signal systems were completed, and worked on all our sea coasts, the products of our fishing industry would increase in a greater degree, while the labour and operations of the fishermen would be rendered, on one side less arduous, and, on the other side, more remunerative. He concluded by citing extracts from a report of Her Majesty's Vice-Consul General at Christiana, on the Cod and Herring Fisheries of Norway, for the year 1866. He was glad the House had adopted the item, and was satisfied the most beneficial results would follow.

Bill read the first and second times.

MASTERS' AND MATES' CERTIFICATES
ACT EXTENSION BILL.

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

Order for House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider a certain resolution respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships, *read.*

MR. HOLTON said he desired to call the attention of the House to the loose practice they had fallen into in regard to these money resolutions. The rule of Parliament was very clear that a preliminary motion, appointing a day for the consideration of these resolutions, should be made before the House could go into Committee upon them. In only one or two instances this Session, had that wholesome rule been observed. It was a very simple thing to do, but it was, in his opinion, of considerable importance that that rule should be observed. It had never been waived in England, and he did not like to see it departed from here. If they should meet here another year, he should insist on the fulfilment of this rule. In strictness, the Speaker of the House of Commons should not allow a motion of this kind, when this rule had not been observed. They might do almost anything by universal consent, but there were certain cardinal points of parliamentary law, which the Speaker enforced of his own right and duty from the Chair.

House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee.)

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said this resolution required that the first and second mates of vessels should have certificates of service. For some years Canadian ships going to England had been subjected to a great deal of inconvenience because of the mates not having certificates, and in many cases masters and mates had to take on strangers from other ships. In 1878, an Act was passed authorising certificates to be given to the master and first mate. This law had worked exceedingly well, and had saved much trouble and inconvenience to ship-owners. The certificates of our officers

obtained here from a Canadian port, were fully recognised at home, and, so far as the master and first mate were concerned, there was now no inconvenience. The intention of this Bill was to authorise the voluntary examination of second mates. Under our law there was no authority for the granting of certificates to second-class mates, and many of our young men who were scarcely fit to pass an examination as first mates, might pass as second mates. It was expected that the revenue would amount to between \$500 to \$1,000, which would be sufficient to pay the expenses of the Board of Examiners.

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Mr. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) introduced a Bill (No. 112) To extend an Act respecting certificates of masters and mates of ships.

Bill read the first and second times.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced, and read the first and second times:—

Bill (No. 113) To provide for the liquidation of the affairs of building societies in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

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

After Recess.

DYNAMITE EXPLOSION IN STRATFORD.

REMARKS.

Mr. HESSON said he desired, with the permission of the House, before the Orders of the Day were called, to make a few remarks in reference to a sad occurrence in his own town, and to direct the attention of the Government to the matter. It was well known to the members of the House what he referred to—the explosion of dynamite which occurred the previous morning at the town of Stratford, by which a large amount of property and several valuable lives were lost. He was sure he need only say that an occurrence of that kind might

Mr. POPE.

take place at any time, perhaps under more unfavourable circumstances. He was pleased to know they had escaped a much greater calamity than might have befallen them had the explosion taken place some five minutes before, when the express train was passing within a few yards of the scene of the accident. Hon. gentlemen who would take the trouble to read the details would, like himself, be very much affected, and very much concerned for the safety of the public, when they also reflected that a similar disaster might occur at any moment. He thought it would be the duty of this Government, or of any Government, to take such steps as might be deemed necessary for the protection of the lives and the property of the public. This 3,750lb. of nitro-glycerine or dynamite, which exploded, was shipped under the name of blasting powder for Mr. Vanderbilt, or his contractor, for blasting a tunnel at Amherstburg. He thought it was desirable that some provision should be made whereby the transit of such dangerous explosives would be entirely prohibited in the future. He thought it was quite within the power of the Government to make such regulations. He believed the company refused to carry these explosives, if they knew it, and he was of opinion the Government should deal with the matter in the public interest. They could imagine what would be the result of a similar explosion at the Union depot, Toronto, or some more densely populated place. No doubt the company would feel it their duty to ascertain who the parties were who shipped this dangerous matter without the proper precautions. He was sorry to trouble the House with the matter, but he thought it was of such importance that it would not be amiss for the Government to take the matter into their consideration.

Mr. TUPPER said there was no doubt that the subject to which the hon. gentleman had drawn the attention of the House, was one of very grave importance indeed, and the frightful disaster which had occurred showed how much more extensive it might have been if it had been in a different locality, or if it had occurred, as the hon. gentleman had said, a few minutes earlier than it

did. The attention of the Government had already been drawn to the matter, and they had satisfied themselves that there would be a thorough investigation into the deception which appeared to have been practised on the railway authorities, who were not aware that they were carrying dynamite. The matter would receive the fullest consideration at the hands of the Government after the investigation took place, and they were satisfied no effort would be lost in endeavouring to ascertain how the deception was practised.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think there is a law already that relates to the subject, if it is only put in force.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that his impression was that it was a penal offence to carry these explosives without notice. If not, it ought to be so.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 94.]

(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

THIRD READING.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 74.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved that the clause be amended by adding after the last word, the following: "provided that such appeal shall be from the Court of Queen's Bench only."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 9,

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved that the clause be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

On section 12,

MR. GUTHRIE said it was not desirable that they should be deprived of the power to apply to those Judges for a writ of *habeas corpus*. He did not think that this clause should be passed.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he thought it was hardly necessary to encumber the time of Judges of the Supreme Court with appeals, which were practically appeals from the Ottawa Police Court. In any important case, which was really a *habeas corpus* matter, a delay of twelve hours to go to Toronto would not be of great consequence. It was not right that Judges of the Supreme Court should sit and listen to objections from the Police Court on warrants of pretended false committals and matters of that kind.

MR. GUTHRIE said that such a view should not be encouraged. The administration of justice, even in a small matter, should not be beneath the dignity of these gentlemen. Cases of extradition might arise, cases of very great importance, in which it would be convenient for parties having counsel at the capital here, to argue the case before one of the Supreme Court Judges.

MR. TASSÉ said this section took away from the Court the jurisdiction which it possessed in cases of *habeas corpus*. Till now, this jurisdiction had been found most convenient to parties interested in Ottawa and in the surrounding country, and, if it were abolished, whenever a writ of *habeas corpus* was asked for, it would be necessary to go to Toronto, at great inconvenience and expense, and apply before some Judge there in order to obtain such a writ. In the Province of Quebec, where the judicial power was not centralised as it was in Ontario, such an inconvenience would not be felt by the adoption of this section, but it would be here one of its immediate results, as there were no local Judges to try these cases. The tendency of their legislation had assumed already too much of a centralising character, and such a tendency should not be encouraged any longer. If the Judges of the Supreme Court were overworked, as were the Judges of some other tribunals, the expediency of re-

stricting their jurisdiction to cases strictly appellate might fairly be considered, but no such complaint had been heard from the proper quarter. He could not endorse the contention that it was below the dignity of the Court to take cognisance of such cases. Under the English law the liberty of the subject was considered one of the most important, one of the most sacred things that could be involved in any legal suit or proceeding. In fact, the liberty of the subject was one of the fundamental principles of the English law. This fact was so well recognised that, by the Statutes of Charles and George (31 Charles II, chap. 2 and 56 George III, chap. 100), all the Judges in England, the 'Lord-Chancellor, or any of Her Majesty's Justices of one Bench or the other,' etc., had jurisdiction in such cases. And what was not deemed *infra dig.* in England ought not to be considered *infra dig.* in Canada. For these reasons he trusted that the Minister of Justice would find it proper not to suppress the jurisdiction at present enjoyed by the Judges of the Supreme Court in matters relating to the *habeas corpus*, which was so important and so essential to the liberty of the subject.

MR. HOLTON said why should these gentlemen be exempt from a duty of that kind, the highest duty that fell to a Judge—the duty of protecting the rights and liberties of the subject? The highest Judges in England discharged that duty. All the Common Law Judges, from the Chief Justice downwards, sat in *habeas corpus* cases, and, according to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), the Lord Chancellor also performed that duty. He could not see why this clause should be inserted. He understood this Bill was drawn up by the Judges of the Supreme Court, and offered to the Minister of Justice to be presented to Parliament for adoption. He was opposed to those Judges being relieved of this duty.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the only object of this clause was to relieve the Supreme Court of a jurisdiction which was of no earthly advantage to anyone, except that it made it, as he was instructed and believed, a mere Court of Appeal from the Police Court. He believed that any invasion of the

liberty of the subject could be remedied perfectly and regularly as before, without falling upon the Judges of the Supreme Court, and that it was well to relieve them of that duty. However, on the objection of any hon. member of this House, he would not insist upon the clause being adopted, but would withdraw it.

Section *withdrawn*.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that the only remaining clause was that fixing the terms of the Court. He desired to fix the terms as follows:—The second Tuesday of February, the last Tuesday of May, and the third Tuesday of October, which he understood the Judges had approved of. The distribution of the time had been made with a view to the convenience of the Judges. The difficulty, on the other hand, was with the members of the Ontario Bar, who desired to fix times more convenient to themselves in attending the Assizes and other Provincial Courts. While very anxious to meet the views of every member of the Bar, he thought that the convenience of the Supreme Court ought to be a paramount consideration. He had a statement from one of the Judges of that Court in favour of the proposal submitted in that clause, and who best understood the requirements of the Court with a view to its convenience. He was sure that every member of the Bar would agree to submit his convenience to that of the Supreme Court.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said that this matter had been considered very fully by leading members of the Bars of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. With regard to the first hearing term beginning on the second Tuesday in February, every member from Ontario knew that that was the beginning of the second week of Hilary term. The fixing of that day was a very unfortunate matter, it being highly important that lawyers from Ontario and other Provinces should be allowed to attend to their own cases in the Supreme Court, if they could, which, with this proposal of the Minister of Justice, would not be possible, so far as Ontario was concerned, as then the leading members of its Bar

MR. TASSÉ.

would be all very much engaged. He could not understand why it would not be just as convenient for the Government to fix a date more suitable to the Ontario Bar. The letter read by the Minister of Justice showed no great objection to the third Tuesday, although the second was suggested. Certainly no more inconvenient time for the Ontario Bar could be chosen. With regard to the June term, he believed that, after a consultation with one of the Judges, it was agreed they would put up with any inconvenience of their own to meet the views of the Court, by holding a session on the first Tuesday, although that term also came within the Easter term in Ontario. With regard to the October term, he understood that the fourth Tuesday would suit the Judges, and the leading members of the Bars from Ontario could hardly attend before that day, and even that interfered very much with the Assizes. He hoped that the Minister of Justice would consider not only the convenience of the Bar in this matter, but that it was of great importance to the suitors that the counsel who conducted their cases through the lower Courts should be able to attend to them in the Supreme Court. He hoped that the Minister of Justice would accede to the request of the members of the Bar, who had agreed with the Judges in that matter.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that, if the Judges would consent, he should be delighted. He had fixed the dates after consultation with one of the Judges representing, as he understood, the ideas of his brethren; but, if they agreed with the lawyers on a change, he had nothing to say.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said that he had not consulted with the Judges, but the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) had, and he had informed him that the days suggested by him (Mr. Robertson) were satisfactory to the Judges. Mr. Weldon informed him that he had consulted with the Chief Justice, and that those days were satisfactory to him. That clause unamended would cause a great deal of dissatisfaction.

Section agreed to.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had an amendment to submit with reference to the inscription of appeals for hearing by the Registrar of the Court, those from the Maritime Provinces, Quebec and Ontario respectively having to be set down separately, so that gentlemen from any Province might know approximately when their cases should come on for argument.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

Amendments read the first and second times, and agreed to.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved the third reading of the Bill.

MR. CASGRAIN said he would like the Minister of Justice to reconsider his decision as to the right of appeal. He thought he would, on second sober thought, leave it alone.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he did not think they need discuss the matter again. He had considered it already.

MR. HOLTON said that, as a mere matter of courtesy to private members, a Bill of such importance ought not to take so many stages the same night, and particularly if any considerable number desired to understand the precise effect of the amendments made. He did not think there could be any objection to the taking of the final stage to-morrow.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that, if there were any difficulties in the amendments, he would consent to delay as a matter of courtesy. But his hon. friend and himself had discussed the only amendment on which discussion was desired, with reference to the question of appeal in election cases. He thought the House fully understood the question, and he did not think his hon. friend from Chateauguay should ask him, as a mere matter of courtesy, to delay the passage of the Bill for another day, since the House already understood it so well.

MR. HOLTON said his hon. friend had already carried the Bill one stage by courtesy—the concurrence in the amendments made in Committee. They had given three or four stages to a great number of Government Bills in the course of the same sitting; but in this case some hon. gentlemen would like to see the Bill in its complete form before sending it to the Senate.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he understood the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland objected to only one clause. The question was whether an appeal ought to lay in election cases on preliminary objections. It seemed to him that there could be no question, whatever, on that point. This Bill made no new law in elections; it did not provide any new rights, whatever; it only provided a mode of ascertaining by means of the highest tribunal in the country what the law of the land was.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he objected that a law should be passed with a retroactive operation, so as to change the rights of parties, and expose them to further litigation. This was a subject of considerable importance, and he had understood from the hon. the Minister of Justice that they would have a full opportunity of considering this Bill in its various phases, to-morrow.

MR. McDONALD said, although it was so late in the Session, he would allow the Bill to stand over, in order that the hon. member should feel that no injustice had been done him.

Third reading *ordered* for to-morrow.

BANKS AND BANKING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 71.]

(*Mr. Tilley.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill *considered* in Committee of the whole, *reported*, *read the third time* and *passed*.

ONTARIO MARITIME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 73.]

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill *read the second time*.

MR. McDONALD.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the object of this Bill was to limit the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario, so that the right given by the Act constituting that Court should not be applicable to cases where mortgages existed at the time the Act came into force; that was to say, that rights that had accrued before that Act came into force should not be affected. Everyone would admit that this Act should not have a retroactive effect. The second clause of this Act also changed the law with regard to mortgages; it said that they should be cut out in certain cases, that certain claims should have priority to mortgages, that no right or remedy given by the said Act should apply against vessels where mortgages had been given in cases of towage or claims for damage by collision. Under the law as it stood at present, any claim for towage, for damage by collision, for seamen's wages, or for salvage, should have priority even of mortgages that had been given. It was considered by a great number of vessel-owners throughout Ontario that this was an injustice, and they had difficulty to borrow money on their vessels, because the law cut out mortgages. Persons building ships could not raise money on them to go on with their industry in consequence of the uncertainty in which their mortgages were placed. Large vessel-owners had represented this matter to the Government, and this clause was to provide that mortgages should only be cut out by claims for wages and for salvage. There were a great many vessels plying in the inland waters of Ontario that were registered in the port of Montreal. In former years all vessels trading on the upper lakes were registered under the Merchant Shipping Act generally at Montreal, and, consequently, a large number of the vessels navigating the Inland waters of Ontario were registered at that port. The original Act contained the clause making it apply to vessels registered in Ontario and Quebec, and, therefore, he thought that the words at the end of this clause should be amended, so as to read: "Shall be enforced as against

any *bonâ fide* mortgagee, whose mortgage is duly executed and registered in a port of either the Province of Ontario or Quebec.

SIR A. J. SMITH said this Act would not apply to the Lower Provinces, but, as it was limited to the Province of Ontario, he could see no objection to it.

Bill *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Bill *reported, read the third time, and passed.*

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally *read the second time, considered* in Committee of the Whole, *reported, read the third time and passed* :—

Bill (No. 104) To provide for the inspection, safe keeping and storage of petroleum and the products thereof.—(Mr. *Baby*.)

Bill (No. 107) To amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)

PUBLIC BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally *read the third time and passed* :—

Bill (No. 57) To make further provision in relation to Statutory Holidays.—(Mr. *Domville*.)

Bill (No. 99) Respecting Building Societies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*.)

House adjourned at

Thirty-five minutes after

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 7th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced, and *read the first and second times* :—

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Tilley*.)

SELKIRK ELECTION.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said he rose to a question of privilege. He had noticed in a Ministerial paper of this city the report of a matter with regard to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. *Campan*) reflecting on himself (Mr. Smith) as a member of this House, in connection with a recount of the ballots cast in the election for Selkirk. The inference to be drawn from the statement of the paragraph was that he had benefitted a Judge of that Court by giving him money to a large extent on a property—more than its worth. It had, he believed, been said that Judge *Betournay*, who was universally respected, had insisted on obtaining from himself (Mr. Smith) or agent the large sum spoken of, \$10,000 or \$15,000; but, on the whole, he had only \$4,000 on a mortgage, not from him individually, but from his agent, who had acted in this case, as in every other with which he had been connected in Manitoba, simply as his agent to invest moneys, and in most cases without his personal knowledge. In many cases he did not know the parties dealt with or sums handled. The particular transactions spoken of in this instance took place in August, 1874, when his agent, Mr. *Blanchard*, a barrister of Winnipeg, was put in charge of his (Mr. Smith's) personal affairs in Manitoba, and who had invested for him to a considerable extent, on his belief that the security given was ample. That sum of \$4,000 was loaned to Judge *Betournay* on property said to be worth \$8,000 or \$10,000. More than that, not a penny had Judge *Betournay* received from him. So the case was very different, indeed, from what it was made to appear before the House and country. Since that time he had had no knowledge whatever of the transaction. Accounts had been rendered to him of this and other matters, but, with regard to anything in the shape of a mortgage, he had never learned anything. He was determined he should be free from suspicion. In this, as in every other case in which he had done business in the North-West, it

was purely a business transaction. There could be no question, whatever, that the property was worth two or three times the money placed on it. Consequently, it would be seen that Judge Betournay, very far from being indebted to him to the extent of all his personal and moveable property, as was said or inferred, might, at any moment, transfer his mortgage to parties who would have been very glad to take it up as a business transaction. He disliked very much to come before the House on any personal matter, and for his own sake would not have spoken. He had shown he had cared very little for what might have been said against him in the public press; but, when they knew that the reputation of a Judge depended so much on the estimation in which he was held by the people, he believed that it was his duty to come forward and vindicate the Judge reflected upon in that journal.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed.

Bill (No. 108) To provide for the payment of an additional temporary grant to the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Tilley.)

Bill (No. 109) To provide for the salary of one additional Judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the salaries of the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 111) For granting an annual subsidy towards the construction and maintenance of telegraphic communication to and upon the Anticosti and Magdalen Islands.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 112) To extend an Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 74) Further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

TARIFF BILL.—[Bill 93.]

(Mr. Tilley.)

THIRD READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it was with some reluctance that he again re-opened

MR. SMITH.

the discussion on this subject, after it had continued for nearly a month on the floor of the House, but as this was, to all intents and purposes, the last opportunity they would have of making any comments on the revolutionary legislation contained in this measure, he desired, before it to finally left their hands, to call attention a few points which, it appeared to him, might not unprofitably be discussed. When this measure was first introduced to their notice, it was only possible to scan rather cursorily what appeared to be its real tendency. Since that time they had had an opportunity of sifting it in detail, and he was bound to say now, after two months of exceedingly careful consideration, all those fears which he expressed, appeared likely to be even sooner realised than he had then anticipated. They had now, as far as legislative enactment could do it, committed themselves to the theory that the Dominion of Canada, being very largely a maritime country, and having a very large interest in everything which could promote the free exchange of commodities between one country and another, could best do that by reducing the total volume of its trade with other nations; that, seeing we had a very large tract of unoccupied country, which it was very important for us to settle, and on success in settling which the whole future of this country largely depended, they had solemnly declared, by way of encouraging settlers, that henceforth it was better that we should manufacture bad goods, or indifferent goods, at a dear rate, rather than purchase excellent goods cheaply where we best could. Having expended enormous sums of money for the purpose of facilitating and cheapening transportation, they had now decided that we could best attain this object by inflicting heavy penalties on those who desired to use the great highways they had provided. He must say the morality of the transaction appeared to be quite on a par with the wisdom of the theory he had adverted to. Here in Canada, for the first time in its history, they had formally decided that was no sort of objection to the imposition of any tax, that it would work the grossest injustice, not only to special classes, but even to whole Provinces of our Confederation. He felt convinced that the battle on this question,

which took place last September, was fought in the dark, and, although it was true enough, as stated by the hon. gentleman opposite, that the contest was between a revenue and Protective tariff, still he knew right well that, had the tariff now submitted been then presented to the people of Canada, the result would have been entirely different as to the duration of this duel between legislative enactment on the one side, and the laws of truth and nature on the other side; he would say that, accidents apart, he believed it would be of much longer duration than most persons supposed. Knowing, as he could not fail to know, that the tariff would, of necessity, for years to come, press with extreme vigour upon the population of many Provinces, he was satisfied there were many conditions likely to bring about an end to this state of things, even sooner than might be supposed. He entirely denied that there was any fair analogy between the condition of things in Canada and in the United States, and those gentlemen who expected the success of this experiment from the temporary success that attended a similiar tariff in the United States, would do well to remember that in that country there existed the actual fact of Free-trade over almost half a continent between twenty or thirty powerful States, many of which were as populous as the whole Dominion. Now, they had been told by many gentlemen opposite that so clearly was the will of the people expressed, so overwhelming was the decision at the polls, in favour of a Protective tariff, that it was presumptuous for them to oppose their opinion to that of the great majority of the people of Canada. He denied entirely the existence of any great majority of the people in favour of this tariff. He repeated that this battle was fought in the dark, this victory was obtained under false pretences, and the result shown by the election returns, which were lately placed on the table of the House, established conclusively that the great alleged majority was an utter delusion. These returns showed that of a total of 485,000 votes polled, in the contested elections throughout the Dominion, there were cast in favour of the Protective tariff 254,000, and against it 231,000; in other words, if we had at this moment in Canada a

system of proportionate representation, the great majority of 80 in this House to which these hon. gentlemen appealed, would have shrunk to a genuine majority of eight. If they looked at Ontario, they would find that out of about 30 seats carried against the Government of his hon. friend, the total aggregate majority in these 30 constituencies was barely 1,162 votes; and in 82 constituencies in Ontario, excluding two large cities, the total aggregate majority in favour of this tariff, by actual count, was barely 3,150. Now, he was not going to deny that a wave of public opinion did set strongly in in favour of a Protective tariff, but he called the attention of the House to the fact that these returns showed how very slight was the majority in favour of this policy, and how very unsubstantial, indeed, was the ground upon which a great public majority and a decided expression of public will had been claimed in favour of a tariff which the people never saw and which, he dared to say, no man believed would ever be brought down. He wished to call the attention of the House also to the fact that all through this discussion no answer had been given to the facts brought forward by his hon. friend the late Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee), when he showed conclusively that by the application of the existing tariff to the importations for the year 1877-78, a total tax exceeding \$7,000,000 a year would thereby be placed on the people of Canada for the purpose of making up in part an imaginary deficit of about \$2,000,000. Nor could this be answered, because, if they took the statements of the hon. the Minister of Finance, it followed that, as he expected, to prohibit the importation of a large amount of duty paying goods, the people would have to pay, in the shape of additional taxation on these goods, a largely increased sum, which would go for the benefit of certain manufacturers, which, at the same time, in addition to the \$2,000,000, he would have to provide for the whole loss of revenue caused by the prohibition of the importation of these goods. But what he chiefly desired to call attention to, was the utter failure, on the hon. gentleman's own showing, of the one thing which, more than anything else, contributed to induce the people to consent to this tariff being carried into operation. Everybody who

knew anything at all of the mode in which that contest was conducted was well aware that the agriculturists and the workmen were induced to support the proposition for additional taxation by these two arguments—first, that they would get better prices for their products, a thing which they were all beginning to perceive was a mere delusion; and, in the next place that a large home market would be provided by the number of persons to be given employment in the various industries about to be created. He wanted to call the attention of the House to the way in which, according to the statements of the hon. gentleman himself, these promises were likely to be fulfilled. They knew now what the possibilities were which he expected, and what was the utmost number of men likely to be employed. Making a careful estimate of all who were likely to be employed by reason of this tariff, if they manufactured all the goods the hon. gentleman expected, they would be able to give employment to about 1,000 additional hands in the manufacture of cotton; 1,200 in the manufacture of woollen goods; at a large allowance, 1,000 in the manufacture of iron wares; 500 in coal; 500 in sugar; and in various miscellaneous occupations perhaps 1,200 more. If the hon. gentleman was correct in his estimates, between 5,000 and 6,000 hands were about the total number of persons to whom there was any reasonable prospect of giving employment by reason of factories which would be brought into operation under the tariff. If they looked to those who would be injured by the operation of this tariff, what would they find? First of all, they found in the occupation of lumbermen and in saw-mills, 45,620 men; as fishermen, about 18,362; common carriers or railway employes, 2,700; blacksmiths, 15,000; carpenters, 32,000; printers, 2,700; shipwrights, 6,000; seamen 16,000. Now, there had been no sort of pretence set forward that any of these men would be benefitted in the slightest degree by the tariff. On the other hand, it had been shown conclusively by gentlemen conversant with those industries, that while they might possibly give employment to 5,000 or 6,000 people additional, this tariff would, in fact, work a serious injury on some of

the most important industries in this country, employing, at the last Census, at least, 142,000 full-grown men. That was a fair indication of the relative percentage of loss and gain to the whole people of Canada under the operation of this tariff. Why, if all the hon. gentleman claimed was wrought out, and if he did give employment to all these people, the closing of half-a-dozen great lumbering establishments more than destroyed all the possible advantages to be derived from the home market professed to be established. He saw nothing, at the moment, of the fact that in order to do this they could not diminish the purchasing power of the whole 4,000,000 people of Canada. Just so much more as the people of Canada had to pay for their sugar, or iron, or coal, or cotton, or woollen goods, just so much less would they have to expend in the purchase of agricultural implements, and in the purchase of all those articles which had been hitherto successfully manufactured under the tariff which then prevailed. Now, he wanted to call attention to one point especially, in connection with this tariff, and that was the enormous taxation it would impose on the whole agricultural population of Canada in comparison with the utterly insignificant return, which, on the showing of the hon. gentleman himself, they could hope to obtain. But before going on to that, he might say that, although he believed there were not a few industries, which might be profitably enough conducted in Canada, he believed that there were many industries which it was physically impossible for them to conduct advantageously here as they could be conducted in other countries. He said this not because he thought there was any inferiority on the part of the people of Canada, but because he recognized the situation in which they were placed. He said that because the physical and geographical conditions in which they were placed, offered a serious impediment to the carrying on of certain industries successfully. For a long time to come the cost of capital in Canada would be considerably greater than in many other countries; and, in addition to that, being only a population of some 4,000,000 or 5,000,000, and not likely to increase

with great rapidity, they could not, for a long time to come, hope to have as large a market as was necessary, in order to manufacture many articles cheaply. Therefore, it was impossible for them to compete successfully with the manufacturers of other countries in certain branches of trade. He did not say that these obstacles were irremediable, but it was not likely that a great many would be removed for generations to come. He desired next to consider how the taxation was likely to affect the agricultural community. Of course, to a very great extent, they must share the right of any taxation which is imposed on the people of this country; but, when they considered how any policy was going to affect the Dominion it was a very grave question, indeed, how it would affect the agricultural class, for the simple reason that in all probability, at least, three-fourths of the adult male population of this country were engaged in agriculture. If they supposed that the proportions had remained unaltered since the last Census, they found then that out of an aggregate male population of about 700,000 strong, over 476,000 were reported as farmers, while a large proportion of the 124,000 set down as day labourers were undoubtedly engaged likewise in agriculture. A consideration of that fact alone would serve to show conclusively how very grave an objection it would be if it could be shown that the operation of this tariff was going to press most unfairly on the agricultural population in the Province of Ontario, where 226,000 farmers and 62,000 labourers, mostly employed on farms, used to reside. He had caused careful examination to be made into the practical working of this tariff on the farmers of that Province. He did not base his calculations in this matter on mere hearsay evidence or mere idle assumption. Within the last two months he had received a number of detailed accounts from traders in various parts of the country, who had been in the habit of dealing with farmers resident in the neighbourhood, and from these returns, which represented the transactions of farmers, not of large, but of ordinary means, he found that the total amount of dry goods, hardware and groceries, likely to be purchased by an average family, would

amount to \$250 or \$300 a year. In certain sections of the country it was a common thing for farmers to spend in hardware, exclusive of agricultural implements, from \$80 to \$82 a year, and their accounts of dry goods ranged all the way from \$100 to \$500. Those who knew the state of well-being in which the farmers of Ontario were living, would admit that his estimate was a moderate one. By a careful examination he found that the average increase of duty on these articles which the farmers chiefly consumed, was 12 per cent., in other words, that under this tariff the great majority of the farmers of Canada, or of Ontario at any rate, in moderately comfortable circumstances, would be taxed to the extent of \$25 or \$30 per family. Was there any reasonable possibility of any advantage being gained in return for this? Were it possible to create a large number of home consumers something might be said, but they had seen how utterly idle that expectation was. For his own part, he believed that the losses inflicted on the class he had referred to, would so seriously diminish their powers of consumption as to so far equal any trifling advantage that might arise to them from having 5,000 or 6,000 additional consumers to provide for. What were the direct benefits the farmer was to receive? No man who had listened to the discussion on this question would maintain, particularly after the announcement made by the First Minister, that whenever a time of necessity arose he was prepared to abandon the duty on breadstuffs. No man would maintain that there was the slightest possible advantage to the farmer in the duties imposed on wheat, barley, peas, or any article of that description. There were but two articles, Indian corn and oats, out of the duty on which any possible advantage could arise. He did not himself believe that would be the case, because it was perfectly clear to him that the effect of the duty on Indian corn, at any rate, would be to take the money out of the pockets of a very large number of farmers, rather than to give any advantage to them as a class; but, for argument sake, he would take the statement of the hon. gentleman himself, that he expected to

diminish the importation of Indian corn by 1,500,000 bushels. He would suppose that the 7½c. proposed to be levied on this quantity would, by some extraordinary *hocus pocus*, benefit the farmers of this Dominion, although it was notorious that the distillers would not abandon the use of Indian corn, and that the whole weight of this tax must fall on those farmers who were in the habit of purchasing corn for the improvement of their stock. But, granting, for argument sake, that, from this source and from the duty on oats, some advantage might be derived, to what did it amount? Eight hundred or nine hundred thousand bushels of oats were the total quantity that could be affected by this tax, because it was not pretended that the tax on oats, which they imported for the purpose of exporting in oatmeal, could in any way benefit the farmer. They, therefore, obtained this result: that, whereas the farmers of Canada were likely to be taxed to the extent of at least \$25 or \$30 per family, they might possibly get the benefit of the increased duty, amounting to about \$180,000, divided among 476,000. In other words, when they lost \$25 or \$30, they might, peradventure, gain 30c. or 40c. apiece. He thought that was a very fair illustration of the mode in which this tariff was likely to benefit that class which contributed most, and was always likely to contribute most to the revenue of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman had forced another subject upon the attention of the House, by causing or permitting to be published in the English newspapers, a copy of the communications which were yesterday, for the first time, submitted to the House. In looking over these papers, which he must necessarily treat as being communications of the Minister of Finance, he could not but regret the mode in which the hon. gentleman had thought fit to parade his views before the English people. He would not say that the statements which he had made were false, but he would say this, that though the hon. gentleman might have told the truth, he had been very far indeed from telling the whole truth. All through these papers there ran a delusive meaning, anything but creditable to that hon. gentleman, and which he would hardly have resorted to,

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

unless he had believed, perhaps, with too much truth, that very little was known on the other side of the Atlantic of the position of the finances in Canada. He defied any man to take up this memorandum and read the account of the several deficits which occurred from the years 1875 to 1878, without being brought to the conclusion that, in all probability, by reason of these deficits, the debt of Canada had been increased by about \$4,500,000. Now what were the real and actual facts? The hon. gentleman, when he put into the mouth of His Excellency this statement, knew perfectly well that in 1874-75 \$555,000 was applied to the Sinking Fund for the reduction of the public debt; that in 1875-76, \$832,000 was similarly applied; in 1876-77, \$328,000, and in 1877-78, \$945,000. He also knew that the actual result was, that in four years, beginning 1st July, 1874, and terminating 1st July, 1878, so far from there having been \$4,500,000 added to the net debt of Canada, after they deducted these sums which were applied to the Sinking Fund, and the surplus for the year 1874-75, the actual deficit over these four years amounted to barely \$400,000. If they went back to 1873, and took the amount paid into the Sinking Fund and the surplus of that year, they would find that in these five years, beginning 1st July, 1873, and terminating 1st July, 1878, so far from these deficits having caused an increase in the net debt of Canada, the net debt of Canada was diminished by \$1,000,000; and, bearing in mind the condition of the country during the last few years, it was absurd to parade the fact that there was, in the last four years, a total addition to our net debt of \$400,000, as any cause for serious alarm, much less for the total revolution in our fiscal policy. In a paper like this, he thought it would have been wise and proper to have called the attention of the English public and the English Government to the notorious fact that, during these three years, there was an unprecedented shrinkage in the value of those commodities on which our revenue chiefly depended, a shrinkage more remarkable than any that had occurred for perhaps more than thirty years. Passing by that fact, he said it was not quite correct for the hon. gentleman to talk about the amount of our

debt to be redeemed, which he put down in 1885 at \$32,467,000, and not to add that that debt was redeemable entirely at our own pleasure. It was a still more disingenuous statement, a statement which he regretted to see in any memorandum signed by the Canadian Minister of Finance and submitted to Her Majesty's Government, to find such an explanation given of the relative effect of this tariff on our exports and imports as between Canada and the United States and Canada and Great Britain. The very largest item which the hon. gentleman paraded as a proof of the alleged fact that this tariff discriminated against the United States consisted of \$13,300,000 worth of breadstuffs. Now, the hon. gentleman ought, in common honesty, to have told Her Majesty's Government that of that \$13,300,000 to which he referred, probably quite \$11,000,000 worth were goods merely passing through Canada *in transitu*, which would not be affected, which he did not intend should be affected, which he hoped could not possibly be affected, by the operation of this tariff. If this document were honoured by the English press or Government with anything like a critical scrutiny, and if that fact were brought to their notice, the impression produced on their minds could not fail to be most unfavourable, not only to the hon. gentleman, but to the whole course of the discussion on this subject in Canada. It remained as a disgrace to a paper, even dated from the Department of Finance, that in this, by far the most important item in this list, the material fact necessary to guide Her Majesty's Government, in forming an opinion on this tariff, was entirely omitted. It was not necessary to call the attention of the House to the fact, that, while a great deal had been said of the enormous preponderance of imports from the United States, our exports to that country had been absolutely kept out of sight, that of that import of \$48,000,000, probably \$11,000,000 was simply bought by us for the purpose of selling again, or passed absolutely, entirely *in transitu* through our country, while of the other articles that we imported from the United States, a very large proportion was hides or wool, or

other articles which simply passed through the United States *in transitu* for the benefit of our manufacturers. When we came, on the other hand, to deduct from our exports to England the eleven millions or thereabouts which were *bona fide* American goods, we found as a result that the actual trade between England and Canada and between Canada and the United States, when it was critically analysed, was almost precisely carried on on the same footing with England as it was with the United States. It would have been more honest and more consonant with the dignity of his position for the hon. gentleman to have told the English Cabinet, as some of his organs had done, that it was no concern of theirs, that he was going to regulate this tariff as he thought best for the interests of Canada without paying regard to how it affected the interests of the English people. What he had done could not possibly have good effect, but might, on the other hand, go far to deepen the bad feeling which, as almost every English newspaper showed, had been created in the minds of a very large portion of the people of England with respect to the legislation which had just enacted. Although he could not hope to influence, in any shape, the votes of hon. gentlemen opposite, it was well that the people should be informed as to the views of the ultimate results of this policy, held by persons on the other side of the border. There had been lately placed in his hands a complimentary notice from the Industrial League of the United States, to which he would beg to call the attention of the House:—

“Of a totally different nature is the aspect of our commercial relations with our neighbours on the north, where we see with interest that Canada in her turn is giving her adhesion to the policy of furthering home industries. It must be admitted, however, that the smallness of her population, of her home markets, the exclusively northern character of her productions, in contrast with the almost unlimited variety of ours, and the immense extent and expensiveness of her Customs line, render her an unfavourable subject for a separate experiment. A commercial union with the continent of which geographically she is a part, and with which she is connected by identity of race, would afford her large and unrestricted markets, free participation, perhaps, in our coasting trade, with other commercial advantages too numerous to specify, and, at the same time, give her the needful protection against

that European competition from which her rising industries have most to fear. It would, in fact, afford to her what we already enjoy—all the practical advantages of both Free-trade and Protection. Obviously, no policy of tariff legislation hostile to the United States can long be sustained in Canada, since her chief markets for barley, lumber, fish, and other products, as well as her indispensable access to the sea across our territory, can be cut off at pleasure, whenever her tariff policy shall have become sufficiently annoying to provoke retaliatory legislation from our Government."

He (Mr. Cartwright) did not mean to say that the hon. gentleman was bound to regulate his policy according to the dictates of gentlemen on the other side of the line, but it would be worth his while to consider whether there was not some considerable amount of common sense and truth in the remarks which he had just read, coming from a source very decidedly favourable to the policy of the hon. gentleman. The Government had chosen to take up what would very shortly be the cast off clothes of the people of the United States. They had brought in a shallow and ignorant copy of a shallow and ignorant policy, the only excuse for which was that the people of the United States, rent and distracted by a great civil war, were for the moment at the mercy of a number of men who preferred their own selfish interests to the real welfare of their country; and they, with far less advantages in the race, were about to compete with them in an experiment which the ablest of their own advisers had pronounced and proved to be a decided failure; at anyrate, as far as the welfare of the great mass of the population was concerned. As far as the Opposition was concerned, they had done their duty sufficiently in this matter. They could not be accused of having neglected to give sufficient warning against the policy which had been forced on the people. In conclusion, he would advise his hon. friends behind him, during the succeeding year or two, to devote themselves in their constituencies as they had done on the floor of this House, to sift out in minute detail the policy from end to end, and they would speedily succeed in obtaining innumerable instances of the folly which disfigured every line of it, and in all probability, within a short time, they would see the people of Canada once more returned to a right mind, and

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

convinced that it was utterly absurd to attempt to enrich themselves by doubling and trebling the taxation of the people of this country.

MR. TILLEY said the hon. member who had just taken his seat thought it advisable to read him (Mr. Tilley) a lecture as to what he considered to be the proper course that should have been pursued by him in the preparation of the memorandum submitted for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor-General. The hon. gentleman said it was not a false statement, but that it did not contain the whole truth. Had any other hon. member of the Opposition taken him to task on a question of this kind, he would have listened with interest, and have been, perhaps, improved by the suggestions which might have been made or criticisms offered, but if there was an hon. gentleman on that side of the House who should have been the last to have undertaken to point out to him what he should have written or prepared, as he said, for the press of England, with reference to the financial conditions of this Dominion, it was that hon. gentleman who had been brazen-faced enough to rise and admit, before the people of this Dominion, that he, in asking for a loan of money from the people of England, presented to them the silver side of the shield, and presented, when he came back to Canada, the brazen side of the shield, to influence the position of the Opposition of that day. The hon. member said this was prepared for the press of Great Britain. It was not prepared for the press of Great Britain; but there had been a great deal said of late in this House, with reference to the opinion of the English press, and he (Mr. Tilley) recollected, on more than one occasion, that the hon. member quoted, with a great deal of feeling and emphasis, an editorial or two that appeared in the *London Times*, as expressive of the opinion of the people of England, with reference to the tariff and policy of the Government, and as to his course as Minister of Finance. He (Mr. Tilley) then said that if it was an editorial, it was written by an emissary of the hon. gentleman opposite. It turned out to be the fact that it was not an editorial, and he would venture to say the hon. gentle-

man opposite could point to the man who wrote that article. He could quite understand that the English people and manufacturers, when they were imposing additional duty on coarse woollens, upon certain descriptions of cottons of that country, would say this interfered with their trade, inasmuch as it would transfer the manufacture of these articles from England to Canada; but it was remarkable that, in that article quoted by the hon. gentleman, his (Mr. Tilley's) course in permitting the moneys received into the Treasury to be paid into the respective banks on which the cheques were drawn, irrespective of any political influence, was referred to. On the face of it, it was a political—

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Does the hon. gentleman say it was not an editorial?

MR. TILLEY: I understand it was a communication.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Here it is; an editorial of the plainest character.

MR. TILLEY said then that editorial was inspired by some person with the authority of the Opposition.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Give your proof.

MR. TILLEY said he looked to the hon. gentleman for that. He could, no doubt, give evidence.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. gentleman refers to me for proof. I know nothing about who wrote it, and had nothing to do with inspiring it, further than the communicating my speech may have done.

MR. TILLEY said he knew that responsible governments were supposed to be responsible for despatches written by Governors-General, but here the hon. member called attention to a despatch of the Governor-General, and questioned the accuracy of its statements with reference to the deficits in the last four years. He did not say these statements were not correct, but that he (Mr. Tilley) should not have put in the Governor-General's mouth that there were certain liabilities falling due at certain periods, and he referred particularly to

the \$35,000,000 due at a certain date, and said this was redeemable, or not, according to the will of the Government. He stated, that if we would take into account the Sinking Fund, that would be largely reduced. Was not the Sinking Fund one of the liabilities of this Dominion? Had it not to be provided for, not by vote of Parliament every year, but by Statute? It was the first charge upon our Treasury. The hon. gentleman had stated, year after year, from 1874 until he resigned, that there were certain fixed charges upon the Treasury of the Dominion, and this was one of them, which amounted to \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000, and sought to justify the large expenditure which took place under his Administration, on the ground of having to provide for this uncontrollable expenditure. He (Mr. Tilley) had never seen one word or letter of that despatch until it was put into his hands as a despatch to be submitted to this House.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman does not mean, solemnly, to tell us he is not responsible.

MR. TILLEY: Certainly, constitutionally. But the hon. gentleman said I put words into His Excellency's mouth. I am prepared to take every responsibility.

MR. MACKENZIE: You have no right to say you never saw it.

MR. TILLEY said he had a right to say so. He had stated at the outset that, constitutionally, the Government was responsible for this despatch. The hon. gentleman was endeavouring to make a point. We had had nearly a month's discussion on this tariff, and he doubted if they would have had this speech from the hon. gentleman, if it were not for the approaching elections in Ontario. A large portion of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Cartwright's) speech was directed to the farmers of Ontario. He (Mr. Tilley) would not say why it was, that the hon. gentleman was so solicitous for the interests of Ontario. Perhaps it was because it was the Province he more especially represented. But why he selected the farmers of that Province especially to prove his points, he (Mr. Tilley) could not well

see. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to produce an effect upon the farmers, also upon the lumbering and shipping interests of the Maritime Provinces, in reference to the increased taxation imposed upon them. Why had he not endeavoured to make it as apparent as possible that the Government were not responsible, that this taxation was absolutely necessary, that the Government were not asking one dollar more than the late Government engaged to extend during the current year? Looking at the Estimates submitted, could the hon. gentleman deny that? It would be found that the expenditure proposed to be made next year was considerably below what would be expended during the current year? And still the hon. gentleman endeavoured to impress upon the farmers of Ontario and the lumbermen of the Province, that the present Administration were imposing additional burdens upon them. They simply asked the people to contribute the same sum of money which the hon. member asked to be collected; and to make up the deficiency of \$2,400,000. That was the position, and yet the hon. gentleman endeavoured to impress upon the farmers of Ontario and the people generally throughout the Dominion, that the Government of the day were responsible for this taxation which was necessarily imposed upon them. Such was not the case. He took exception to the arguments of the hon. gentleman, which referred more particularly to the farmers. He held the position of the farmers was just the opposite to what the hon. gentleman had endeavoured to prove. He held that the whole of the farmers, whether they were wealthy, in easy circumstances, or poor, did not pay in the same proportion to the revenue that the residents of cities did. That was conviction. Under the operation of this tariff was the grocer's bill increased? Did the hon. gentleman mean to say that the cost of tea had been increased? Had they increased the cost of tobacco? On the contrary, the cost was something like six cents a pound less than before. Had they increased the cost of sugar and molasses? On the contrary, they had reduced the taxation upon them, and they were the articles mainly bought by the farmers from the grocers. Then,

MR. TILLEY.

it was known that the farmers, especially in the Maritime Provinces, wove the woollen cloth they used. He did not hesitate to say that, in his judgment, taking the means they had at their disposal, that the farmer would contribute less in proportion to their wealth and circumstances of the additional taxation than the residents of cities. He believed that as a whole they would pay a smaller proportion in proportion to their wealth and number than would the shipbuilder or the manufacturer. Hundreds and thousands of men were now employed, and many were working on full time, who had been previously working on half time, or were out of employment previous to the 13th of March. This was demonstrated beyond a doubt. And would it be said that the farmers, who were supplying those men, and brought the produce into the market, would not sell it more readily, and in many cases obtain better prices, now that they were working on full time and at high wages? Why, they found that even now men were demanding increased wages, and that strikes were going on in Montreal and elsewhere. Would hon. gentleman opposite say that farmers, suppose they had no other direct benefit or encouragement than the home market, in the towns or cities to which they were in the habit of taking their produce, were not directly protected apart from anything else given them under the operation of this tariff? Certainly it would be so. And, further, the farmers did not consume as much wine and spirits, on which the taxation was increased, as the residents of a town. He took, for instance, the Province he represented, where there were counties in which there had not been a licensed tavern for years. In one-third of the Province wine or spirits could not be obtained, and were they to believe that the farmers consumed as much intoxicating beverages as was consumed in the cities? No. The feeling of the House, he was satisfied, would not support such an assertion. When his hon. friend endeavored in this manner to influence the farmers of Ontario, it might be that he thought they would see through his eyes. He (Mr. Cartwright) was exced-

ingly anxious to convince them that under the operation of this tariff they were to be ground down to the dust, and that they would be taxed exorbitantly without any compensation. The House had heard statements of various kinds. One gentleman said that the imposition of these duties was going to increase the cost of certain articles, whilst another hon. gentleman said they would do nothing of the kind, in fact, that they would amount to nothing. He was satisfied that the statement that a taxation of seven millions additional was to be imposed upon the people for the purpose of getting an additional \$2,000,000, could not be shown, or worked out in figures.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : It was shown.

MR. TILLEY said such a statement would be accepted should those who made it prove that the price of articles would be increased to the full extent of the duties, and that could not be proved. It had been said that this tariff was an imitation of the 35 per cent. tariff. In reply to that, he would just point to the fact that the tariff of last year was a 13 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. tariff on the whole imports, and that the tariff that would become law soon would be about 16 per cent. on the whole imports of the Dominion.

MR. MACKENZIE : Embracing the free goods ?

MR. TILLEY : Exactly. Admitting the free goods. The hon. gentleman said that the increase would be 12 per cent.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : So it will.

MR. TILLEY : No, only 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The United States tariff was 26 per cent, or on all dutiable goods, 45 per cent., and still the present tariff was pointed at as a United States one, as one of the same outrageous character. It was not necessary for him to stand up and justify the United States tariff, or to question the propriety or wisdom of it. While they might be Free-traders or Protectionists, they must look at this question as it was, and not as they desired it to be. The hon. gentleman had referred to natural principles. Was he prepared to resort to direct taxation—to go back to natural principles ? If so, he thought there were many hon. members in this House, who,

though in favour of a Protective tariff to-day, under present circumstances, who would say, "Let us go back to natural principles. Let us exchange our products freely with the products of the world, if the world will trade freely with us." But as there was no question of direct taxation, that was not the position of Canada to-day. They had to deal with the fact that they were alongside a country that protected its industries and labour, that was seeking, in fact, to secure for itself not only its own market, but outside markets, and especially the Canadian market. The statement had been made that the increased duties would increase the price of everything. Why, what were the facts ? The American manufacturers were coming in already and saying : "We will sell you our goods as cheap, if not cheaper, than you can produce them. Your market we are determined to have." And he did not hesitate to say, that, if under the operation of this tariff, such a result followed, as much employment would not, perhaps, be given to the people as the Government expected, still they would realise the revenue. If our neighbours reduced their prices in order to get into our markets, this country would have the additional revenue, our people would not pay the duty, and they would get their goods as cheap as before. Then the hon. gentleman desired to belittle the decision of the House on this ground, that the majority represented but a small majority of the people. Well, it was the same in the election of 1874, verified as nearly as anything could be by an hon. member who sat upon the Government side of the House in the last Parliament as a supporter of the present leader of the Opposition. He referred to the Hon. Mr. Blake. But, supposing the two-thirds majority in Parliament did not represent a corresponding two-thirds majority of the people, would hon. gentlemen opposite say that the representatives of the people were not to be taken as the exponents of the sentiments of the people ? The hon. gentleman wishes to destroy the effect of this proposition by saying, in the first place, that it was not supported by a large majority of the people ; in the next place, that it would be destructive to the people of Canada who did not understand

what they were doing, then the hon. gentleman could take a little comfort from the supposition that at the expiration of five years—the people having the experience which they were not supposed to have had—he would be restored to power again. His (Mr. Tilley's) conviction was, that instead of the proposition being less popular, it would become more and more popular as its operation was understood, and that at the expiration of five years the country would be stronger than ever in favour of the tariff, which, he hoped, would in a few days become a law in the Dominion of Canada.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not desire to bring on a general discussion, but there were a few points he wished to touch upon. In the first place, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley) forgot his position when he told the House he never communicated to the Governor-General the information contained in that despatch, although he assumed the technical responsibility.

MR. TILLEY : I did not send the figures.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was another attempt to place the Governor-General between the Administration and public opinion.

MR. TILLEY : No.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was a sorry exhibition in the House, a few weeks ago, when they found that the Premier had tendered certain advice to the Governor-General, and then came to Parliament before they knew whether their advice was accepted or rejected, and gravely told the House it was a matter of regret that the Governor-General had not accepted the advice, and that it would have been well had His Excellency at once accepted it. And now the Finance Minister, the senior member of the Cabinet, next to the Premier, told the House that the published despatch, written by His Excellency, did not contain anything that he had communicated to the Governor-General.

MR. TILLEY : I am referring to the despatch in which the figures are mentioned. I said I did not see one of those figures.

MR. TILLEY.

MR. MACKENZIE said he knew what the hon. gentleman referred to. It was the duty of a Minister not to say he was not aware of anything in a despatch, but to assume the responsibility.

MR. TILLEY : I did.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was the duty of a Minister to say nothing about it. If he was there as a Constitutional Minister he was bound to accept the responsibility without any special announcement of the fact, but, as a matter of course.

MR. TILLEY : Certainly.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was an unprecedented thing in this country, or anywhere else, as far as his knowledge extended, for a Minister to say that, although responsible for the words in His Excellency's despatch, that he did not know or communicate those facts to His Excellency, on a subject relating solely to his own Department. It was the most extraordinary exhibition of official incapacity.

MR. TILLEY : Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was the most extraordinary exhibition of want of official propriety that could well be made. It was very well that the hon. gentleman was able, when it suited him or his colleagues, to shift upon the Governor-General the responsibility of something or other that had been done or had not been done. On a former occasion the Governor-General was made to bear the weight of not having done something, and on this occasion the House was gravely told by the hon. gentleman that, although responsible nominally for this statement, he was not aware of the facts which were connected solely with his own Department, being communicated to the Governor-General.

MR. TILLEY : No ; I stated that the Government were, of course, responsible, constitutionally, for the despatch, but all I could say was, I had not seen one of the figures until I saw them sent to me from the Governor-General embodied in the despatch.

MR. MACKENZIE said he hoped that the Government, if they intended

to take Parliament into their confidence as to what was or was not communicated to the Governor-General, would tell the whole story, if they were to be called upon to say whether the Minister of Finance's figures contained in this despatch were official or not, and if the hon. gentleman meant to get rid of any responsibility himself—officially, to use his (Mr. Tilley's) own word. He (Mr. Mackenzie) rose chiefly to protest against the statement that the Government were not morally responsible, and this manner of introducing the Governor General's name into discussion—this practice of bringing the Governor General's name between the Government, public opinion, and official responsibility, had been pursued this Session for the first time, so far as he was aware. He desired to say a few words upon another subject. He would not enter into a discussion of its questions which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley) and the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Cartwright) had dealt with, because he was quite willing to allow the speech of the one to pass under review in face of the other, and both to pass for what they might be respectively worth. He proposed to notice one or two matters which neither gentlemen really dealt with. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley) in his reply, maintained that the figures used by the late Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee), were not correct. That was, in stating that \$7,000,000 would be the amount of additional duties levied on the people now based upon the imports of last year.

MR. TILLEY : The hon. member said that the people would be taxed \$7,000,000 additional on the goods imported, over and above the \$2,000,000 paid into the Treasury.

MR. MACKENZIE : His statement was, that in order to get \$2,500,000 paid into the Treasury, the hon. gentleman imposed additional taxation, assuming last year's imports as a basis, of \$7,000,000. That was stated very clearly by the member for St. John.

MR. TILLEY : Seven millions over and above.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman could not deny that statement. It had never been answered. The calcu-

lations had been given special publicity, and it was shown by the hon. gentleman behind him (Mr. Burpee), that, in order to get \$2,500,000, the people would have to pay \$7,000,000, assuming the same amount of imports this as last year. To be sure, the Finance Minister said that importations of certain articles would be largely limited, and that to whatever extent they were, the difference would be seen in the calculations or collections. But, in either case, the hon. gentleman would observe that the people would have to pay \$7,000,000, unless he assumed that the protection would not raise prices. He knew that the hon. gentleman expected it would not in several instances. But it was not human nature not to avail one's self of any protection. Although he might find several parties telegraphing that there was no increase in prices, an increase must be assumed, else there was no protection. The very end and object of the Finance Minister, as he explained it, was to give protection, which meant not merely a larger market in our own country—

MR. TILLEY : That is it.

MR. MACKENZIE : But increased prices.

Several **HON. MEMBERS :** No, no.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was an increase of prices. He could give abundant evidence of the fact, if necessary. One illustration was thrown away by the hon. gentleman, the very illustration that did not suit his purpose. He said there were thousands now employed who were idle on the 13th March. He (Mr. Mackenzie) would be delighted if that were true, but he believed that the hon. the Finance Minister was misled by any assertions of that kind. He happened to know that many were now idle who were employed on the 13th March. But he admitted that in several branches of business the natural effect of the tariff would be the employment of some idle men; but the question would arise whether that employment was not obtained at too high a price for the whole community. The hon. gentleman stated that the farmers who might be influenced by some statements in the speech of the member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright)

would not, in his opinion, pay as much per head as the citizens of the towns. That might be true as to groceries, but as to hardware, crockery, and all kinds of dry goods, the reverse was the case, in Ontario, at all events; and the farmers purchased very largely in excess of the ability of the mechanic or workingman. He (Mr. Mackenzie) knew that it was the farming population who would pay the largest proportion of the taxes. The hon. gentleman had referred to the fiscal policy of the United States, and had attempted, apparently, to compete with their Protection policy, but his (Mr. Mackenzie's) information was that the period of inflated prosperity which the United States tariff had, apparently, created, had now passed away; and he had shewn, a few nights ago, that the realised capital of that country was less than ten years ago, according to some of its best authorities. It was alleged that the tariff was imposed with a view of competing with the States. Some of its particular advocates, however, had another object in view. He would read the letter in an English newspaper, from a somewhat prominent gentleman in Canada, who had been writing strongly in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite. It would be interesting to know why he had worked for them at the last elections, and what kind of an alliance he had formed with them. The following was the letter written by Mr. Goldwin Smith to Mr. Potter, a distinguished English publicist, and member for Rochdale:—

"THE GRANGE, TORONTO,
"March 24, 1879.

"MY DEAR POTTER,—This new Canadian tariff, which shocks you all so much, is the inevitable outcome of the political situation. You must set it down to the account of the Empire which you have just been toasting at the Dufferin banquet.

"Canada is merely the border of the habitable and cultivatable portion of this Continent. She is not even an unbroken border, but broken by an uncultivable tract between this Province and Manitoba, and again between Manitoba and British Columbia by mountain ranges, through which the projectors of the Pacific Railway have not yet found a practicable route. Cut off this border by a Customs line from the rest of the Continent, and you will have commercial atrophy and financial deficit. The true remedy is commercial union with the rest of the Continent; but this 'Empire' forbids, and so the Canadians, in a state of deep commercial depression, and

with their Government on the high road to bankruptcy, are forced to try something else.

"Of the deficit which compels the imposition of fresh taxes, more than half may be charged to the Intercolonial Railway, a politico-military railway constructed for the purposes of the Empire, in which some six millions sterling have been sunk, and which is still run at a loss. Of the rest a considerable proportion may be charged to the military force, which we are made to keep up against the Americans.

"We are now going to sink twenty millions sterling in the Pacific Railway for the purpose of uniting British Columbia, with its population of 10,000 whites, to the Provinces on the Atlantic coast, with which it has no natural connection whatever. This will probably be the end. But thanks to the assiduous cultivation by Dufferin and Co. of an Imperialist and anti-Republican feeling here, the end will probably not come without a convulsion, perhaps not without a bloody one.

"If Canada had been in the Union she would have turned the scale so completely in favor of Freedom against Slavery that there would most likely have been no civil war. If she were in the Union now, she would, in the same way, render hopeless the attempt of the South to regain its ascendancy in conjunction with the Democrats, which is apparently going to breed fresh troubles on this Continent.

"Leave the New World to its own destinies, and you will have first its assured friendship and then its trade. You have sent us, and are daily sending us, many good things of other kinds; but your political interference has been and is mischievous, alike to yourselves and to the communities of the New World.

"I enclose 'Professor' Fanning on Court Etiquette, and one or two cuttings from the papers, which which will give you some idea of a court in a colony. Professor Fanning is a Toronto dancing master, who went to England and interviewed the Lord Chamberlain in order to qualify himself for being the Beau Nash of the Court of Ottawa.

"I suppose you begin to see now what a humbug Dufferin's 'policy' was.

"Yours most truly,

"GOLDWIN SMITH.

"P.S. You will observe that the tariff is not so Protectionist, in the proper sense of the term, as intended to enforce Reciprocity. Our duties are to be lowered again, if the Americans will lower theirs. But they will not lower their duties or do anything else to foster a political outpost of the British aristocracy, and a possible source of future trouble to this continent. The case of the Canadian manufacturers was really a very hard one. They were shut out from the markets of the continent, and, at the same time, exposed to the influx of American goods whenever there was a glut in the States. If the quantity in the aggregate was not very large, the liability was enough to disturb their calculations."

He read that letter chiefly to show the object which this ally of hon. gentlemen

opposite had in view of supporting them at the late elections. Mr. Smith thought it desirable there should be a union of Canada with the United States, and that that object would be promoted by the adoption of the same system of commercial legislation which prevailed in that country, although they, on this side of the House, believed that that was not only a failure, but that nothing was more unpalatable to the people of this country than any such project as Mr. Goldwin Smith estimated was to be the real and proper destiny of Canada in our day. They, on the Opposition side of the House, believed in the very opposite policy. They did not believe that any party advantage should ever be gained by any attempt to obtain any benefit of that sort at the expense of the connection between Canada and the Mother Country. The hon. gentleman had declared, in his first speech on this subject, that this was a revolution. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had no hesitation in expressing his firm conviction that no kind of revolution would stand between the hon. Premier and power; that a revolution even more extensive would be resorted to, without scruple if necessary, to obtain his and his party's ascendancy. It would be an easy matter to illustrate that statement, but it was too late in the Session to do so at present. The hon. gentleman said that the payment into the Sinking Fund was an ordinary liability of the Government. It was not so; payments to that fund was a redemption of obligations already existing, a reduction of the country's debt; and so the late Government were compelled to pay a much larger amount into the Sinking Fund in consequence of increasing liabilities under the legislation of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would like to know what legislation of the late Government was concerned in the expenditure on capital account of late years. Not an act of theirs created any extension of capital expenditure, except those respecting the St. Peter's Canal and the west wing of the Western Departmental Block, Ottawa. But if they had paid a much larger amount into the sinking fund, it was at the expense of the revenue for the year, for the purpose of re-

demption of the debt, and the member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) was quite right in taking credit for that as against the deficits. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to think it something of a crime in the late Government to have a deficit. Why, it would have been easy to lay on taxation to prevent any; but they took the view, which hon. gentlemen opposite might condemn as a matter of opinion, that, during commercial distress, it was not desirable to increase the burdens of the people, believing that a restoration of confidence, at no far off day, would enable the business of the country to resume its wonted elasticity and produce the funds necessary for the public service without fresh burdens. As an English example, Sir Stafford Northcote was not, at this moment, increasing the taxation to meet the whole deficiency, but was extending it over a number of years to avoid taxation necessary to meet it all at once. What course did the hon. Premier opposite take from 1858 to 1862, during which a deficit accrued five times the amount of that of the last four or five years? Did he ever attempt to reduce it by fresh taxation? No, he did not; though he now attacked the Opposition for not having done it in their time. To leave the money in the people's pockets, when they required all obtainable for their paramount and pressing wants, was not an act to be blamed, but commended. Hon. gentlemen opposite were, in the first place, responsible for the deficit itself, which arose from obligations contracted by them. The sinking fund payments of the succeeding Administration were nearly equal to the entire deficit, and, with the surplus of the first year, entirely equal. Therefore, nothing could be more prudent than the course the late Government pursued, although hon. gentlemen opposite might fairly differ as to whether taxation should be increased to make up for deficits at all times. He believed now they pursued the proper course, and was quite satisfied that the hon. gentlemen opposite, in imposing a rate of taxation so excessive, so largely in excess of that borne hitherto, had adopted an unwise course which would result disastrously to the country. He had only now to call the attention of the House to the hon. gentleman's state-

ment that the average rate of duty would only be $16\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. this year, although he had imposed duties averaging from 12 to ≈ 30 per cent. on goods coming into the country. In arriving at that conclusion the hon. gentleman had taken into consideration the imports of free goods into the country, which were merely *in transitu* from the Western States to England. That was not a fair mode of calculation. Let him compare the revenue tariff of last year, upon all articles bearing duty, with that of the present year, and give the percentage, which would show the real increase and the rate of taxation. But the hon. gentleman had proceeded with his illustrations, both in the despatch that he declined to acknowledge having seen before it went to England, and in his speech to-day, in a manner to give a totally false impression of the real condition of matters under this tariff.

SIR JOHN. A. MACDONALD said he observed that the debate had taken a wider scope than the consideration of the tariff, and that the hon. gentleman from Lambton had introduced a constitutional question. The hon. gentleman had charged his hon. friend the Finance Minister, and the Administration of which he was a member, of being guilty of the crime of sheltering themselves behind the Governor-General, and of throwing the blame on the Governor-General by introducing his name, and all because his hon. friend stated that he had never seen this despatch sent by Lord Lorne until it was communicated to him by His Lordship, and after it was asked for by this House. That was a most extraordinary position for the hon. gentleman to take. The hon. gentleman had been a First Minister himself, and knew exactly the relation of the Ministry of the day to the Representative of the Sovereign, and the relation of that Representative to Her Majesty, who was the Sovereign of us all. The hon. gentleman knew that the Governor-General was an Imperial officer who could send such despatches as he pleased. It was a matter of no consequence to us what were his private opinions, or what his political or religious principles might be, or what communication he might make, or what opinions he might have about the *personnel* of his Government, or

Mr. MACKENZIE.

about their policy, so long as he *loyalty* and truly carried out the constitutional principles of listening to his advisers, and following their advice, constitutionally tendered, as long as they had the confidence of Parliament. The Government were responsible for all their own acts, but they could not be responsible for instruments or documents which they were not consulted about, and such as might be of no consequence in the Government of the country. The opinion of the Representative of the Sovereign, as an Imperial officer, was a matter with which they had no concern whatever. Now, what were the facts? The Governor-General asked from the Minister of Finance, as one of his advisers, and the adviser principally interested in financial matters, for a memorandum connected with the tariff. That was furnished to him, and His Excellency, as an Imperial officer, transmitted it to Her Majesty's Government, accompanied with a despatch containing such views as he thought proper to express. His Excellency might have stated, if he had chosen, that he was sorry his advisers had recommended this tariff, that he was a Free-trader in principle, and regretted extremely they had taken that course, but as Constitutional Governor he must accept their advice and had done so. He might have said that if he had chosen, and this House had no right to find fault with it. We had no right to know what he communicated to Her Majesty's Government or to Her Majesty. But Her Majesty's officers in England thought proper to lay this despatch before Parliament, with the accompanying memorandum. That having been done, the hon. gentleman opposite very naturally asked for it, and the Government had to ask permission of His Excellency to lay it before this House, as they had never seen it before, and were informed of it in the same way the hon. gentlemen were informed of it, and in no other way. It was now laid before this House as a matter of information because, after having been communicated by Her Majesty's Government to the British Parliament, there could be no reason why His Excellency should decline to comply with their request that it should be submitted to this Parliament, and, therefore, it was quite absurd—he did not wish to use that expression

offensively—but it was extraordinary rather than the hon. member for Lambton should take the course of charging his hon. friend the Minister of Finance with sheltering himself behind the Governor-General, and throwing the blame on him. He (Mr. Mackenzie) said he never heard of that being done before. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was not aware it had been done before by this Government, but he knew it had been done by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was the head. He could remember well how that hon. gentleman and his whole Government sheltered themselves in the pardon case for Riel and Lepine. They all remembered how, before that hon. gentleman was a Minister at all, before he was a member of this House, and while he was a member of the Legislature of Ontario, how he hoisted the "bloody shirt," as it was called in the United States, and invoked the ghost of the slaughtered Scott; they all remembered that, and how he tried to rouse up the country on that question, and how, when he came to be a Minister here, he was willing to crouch behind his French-Canadian and Catholic supporters. He forgot the bloody shirt then, he forgot the ghost of the murdered Scott, and he got the Governor-General—they had a right to say so, as he had said the same of the present Government—he got the Governor-General to intervene and take the responsibility off his shoulders, letting off Riel and Lepine. It did not rest in the hon. gentleman's mouth to make such a charge now, especially when the charge was altogether unfounded, that this Government in any respect, or on any occasion refused to assume the full responsibility of all their acts, of all their advice, and of all their conduct. He supposed the hon. gentleman did that in consequence of his alliance—rather an entangling alliance he would find it—with the present Ontario Government. For the purpose of assisting that Government in their great straits, he had tried to make political capital of such a dry subject as a tariff. But now, instead of talking about tea, sugar, wheat and barley, he talked about independence, he talked about ministerial responsibility, he talked about Goldwin Smith, he talked about everything, es-

pecially about the hardships of the poor farmers who were going to be crushed by this tariff. Poor farmers.

"Alas! unconscious of their doom,
The little victims play;
Careless they are of ills to come,
They think but of to-day."

The poor farmers were quite unconscious of all the ruin the tariff was going to inflict upon them, and if the hon. gentleman had the correspondence put into his hands that had been received by the hon. the Finance Minister, he would find that whether the letters came from the farmers, the manufacturers, or whatever class it was, the complaints were all, and especially those of the farmers, that the protection was not sufficient.

MR. MACKENZIE: They say, then, it is a failure.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said those who wanted Protection, were like the squaw who said about whiskey that a little too much was just enough. Those who wanted to get protected, wanted all the protection they could get. When his hon. friend was making that exhaustive speech of his—if he were allowed to pay a compliment to his own colleague—whenever he mentioned an increase of duty on any article, he was cheered by the immense majority of this House, and whenever he spoke in hesitating tones, as to the smallness of the duty on any article, the House sat in silence. The same feeling existed all through the country, and the hon. gentlemen opposite knew that, be the cause well or ill founded, this country had deliberately—not by surprise, not by false pretences, as the hon. gentleman for Centre Huron had said, but of a full and lengthened discussion for years, of a strong pressure for Protection on the one side, and an able resistance by the hon. gentleman in favour of Free-trade on the other—the country had deliberately accepted a Protective policy. Therefore, the present Ministry came into power on that policy, the vast majority of this House were elected on that policy, and, true to their promises, true to their pledges and their principles, they had presented this tariff to Parliament, and the country had gratefully accepted what it considered a boon. If there were

any dissatisfaction in the country at all in the matter, it was they did not go far enough in the right direction. The hon. gentleman from Lambton generally argued logically, but sometimes his logic did not follow in easy sequence, for in one breath he stated that there was going to be an increase in prices in consequence of the tariff, and in another breath he said there was no improvement in the country at all, and that he believed more people were employed before the tariff was introduced than since. But it was well known, that if prices rose on any article, that business became profitable, and more people were employed in it; and yet, the hon. gentleman in one breath, stated the prices had increased—therefore the profits had increased—and in the next breath he stated that the number of employes had decreased in every branch. But the hon. gentleman had brought in Mr. Goldwin Smith. Now, Mr. Smith was no ally of his (Sir John A. Macdonald's), but he was a member of a celebrated club which, perhaps, the hon. member for Lambton had heard of—the Cobden Club—and he was a Free-trader, like the hon. gentleman. But there was a difference between them; one was a philosophical Cobdenite, and the other a fanatical Cobdenite. There was as great a distinction between the hon. member for Lambton and Mr. Goldwin Smith in that respect, as there was between John Stuart Mill and the hon. member for Lambton. John Stuart Mill, the great exponent of political economy, pointed out that there might be disturbing causes which made Protection desirable. Goldwin Smith, in that letter, which the hon. gentleman had lugged in by the head and shoulders, said the same thing: that in this country, there were disturbing causes; that as it was a new country, and placed on the ragged edge of this continent—he did not know as that was the phrase—that they suffered a good deal by being excluded from the American market, while the Americans could come in and kill any particular industry whenever they liked; and in that letter he announced that the country was suffering from the causes which John Stuart Mill, in his celebrated work, said justified Protection.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said yes; if the hon. gentleman could show that he was wrong, let him do so in his answer. He affirmed that John Stuart Mill said there were cases when Protection was allowable, and that meant, he supposed, protecting struggling industries against heavier capital and established industries. Goldwin Smith said, in that letter, the same thing—neither more nor less. He began to think that the reason the hon. gentleman brought in that letter, was because Mr. Goldwin Smith, in the same letter, intimated that he thought this country ought to walk alone, that they ought to be either an independent people or a portion of the United States. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not agree with him in that opinion, nor did the hon. member for Lambton agree with him either. On that point they both agreed that Goldwin Smith was wrong, but though he might be wrong on that point, he might still be a very good political economist. It did not lie in the hon. gentleman's mouth to speak of Goldwin Smith as the ally of the present Government, when one of that hon. gentleman's own colleagues in his Government, had written an essay, and boasted of it, in which he declared that Canada could never be prosperous until she was free from Great Britain. That was the hon. member for Shefford, and when he was charged with it in this House, he drew himself up and said he did not write that letter as a politician or as a member of the House of Commons, but he did it as a mere literary man. And so Mr. Goldwin Smith would say the same thing; he was a literary man, and not a politician, he had no responsibilities, he was not a member of Parliament. He had no constituency as the hon. member for Shefford had, when he made that independence speech, and yet the hon. gentleman tried to lug him in, in order to hit us over the shoulders. As long as that hon. gentleman was an opponent of the Government, prior to 1873, he was hail fellow well met with the hon. member for Lambton, they would sleep in the same political crib together, and the hon. gentleman did not then feel he could dispense with his assistance. We could all remember how his variable letters—some, perhaps, not very agreeable to himself personally, —were heralded and quoted with such

unction by the hon. gentleman in attempting to hurt us. However, we could leave Mr. Goldwin Smith to take care of himself, as he was quite able to reply to the attacks made upon him by the hon. member for Lambton.

MR. MACKENZIE : I made no attack upon him.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said : Oh, no, it was no attack upon him at all, but they knew perfectly well that before 1873, he was a strong Liberal, he was a strong opponent of the Government which existed from 1867 to 1873. He was the accepted ally of the hon. gentleman opposite. He was united with the Hon. Edward Blake in getting up a Liberal newspaper that was to dispose of the old and effete Globeites, and succeed in bringing about a return to the old golden—not Goldwin—days. But, strange to say, strong as Goldwin Smith was in his opposition to the old Tory Government under himself (Sir John A. Macdonald), he changed his tone. Notwithstanding the extreme liberal views he entertained in England, notwithstanding his somewhat peculiar views as to the failure of this country, strange to say, he changed his tone. Two years' experience of hon. gentlemen opposite was quite sufficient to change his honey into bitterness, and to induce him to support the present Administration, and support the majority of the Dominion. They could not be surprised at Mr. Goldwin Smith changing his opinions, when 50,000 Liberals must have done the same thing, and must have changed their views between 1874 and 1878. The people now found that they had an "abiding city," and it would take more than five years—it would take a good many five years—before the memory of the past five years would fade away from the memories of the people. The grandsons of the present electors might inaugurate a change, but it would not be in his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) time. It might be that, in the far distant future, he would have an opportunity of looking down upon the House from a very impartial standpoint, and see the positions of the parties reversed, but, he would repeat, it would not be in his time.

MR. MACKENZIE : I would merely remark, the hon. gentleman does not mean he would look downward. He would look upward.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I always look up to my hon. friend.

MR. HOLTON said he would call the attention of the House to one or two points in connection with the papers that had been laid before them that day. It appeared to him that there was a hiatus in the despatch, in fact, two or three hiatuses, which ought to be explained. It seemed to him they had not all the papers before them. He remembered not very long ago, a statement was made in the English House of Commons, by Sir Stafford Northcote, to the effect that an explanation had been invoked from the Government of Canada as to their policy. He would ask the hon. gentleman opposite, whether this despatch and the accompanying memorandum were in reply to the demand for information, and whether they were complete.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they were not. There was, however, a telegram forwarded to Canada, which was read in the House of Commons, and which was published everywhere.

MR. HOLTON : Was this in reply to that ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : No.

MR. TILLEY said the reply in question was despatched on the Tuesday, and he did not submit his financial statement until the Thursday.

MR. HOLTON said the hon. gentleman had stated that he knew nothing about that paper until it was brought down. Now, it was quite clear that the writer of the despatch used the third person plural, and it was manifest that that was the opinion that had been given him by his Ministers.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Very likely.

MR. HOLTON : It must be so. The despatch is so written by the Governor-General as to convey the impression that the information had been imparted to him by his responsible advisers.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Certainly.

MR. HOLTON said it was evident hon. gentlemen desired to shelter themselves behind the Governor-General. He thought that hon. gentlemen were acting wrongly in making use of the Governor-General's name, as they had done this Session, notably in the case of the Letellier affair some weeks ago.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
We did not.

MR. HOLTON said he thought hon. gentlemen acted wrongly in making such free use of the Governor-General's name. Did not the hon. gentleman say from his place that he regretted exceedingly the Governor-General had not acted on the advice they had tendered to him ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
What of that ?

MR. HOLTON : I say it is taking shelter behind the Governor-General.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Hear, hear.

MR. HOLTON : Why does he cast odium on the Governor-General ?

Several HON. MEMBERS : Order.

MR. HOLTON : It tends to make the Governor-General unpopular.

Several Hon. MEMBERS : Order.

MR. HOLTON : A few days later he was obliged to come down and say, "I advised the Governor-General to do this."

Several HON. GENTLEMEN : Question ; order.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. gentleman is out of order in alluding to a previous debate.

MR. HOLTON : Well, this is a debate in which the greatest latitude and freedom is allowed. I know the hon. gentleman does not like any reference to be made to that matter. He hopes this Session will be allowed to pass without his being brought to task.

MR. HOLTON.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Order.

Several HON. MEMBERS : Question.

MR. HOLTON : That attack of his on the Governor-General—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Order.

MR. HOLTON : The hon. gentleman may cry "order." He is very apt to cry "order" when he is out of order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I never was called to order by a Speaker in my life.

MR. HOLTON : I have heard the hon. gentleman say that often, after his being called to order by myself, and my being sustained by the Speaker.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Your memory is failing you, Sir.

MR. HOLTON : I think the hon. gentleman finds my memory rather too long.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had stated that there was apparently something left out in these papers. The hon. gentleman had been a Minister for a short time, and he ought to know that there were such things as verbal conversations between the Sovereign and his advisers. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had had several conversations with the Governor-General on subjects of public interest, and he had no doubt his hon. friend the Minister of Finance had had similar conversations with the Governor-General. It was his Excellency's right of his own mere motion to send such despatches to England as he pleased. They desired to point out, and they did point out, the circumstances mentioned here again and again. Governors-General were all desirous of getting information from all sources, not only from Ministers, but from Opposition politicians, and from the world in general. The Governor-General got that information, no doubt, from the Government. His hon. friend had said that they were responsible for every word used in that despatch. They were responsible, because they knew every fact

to be true. They were responsible because he had no doubt that most of these facts were conveyed by his hon. friend and himself. The hon. gentleman knew well, and, if the hon. gentleman did not know, the hon. member for Lambton would teach him, that a Governor-General had a right to convey to his Sovereign whatever he pleased, without reference to his Ministers. They had no right to know what his private or confidential correspondence was with the Imperial Government or the Colonial Office. All they had a right to insist upon was that he should take the advice of his responsible advisers as long as they had the confidence of Parliament, as every Governor-General he had served under had done without exception. In reference to the Letellier matter he would take the opportunity, before the House rose, of discussing that matter a little more with his hon. friend.

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

After Recess.

MR. MILLS said the hon. Premier had complained, when he objected to the interpretation put by the hon. gentleman upon certain views that were to be found in Mr. Mill's work on Political Economy. He would ask the hon. gentleman to read the paragraph, to which he alluded, to the House, and to show that Mr. Mill, in any degree, upheld the opinions which he had put forward.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I will send for the work and read the passage.

MR. MILLS said that Mr. Mill contended, that as long as a system of Protection continued, it was a financial loss to the country. The hon. gentleman did not admit that. His contention was that Protection itself was an economic advantage. Mr. Mill contended that the only ground upon which Protection could, at any time, be defended, was that an industry for which they had not the necessary skilled labour, was well adapted to the country, and he held that a financial loss might be submitted for a time in order that by-and-by, when that industry was established, it might be-

come economically advantageous. But, so long as Protection was required, the country was losing financially. This was the position taken by Mr. Mill, and not that taken by the eminent literary writer to whom the hon. gentleman referred (Mr. Goldwin Smith), and certainly of the view put forward by the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman ought not to persist in attributing to Mr. Mill opinions which he would have been the last man to uphold. He (Mr. Mills) had not risen to discuss the subject of the tariff at all, and would not allude to it further. What he rose to take exception to, was the constitutional doctrine laid down by the hon. the Premier, with reference to the papers submitted to the House. He (Mr. Mills) did not admit that the Government could put on the table any public document discussing public questions of this country—the financial policy of this country, at the instance of the Government, for which the Government were not responsible—documents or communications between the Governor-General and the Government of Great Britain. Confusion, no doubt, had sometimes arisen in distinguishing between the communications written to the Colonial Office by the Governor-General as an Imperial officer, and that written by him as the Queen's representative—as the chief executive officer of this country. The hon. gentleman had submitted to the House a document which he called a private despatch, written by the Governor-General to the Colonial Minister, for the contents of which he claimed to be in no way responsible. That was not the opinion of the hon. the Minister of Finance. He stated that, constitutionally, the Government was responsible. It was not to be supposed that communications between the Governor-General, in his capacity as Imperial officer, and the Colonial Office, he would become simply the mouthpiece of his advisers, and would discuss their acts and opinions with a view to making a defence of them. He was as free, in such communications, from their advice, as he would be were he writing to an intimate friend. But, when the views of the Government were to be communicated to the Colonial Secretary, they should be communicated by a memorandum in Council, or a memorandum prepared by

some member of the Government, as the exponent of the views of the Government. When the hon. gentleman laid down the doctrine that he could bring down to this House public documents and despatches discussing the affairs of this country, putting forward the views of the Government professedly, and disclaim any responsibility for them, he (Mr. Mills) entirely dissented from that view. He remembered some years ago, when the hon. gentleman was leader of the Government, that while a matter was under discussion in this House, he expressed an opinion that it was not desirable that the House should proceed with the discussion at all until a certain communication from the Governor to the Imperial Government was laid on the table of the House. The hon. gentleman brought that document down without any motion of the House, and after it was laid on the table the hon. gentleman stated he was not in any way responsible for the contents of the despatch, and that it was not proper to say it was brought down for a purpose. To day the hon. gentleman laid down a similar doctrine from which he (Mr. Mills) dissented. If the Government chose to discuss this question with the Imperial authorities, with a view to defend themselves, whether they did it through the Governor-General or through an Order in Council, they were equally responsible to the House. This communication said: "They also desired to point out." Who desired to point out? Why, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues. Point out to whom? To the Colonial Secretary and the Government of England. Did the hon. gentleman pretend that a document written at their instance—because it was perfectly obvious they could not desire the Governor-General to point out certain things to the Colonial Minister and his colleagues, unless they thought he was going to communicate with them on the subject—was one for which the Government were not responsible? It was not written by His Excellency in his capacity as an Imperial Officer, but as the Chief Magistrate of this country, advised by his Ministers, in defence of their fiscal policy. That was patent on the face of this communication. The only way in which the Government could avoid responsibility,

was to provide that communications between the two Governments should be carried on in such a way that the despatches of His Excellency might wholly drop out of sight, without impairing the correspondence. Communications from the Colonial Secretary, when in reply to a Minister or memoranda of the Council, could be brought without its being necessary to bring down the despatch of His Excellency. But so long as they contained the views of the Government, at the instance of the Governor, they were despatches for the contents of which the Government must be held responsible by Parliament. Every communication made to the Colonial Office, discussing and defending the policy of the Government, explaining or defending the views of the Government in any matter of difference, was a communication for which Ministers were responsible as much as Her Majesty's Ministers in the United Kingdom were for the despatches of the Foreign Office.

MR. PLUMB said he did not suppose any leading member of the Opposition would have ventured to make a statement on these resolutions in the direction of tariff argument unless he had something new to say in a matter which had been so long agitated and discussed in this House and elsewhere. He did not suppose that the late Finance Minister would have ventured to present to this House a restatement of the arguments that had been made by the hon. gentleman himself as well as by most of the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, but that he would have brought some new matter into the discussion if he had opened it at all. The hon. gentleman had again stated what he had reiterated very often, namely, that the tariff did not benefit the farmer, and he had given one extremely apocryphal authority to show that the farmers of Ontario would suffer under it. He stated that the average expenditure of the farmers in dry goods and hardware and groceries ranged from \$250 to \$500 a year. While the hon. gentleman might perhaps know something of the farming interest of the county he once represented as a non-resident, he (Mr. Plumb) knew something of the farming interest in the West. He knew what

it was for a farmer to buy a farm and to struggle during twenty or thirty years to get it cleared and paid for, and with the most rigid economy it was usually the case that he was fortunate if he was barely able to leave 100 or 150 acres as a heritage to his children. Such a man had not spent \$250 or \$500 a year at the shops, or his farm would not have been paid for. The basis of the hon. gentleman's statement was an entirely fallacious one. He said the tariff had been aimed particularly at the farming class. The organ which was now the hon. gentleman's patron, but which was not his patron in 1872, the *Toronto Globe*, had claimed to be the farmers' organ for a great many years, and had claimed to be the exclusive protector of the farming interest. That paper had constantly asserted that the proposed tariff was against the interests of the farming community; but the farming community did not believe that statement. It was to the farming community, and not to the manufacturers, that the present Government was indebted for the position they now held as Her Majesty's advisers. The farmers knew perfectly well that it was necessary that they should have a home market, and that they should be permitted to relieve their starved lands by a rotation of crops. They understood clearly the arguments that were addressed to them. Their intelligence might be underrated by hon. gentlemen on the other side; he thought it had always been underrated by those hon. gentlemen. He believed the intelligence of the farmers of the great Province of Ontario was equal to that of any other class, and he thought they would appreciate at their true value the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was useless for them to imagine that they could bring those arguments to bear with any effect upon the farmers of Ontario in the coming election. The hon. gentleman from Centre Huron said that this tariff would impose additional taxes upon the farmers to the extent of \$25 or \$30 a year. He (Mr. Plumb) thought, on the contrary, that they would be benefited to a far larger extent; for instance, as one advantage with the tax upon coal, they would now be able to obtain a

higher price for their cord wood. This was an important item. The farmers were sellers, not buyers, of fuel. He also undertook to say that, having a home market which would be induced by the employes of manufacturers who they sought to encourage in their midst, the farming community would benefit to an extent far beyond twenty-five to thirty per cent. a year, which the late Finance Minister asserts will be their several shares of the burdens of the tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) also accused the gentlemen on the Government side of the House with having provided that, whenever there was a time of scarcity, they were prepared to abandon the duty on breadstuffs. Did the hon. gentleman not know that it was not necessary to pass any new provision to that effect, and that full power, contemplating such a contingency, was given under the eleventh clause of the tariff? There was no new power granted in the tariff in that respect. It was precisely similar to the power granted to the late Minister of Finance in the legislation of 1877, and that was the re-enactment of an old Statute. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) said the Sinking Fund was not to be considered in reckoning the deficits which took place under his disastrous administration of the finances of Canada. That was a new doctrine—not so far as the hon. gentleman was concerned—but to every sound financier in the world. The Sinking Fund was provided by our contract with the public creditor for the purpose of reducing the public debt by an annual contribution, and to say that it should not be taken from the current income of each year, or that it should not be included as an item of outlay, was a statement calculated to injure the credit of Canada. The doctrine would not stand examination for a single moment. They had it from the hon. the late Premier that it was not proper that there should be a discrepancy between the receipts and the expenditure, and, at the same time, he said that it would be easy to bring the expenditure within the receipts, and that deficits should not be excused or palliated by saying that any part of them was occasioned by payments into the Sinking Fund. That fund was

a sacred trust not to be trifled with by sophistries so inexcusable as those of the late Finance Minister. Yet, under that hon. gentleman's management, there had been deficits for three or four years in succession. And, what was the apology offered by him for that state of affairs? Why, that there had been a deficit under Sir John A. Macdonald's Administration, in old Canada, somewhere before 1862. He (Mr. Plumb) did not consider that the members of this House to-day had very much to do with deficits that might have occurred in old Canada prior to 1862. They were not to try the Minister who conducted the financial affairs of Old Canada seventeen years ago, but the hon. gentleman who administered the finances of Canada from 1874 to 1878, and against whom the people of Canada had pronounced judgment. In the course of his harangue, the hon. gentleman stated that the trade with the United States and the trade with England, were practically the same, and bore the same relations to us. He (Mr. Plumb) took issue with the hon. gentleman, and so, he thought, would every practical man upon his side of the House who had even taken the most superficial and cursory glance at the condition of things which existed between the United States and Canada, and the United States and England. The hon. member (Mr. Cartwright) said there were some \$13,000,000 worth of agricultural products brought into Canada under the free list, whilst, at the same time, there was some \$11,000,000 worth of the same products exported from the country. In fact, it was merely *in transitu*, and to tax it, would injure the carrying and commission interests. There never had been a more fallacious statement made in the House. It was easy to bond produce *in transitu*. Everybody knew that more than \$2,000,000 worth of the agricultural produce of other countries was consumed in the Dominion. He acknowledged that, under the system inaugurated by the hon. gentleman opposite and his friends, the whole relations of this country with the United States were changed. Under that system, the farmers of Canada exported their produce when there was not enough in the Dominion to feed the country, and they were obliged to import from the United States to

make up the deficiency. We all knew that the inferior wheat which came into Canada from the United States was mixed with Canadian wheat for home consumption and for export. The hon. gentleman said it was an unfair statement to make, to assert that there was an amount of the five per cent. debt to be provided for in 1886, because, although nominally then payable, was in fact payable at our option at or after that date. It was to be provided for, because his hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) would choose to reduce the rate of interest and make a four per cent loan in place of it. He trusted when his hon. friend the Minister of Finance went to England, he would make a fair, straightforward statement of the financial affairs of Canada, like the statements so truthfully made by the hon. the late Finance Minister when he went to England in 1875 or 1876. Those statements were truthfully made, but he (Mr. Plumb) would not vouch for other statements so largely and scandalously at variance with them which were made by the late Finance Minister in Western Ontario in 1877, which he unblushingly called the brazen side of a shield of which he had presented the silver side to the capitalists of England. It was the brazen side of the shield that was placed before the electors of Canada in order to damage his predecessors, and the hon. gentleman had seen the result of it in the judgment passed by the people of Canada upon him. That hon. gentleman had also alleged that the industrial league of the United States had endorsed the policy of this Government. The hon. gentleman had made quotations from certain financial authorities in the United States before, and he had quoted at public meetings from the pamphlet of Mr. D. A. Wells, only stopping at a certain passage, which stated that the annexation of Canada with the United States would be the result of the policy which Mr. Wells advocated and the hon. gentleman endorsed. After quoting a writer whose tendencies were clearly annexationist, the hon. gentleman talked about the policy of the Conservative party as tending to sever the golden link between Canada and England. He, forsooth, was one of the gentlemen who took up the cry of loyalty. He thought it ill-became them to make any such claim as that, as against the

gentleman who now governed the country, who had stood with unbroken front against any attempt to sever the golden link from the time that he first entered public life, and upon whose loyalty there never had been a shadow of suspicion. It was not the place of hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about loyalty. It was not a fair line of argument either, to produce paragraphs from English Provincial newspapers, in support of their contestations, because, forsooth, there had been, perhaps, some little feeling in the manufacturing districts, with respect to a tariff that might impose a small increase of charge upon certain classes of English manufacturers, as to which the wildest misrepresentations had been made here and elsewhere, by the Opposition, in order to create a prejudice against their policy in England. They had all a very high respect for the great commercial and manufacturing interests of England, and a strong desire to prevent injury to those interests; but they must also remember that there was a large investment of English capital in Canada not representing, directly, the manufacturing interests. Capitalists had entrusted large sums of money in this country for which they were not receiving a return, and if the Government pursued a revenue policy that would secure for those capitalists, through reviving prosperity, a better return for their investments in railway and other works, a small amount of that return would more than recoup the \$400,000 or \$500,000 which, it was claimed, would be taken out of the pockets of English manufacturers, and even those manufacturers themselves, would be largely benefitted by a policy which would increase the purchasing power of the Canadian public, who must continue to be large consumers of English goods, whatever might be the effect of the National Policy. If the tariff was intended to promote and foster the manufacture of coarse woollens in Canada, it would also stimulate household manufactures. He did not think that anybody who understood the interests of this country would find fault with a system which would create a home demand for Canadian wool. The hon. the Minister of Finance would be a public benefactor, if he could do anything which would increase the

domestic industries of the Canadian farmer, which heretofore had been too much neglected, if he could cause the hum of the spindle to be again heard, instead of the strain of the piano. His hon. friend on the other side (Mr. Cartwright) was somewhat too sanguine in his estimate of the efficacy of the appeal he made to the country. He (Mr. Plumb) had a little extract from a speech delivered, on the 9th July, 1877, and reported in the *Globe* of the 25th July, by the then Finance Minister. It was as follows:—

“The Protection resolution of Sir John, which my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie disposed of effectually, in a speech of eight minutes by the clock, in reply to Sir John’s so-called oration of one hour.”

The people of Canada did not seem to have disposed of those resolutions of the right hon. gentleman who was again at the head of the Government in that way, and the hon. gentleman who had made that wonderful eight minutes’ speech by the clock, must have been rather astonished that his speech had made no such impression upon the people of Canada as had been asserted. That it was not effectually disposed of by Mr. Mackenzie, was shown by the large majority on the Government’s side of the House. He (Mr. Plumb) was not astonished at his hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) rising to a point of order on constitutional practice. His hon. friend had no other weapon with which to flourish in his little *tours de force*. He (Mr. Plumb), in common with many others on this side of the House, had long since ceased to be alarmed at his frown. That hon. gentleman spoke as if the gentlemen on the Treasury benches were habitually interposing the Governor-General between themselves and responsibility. His hon. friend now kept jealous watch over the rights of His Excellency. He (Mr. Plumb) could recollect—he was not in public life at the time, but he read it in the newspapers—when his hon. friend was not so great an advocate for the shielding of the Governor-General from attack or censure when the Press upon his side were pouring abuse upon Lord Dufferin, and the hon. gentleman himself cried privilege till he was hoarse in an attempt to force the Governor-General into the performance

of an unconstitutional act. Lord Dufferin stood firm, and refused to permit the hon. gentlemen and others of his political leanings to hold a Session of Parliament for the despatch of business in 1873, when, in the Governor-General's opinion, no such Session had been called or agreed upon. Lord Dufferin, in a speech at Halifax, playfully alluded to the castigations of the organs of the hon. gentleman's party in the following language. Speaking of the official relations between himself and his Government, and between himself and the people of Canada, he said :

" Sometimes, of course, no matter how disconnected his personality may be from what is taking place, he will get dragged into some controversy, and he may suddenly find himself the subject of criticism by the Press of whatever party may, for the moment, be out of humour; but, under these circumstances, he must console himself with the reflection that these spasmodic castigations are as transitory and innocuous as the discipline applied occasionally to their idol by the unsophisticated worshippers of Mumbo Jumbo when their harvests are short or a murrain visits their flocks."

He (Mr. Plumb) heard, then, of no attempt of the hon. gentleman from Chateauguay to interpose the ægis of constitutional protection between the Governor-General and his virulent assailants. He (Mr. Plumb) even suspected that the hon. gentleman himself was in the fore front of the attacking party. It was under such circumstances that Lord Dufferin's utterance was made, and he (Mr. Plumb) was somewhat surprised to see that they had changed places on the subject. They on the Ministerial side had won their position by fair play. No argument addressed to the farming community during the contest of next June would have any weight, except one favourable to the Conservative side. He had seen no deception practised on the electors but by the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, who constantly said that the Conservatives never intended to carry out their promises. Indeed, he might truly say :

" When, without stratagem,
But in plain play and even shock of battle,
Was ever known so great and little loss
On one and on the other."

The contest had been a fair stand-up fight, in which the hon. gentlemen opposite had been worsted,

MR. PLUMB.

and he thought that if they bore their defeat without exhibiting so much bitterness and so little resignation, they would stand much better with the country. They were welcome to tear open and display their wounds as long as they chose, but he believed that the country had no sympathy with their gashes, and would willingly see them remain in hospital till they were healed, if they were not incurable.

The motion for the third reading of the Bill was put and declared carried on a division.

THE LETELLIER CASE.

REMARKS.

Order for House to again resolve itself into Committee of Supply *read*.

MR. HOLTON said that he had intended on the motion for the third reading of the Tariff Bill to say a word or two in reply to the remarks of his right hon. friend the leader of the Government, on a previous occasion. Not to put himself out of order by speaking twice on the same question, he had waited until the next motion was presented, but it had passed so suddenly that he had not the opportunity of saying anything on it. He was very glad to hear that they were to have an opportunity for discussion on the Letellier matter before the House rose. However, the real motive for his reference to it was to bring about some discussion on the subject before the House rose. It was very important that that matter should be discussed. They had sent an ambassador to the Court of St. James in reference to it—a distinguished member of the Government—to attend to the prosecution, whether against Mr. Letellier or the Governor-General, they were not yet informed. The first impression was that he had gone to prosecute a suit as between the advisers of His Excellency and His Excellency himself. But the subsequent statement made by the right hon. gentleman rather led to the supposition that he had gone to conduct the prosecution against the Lieutenant-Governor. He (Mr. Holton) might say now, when perfectly in order, that there seemed to

have been some little doubt about the course of His Excellency's advisers on that occasion, and about that of his chief adviser, especially, in drawing a line between himself and His Excellency, as he had done in the first instance—a course which he (Mr. Holton) thought then, and still thought now, was not only contrary to sound constitutional usage, but extremely unfair to His Excellency. He believed the doctrine that there could never be a variance between the Crown or the representative of the Crown, and the advisers of the Crown or of the representative of the Crown for one single hour; and his own judgment was, although he did not shine in anything, according to his right hon. friend the Premier, that there had been a grievous sin against sound constitutional usage in the course he took in communicating to the House at all any difference of opinion between himself and the head of the Executive. He (Mr. Holton) had sought an opportunity of saying so much, and if a further opportunity should arise, he would amplify somewhat his views on that question. Which of them would shine on that occasion remained to be seen, and the matter would be passed upon by an intelligent posterity, if not by the vindictive partisans of to-day. Opinions might differ, and men might depart from their principles; they might not do as well as they knew how to do. His right hon. friend knew pretty nearly what was right in such matters. As his hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie remarked, his was not the sin of ignorance, but a sin against knowledge, and he desired, before the debate passed on, to emphasise his opinion on that question, and say that then, as to-day, he thought the Government were open to the charge of the hon. member for Lambton, of taking shelter, in doubtful circumstances, under the name of the Governor-General, and making an unfair use of that name. That was his (Mr. Holton's) deliberate opinion. The right hon. gentleman must vindicate himself if he could when the debate which he promised was entered upon, from the charge of his having, on the occasion referred to, made a very improper use of the Governor-General's name, and, having violated all correct notions of responsible government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that all he could say would be to take back what he had uttered about the hon. gentleman from Chateauguay not being a shining light. He admitted the hon. gentleman was a shining light.

SUPPLY.

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

200	To meet the possible amount required to complete the expenditure in full of the Seigniorial Tenure Commission	\$1,500 00
-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

In answer to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. TILLEY said he asked for no vote for this object next year. The Commission was about to be closed. It might be desirable to spend a little on it the present year.

Vote agreed to.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

201	{	Increased allowance to Secretary from 1st April..	\$200 00
		Increased allowance to Aides-de-camp from 1st April.....	400 00

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

202	To secure organisation of Staff, as shown in details of Estimates for 1879-80, to take effect from 1st January, 1879.....	550 00
-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

203	Increased allowance to Secretary	300 00
-----	----------------------------------------	--------

DEPARTMENTAL CONTINGENCIES.

204	Additional amount required by Department of Interior.	2,000 00
-----	-------------------------------------------------------	----------

POLICE.

205	To provide for expenditure caused by increase of Staff during the year.....	250 00
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

PENITENTIARIES.

Manitoba.

206 Further sum required for this service \$1,500 00

In answer to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said this item, as well as the next item, were required to supplement the votes of last year, both of which were expended about the 1st March.

Vote agreed to.

British Columbia.

207 Further sum required for this service \$2,400 00

LEGISLATION.

208 To meet expenditure for witnesses and shorthand reporters, Session of 1878.... 1,000 00

209 To meet further expenditure in full, on account of publication of Debates of 1878. 5,364 28

MR. MACKENZIE asked what was likely to be the expenditure this year. When this work was first undertaken, it was with the understanding that the maximum expenditure would not exceed from \$12,000 to \$14,000. It exceeded that the first year, last year it was about \$18,000, and now it was nearly \$21,000. Judging from the size of the present report, and the number of days it was behind, he found it would be still more this year.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said the matter at present stood in this position : last year it cost \$18,000 and a trifle over, but the service, which should have closed the 1st of July, was not all paid for, so that this amount of money had to be carried over into this year. That was what this vote was for. He fancied the debates would not cost as much this year.

MR. STEPHENSON said it was a mere matter of book-keeping ; it was the amount of money expended before the close of the last financial year, and this was a re-vote to meet the expenditure which ran into the present year. The amount of money left in Mr. Hartney's hands was refunded, and this was part of

the money voted to meet the expenditure incurred since the close of the last financial year, because the volume was not finished on the 30th of June last, and the cost of finishing it was borne on this year's appropriation, which they wanted \$5,000 to recoup.

Vote agreed to.

210 To meet the cost of printing and preparing catalogue of the Library of Parliament. \$ 5,300 00

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD explained that in reference to the library catalogue, it appeared that Mr Todd thought he had authority to print and prepare a catalogue, and he placed it in the hands of the contractor. It was in process of being printed when it was found that it was literally impossible for the contractor to have it ready for the meeting of Parliament. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) told Mr. Todd that if he could not get it ready as he desired, he had better divide the work. This was done, and a portion given to the *Citizen* Company.

MR. MACKENZIE : What authority had Mr. Todd ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not know. The catalogue was ordered before they knew anything about it. Mr. Todd said that every ten years he had prepared a catalogue, and he imagined that he had now the authority.

MR. MACKENZIE said Mr. Todd had no such authority.

Vote agreed to.

211 To pay a gratuity to E. U. Piché, Esq., late Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons, on his retirement..... \$1,000 00

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

212 To meet the amount required to complete expenditure on account of the Paris Exhibition..... \$25,000 00

213 To meet further amount required in connection with the preparation of Criminal Statistics..... 1,000 00

IMMIGRATION AND QUARANTINE.

214 To replace fittings at Grosse Isle Hospital, destroyed by fire..... \$1,000 00

PENSIONS.

215. To meet expenditure required for Veterans of 1812-15... \$2,000 00

MILITIA.

ORDINARY.

Military Branch and District Staff.

To provide for pay of one Assistant Inspector of Artillery for the Maritime Provinces, from 17th September, 1878, to 30th June, 1879..... \$ 946 66

216 To provide for gratuities to retiring officers consequent upon the amalgamation of the offices of Paymaster and Storekeeper in various districts..... 2,400 00

Drill Pay.

217 Amount required to pay the cost of the drill of the Ottawa Troop of Cavalry.... 814 50

Guard at Rideau Hall.

218 Pay and maintenance..... 2,500 00

EXTRAORDINARY.

219 To pay expenditure incurred in connection with precautionary measures for defensive purposes..... 3,000 00

220 To pay expenditure incurred through the calling out of the Militia in aid of the civil power at Montreal and Quebec in 1878..... 13,000 00

To pay expenditure incurred through the calling out of the Militia in aid of the civil power at Cape Breton in 1876.... 622 81

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

RAILWAYS.

221 Pacific Railway—To pay Mr. Wallace as compensation for his loss of time whilst employed in this service.. \$ 1,750 00

Intercolonial Railway—
 Amount required for completion..... 20,000 00
 Amount required on account of extension into Halifax..... 5,000 00
 Amount required to pay for construction of engine house at Ste. Flavie, in accordance with judgment of Exchequer Court. 5,721 00
 Amount of award in favour of Messrs. Boggs & Murray, for work under contract, Section 19, and expenses in connection therewith..... 101,753 00

Mr. MACKENZIE said, from the slight perusal he had been able to give the papers in this case, he had come to the conclusion that it ought not to have been taken out of the Court. He had formerly stated that his impression was that the judgment of Judge Fournier was interlocutory, not final. Curiously enough, he had used the same phrase in dealing with it. A reference of it was made to obtain correct information by re-measurement of the work, and, as soon as that should be done, he was to reconsider the case for judgment. He (Mr. Mackenzie) considered the case should not have gone before Mr. Keefer; that the Registrar of the Supreme Court, as directed, should have taken the evidence, assisted by some professional or Engineer, as assessor. There was no leading engineer of the Intercolonial called to give evidence, neither Mr. Fleming nor Mr. Schrieber, both of whom were responsible for any change of location. With regard to Grant's evidence, no doubt he was a resident engineer at that work; but they had evidence in the Department of great want of accuracy and preciseness in his work, and he (Mr. Mackenzie) would not be surprised at mistakes being found. Yet he was the only witness summoned, apparently, except a rod man or chain man was called to give evidence before the arbitrator. He thought the case had been mismanaged.

Mr. TUPPER said he was quite sure that if the hon. member for Lambton had had sufficient time to examine the papers, he would have arrived at a very different conclusion. In the first place, although the judgment was interlocutory, it was

one, in the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, that ought to be remitted to the Registrar for the taking of evidence, which must, in the nature of things, be accepted when taken, although it would go back to the Judge for final judgment; that the Deputy Minister also thought that it would have been utterly impossible for the Registrar, or any gentleman, without technical knowledge of the work done, to have performed that task with any degree of accuracy whatever. Therefore, it was thought best to take it before an engineer. The course adopted was deemed the only one that would secure the Government a right decision. So the case was managed before an arbitrator. But the gentlemen entrusted with the case for the Government were those to whom the late Government confided it, Messrs. Walker and McIntyre, who, if there was any failure or fault in not calling Messrs. Fleming and Schriber, were responsible. But they had produced those engineers before a Court, and their evidence was in the hands of an arbitrator. Those lawyers had conducted the case in an able and judicious manner. He (Mr. Tupper) did not believe they had omitted anything towards a proper discharge of their duty. The award of Mr. Keefer, in the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, was still appealable to the Supreme Court, but, possessing the opinion of Messrs. Walker and McIntyre, he believed the finding was fully warranted by the testimony, and that the result of an appeal would not be satisfactory. Under these circumstances the hon. gentleman would hardly feel that they were not warranted in accepting it. They, therefore, asked Parliament to vote the amount.

MR. MACKENZIE: Why did the hon. gentleman not direct those engineers to give evidence before the arbitrator?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that he was unable to advise in this matter, under any respect, in consequence of having been engaged in the case before taking office, and, therefore, he had not even conferred with the Deputy Minister of Justice on the subject. But the interests of the country were ably cared for by that gentleman. The evidence of Messrs. Schriber

and Fleming, which the member for Lambton erroneously thought had not been taken, was taken and used by the arbitrator, and they were examined and cross-examined by the counsel of the respective parties. Mr. Grant, the engineer under them, and the assistant, were also examined.

MR. MACKENZIE: One was examined.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said all were who were supposed to know anything on the subject. The judgment was only interlocutory, so far as to be subject to review, as was the evidence directed to be taken. But he thought legal gentlemen would say it was merely in the form of a decree of reference on which all the leading elements of the case were finally determined. The Judge, by that judgment, defined with greater preciseness and clearness the points on which he desired testimony in order not to arrive at a doubtful conclusion. But as the certain and only fact to be ascertained was the amount due, Judge Fournier settled the principle on which the ultimate decision was to be founded. He determined that the surveys were not reputable to the parties responsible, and it was on that ground he referred to one fact, defining what the liability was for the change of grade and location. He refused, in distinct and positive terms, the ascertainment of the value either *pro* or *con.* on that change of grade. On those two points he thought the hon. gentleman would find that, although the Judge used the phrase interlocutory, the fact was it was a final decree on the legal elements of the case, refusing to the Registrar of the Court the ascertainment of the amount due. That all took place, except the reference to Mr. Keefer, before the present Government took office. The only charge of indiscretion, if even that could be proved or used against the present Minister of Public Works, would be in reference to the appointment of Mr. Keefer, who was a professional man, in relation to such work, instead of the Registrar.

MR. MACKENZIE said that after Mr. Fleming became intimately connected with the Pacific Railway, he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought he ought to devote

his whole time to that enterprise, reserving to him still two or three great engineering works, such as the Miramichi and Restigouche bridges, and Mr. Schreiber did all the rest of the work. He was more than half the time on the road, and must have known a great deal about the sections, and all those matters were gone over by Mr. Fleming also.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) : He was examined.

MR. MACKENZIE said not before the arbitrators. Messrs. Bill, Jелlette and Mitchell were the only parties that appeared by the papers to have been examined before the arbitrators. Even if the two chief engineers had not been examined technically as to the measurements, they ought to have been there. No lawyer could have conducted the case without the assistance that either of these two gentlemen could have rendered.

MR. TUPPER desired to ask the hon. gentleman which of the two, himself or the hon. gentleman, was to blame for not calling Mr. Schreiber or Mr. Fleming before the arbitrators. All that was done, as far as he was concerned, was to refer the matter to the Deputy Minister of Justice, to find whether the ends of justice would be better attained by the course he had adopted. Was the counsel the hon. gentleman employed, and which he (Mr. Tupper) simply continued, responsible, or was it himself (Mr. Tupper), for any failure to secure proper testimony? The hon. gentleman must know that this matter being in the hands of counsel selected by himself, if there was any failure in calling proper witnesses, or in the management of the case, then those gentlemen employed by the late Government were responsible, therefor, and not himself.

MR. MACKENZIE said he took care that those gentlemen should be at the Court in all the cases that were tried. He conferred with them about the case, and they did attend Court, but they did not attend the Court that was held after he went out of office, and he did not know why. He would ask the hon. gentleman if Mr. Odell gave exactly

the same evidence before the Judge as before the arbitrator.

MR. TUPPER said he knew nothing about it whatever. It being in the hands of gentleman who had conducted the cause, it was left in their hands, and every assistance they asked for was furnished them. They managed the case before the arbitrators and not himself.

MR. MACKENZIE : The exact measurements were only gone into before the arbitrators.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) : I think my hon. friend will find that Odell made the measurements before he was examined by the Judge, and he was examined on those measurements before the Judge, and then was re-examined on the same measurements afterwards.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said the question which came before the Court for adjudication, and upon which evidence was taken, was quite different from the one that came before the arbitrator, and the kind of evidence necessary to elicit before the Judge, in order to enable the plaintiff to establish his case, or the Crown to make a defence, would not be at all applicable before the arbitrator. The only thing that struck him in the matter was, that the evidence of experts in the Department was not taken before the arbitrator on the two questions which were practically submitted to him.

Vote agreed to.

CANALS.

223	Culbute Canal—Amount required.....	\$9,000 00
224	Grenville Canal—Amount required to pay legal representatives of Samuel Cushing for land damages.....	480 00
225	Bideau Canal—Balance of appropriation for 1 77-78, unexpended on 30th September, 1878, and carried forward by special warrant...	3,754 00

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA.

226	{	Eastern Block—Amount required for construction of attics.....	8,000 00
		Western Block—Amount required to complete payment for extension.....	10,000 00

MR. CURRIER suggested that more apartments should be finished off in the Central Block, as the accommodation for members was insufficient. He also desired to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the bad ventilation of the Railway and Private Bills Committee Rooms.

Vote agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Ontario.

227	{	Custom House, Toronto—	\$1,529 00
		Balance due architect....	
		Kingston Military College—	
		To complete.....	
		Ottawa Drill Shed—Amount required.....	2,000 00

Quebec.

228	Montreal Examining Warehouse—To complete.....	10,000 00
-----	-----------------------------------------------	-----------

New Brunswick.

229	Chatham Post-office—Alterations and fittings.....	790 00
-----	---------------------------------------------------	--------

PENITENTIARIES.

230	Dorchester, N.B., Penitentiary—Balance of appropriation for 1877-78 remaining unexpended on the 30th September, 1878, and carried forward by special warrant.	21,505 45
-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

RENTS, REPAIRS, ETC.

231	{	Rents, repairs, furniture, heating, etc.....	45,000 00	
		Lamps for road to Rideau Hall.....		
		Seven months' Lighting and Gas, road to Rideau Hall..		116 66
				180 00

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS.

Ontario.

232	Bayfield Harbour — Amount awarded to J. S. McEwen by official arbitrators, in settlement of his claim for extras.	4,950 00
-----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Nova Scotia.

233	Oak Point Breakwater—To refund J. E. Woodworth certain moneys expended by him in connection with this service.....	530 00
-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

MR. CAMERON.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think they could consent to this vote. That breakwater had been conveyed in fee simple to the Government, which then spent \$20,000 upon the work. He never heard of any one pretending to have a claim against the Government on account of the breakwater. The Government was in possession of it on the most undisputed title.

MR. TUPPER said that Mr. Woodworth had paid out the amount in the resolution in buying up small shareholders, who would not consent to convey their title to the Government. The reason the claim had lain in abeyance was that the amount was a comparatively small matter to him in his former circumstances, but having lost his property the money would now be a consideration to him.

Vote agreed to.

IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGABLE RIVERS.

234	{	Removal of rock, Victoria Harbor, Fraser River, British Columbia.—Balance of appropriation for 1877-78 remaining unexpended on 30th September, 1878, and carried forward by special warrant.....	\$5,320 00
		Oromocto Shoal, River St. John.....	5,000 00

RED RIVER ROAD.

235	Amount required to pay arrears of wages to L. D. Audy.	230 00
-----	--------------------------------------------------------	--------

ARBITRATIONS AND AWARDS.

236	To pay gratuity of one year's salary to Chas. Taylor, on his retirement from the position of Official Arbitrator.....	1,000 00
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

SLIDES AND BOOMS.

237	To pay for professional services in the case of Chevriert vs. Regina, Gatinneau River Booms.....	400 00
-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

MAIL SUBSIDIES.

238	To provide for mail subsidy between Halifax and Cork, if necessary (Revote).....	\$ 19,770 84
-----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

239	To provide for payment for services rendered by the Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island in the conveyance of mails between Summerside and Shediac during the season of navigation, 1869.....	\$1,000 00
240	To provide for further expenditure for investigations into Wrecks and Casualties.	1,266 00
241	To provide for professional services incurred in the suit of the Queen vs. David.	510 27
242	To remunerate Donald McNeill for loss and expenses in connection with his removal from St. Paul's Island in 1874.	200 00

FISHERIES.

243	To provide for salaries and disbursements of additional Fishery Overseers and Wardens in the Province of Quebec	1,000 00
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

MR. KAULBACK said a very large amount of money was expended by the Dominion yearly in the payment of salaries to officials in the protection of river fisheries in Nova Scotia without an adequate return being shown, proofs of which were exhibited to the public very clearly by the sad and apparently wilful neglect that was exhibited by officials in charge of the river fisheries, in permitting mill-dams, without fishways (or imperfect ones, if any), and obstructions of various kinds, to be thrust across the most valuable rivers, and carelessly permitting deposits of saw-dust, not only to the utter exclusion of the passage of fish, but to the passage of ships navigating some of their waters. He had no hesitation in saying that, unless the rivers were protected by proper and efficient officials—men willing and ready to discharge their duties fearlessly and impartially—their rivers, being the nursery of their deep sea fisheries, they would see their fisheries, in a short time, a complete sacrifice and failure. He would very particularly urge upon the Government the necessity for early and prompt attention to this long-countenanced evil.

Vote agreed to.

244	To further provide for the maintenance of the several fish-breeding establishments in the Dominion.	\$4,000 00
-----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

MR. KAULBACK said he hoped that fish-breeding would not be confined to the inland lakes and rivers, but that the deep sea fisheries would be carefully looked after as well. Under the Washington Treaty the poor fishermen of the Maritime Provinces were greatly interfered with in their rights and privileges in having to surrender to the fishermen of the United States the right of fishing in common with themselves in our municipal waters over an extent of coast of 3,160 miles, inhabited by a population of over half a million, who derived their subsistence almost entirely from the sea fisheries. The American fishermen, having had these privileges, had abused and injured our fishermen to a very marked degree, depopulated some of our finest fishing grounds, which formerly were very productive, diminished the production of our fishermen, and materially affected the chances of a living to the hardy, honest and hardworked fishermen. The fishermen, some five years ago, were enabled to gather their harvest within sight of their dwellings, the fish frequenting their bays and harbours. Now they were obliged to launch out into the trackless deep, often beyond sight of land, spending sleepless nights in hard toils, at the risk and peril of their lives, to get a scanty living for their poor families, all in consequence of their rights and liberties having been ceded to foreign fishermen, who were permitted to fish in their waters in the most illicit manner. In consequence of the concession of our fisheries to foreign fishermen, much injury had been done to our fishermen, for which privileges and the injury done to our fisheries and fishermen he contended that the amount awarded us in June, 1877, by the Washington Treaty arbitration, should go to the fishermen, on the principle of equity and justice, that what came from the fisheries should return to the fisheries; all he asked of this Government was to fund the amount of award for the benefit of the fisheries, and apply the revenues derived therefrom in restoring the all but exterminated fishing grounds, and developing the deep sea fisheries of the Dominion, which were the greatest source of revenue to the Dominion.

Vote agreed to.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

245. To further provide for expenditure on account of measurement of steamers, etc.. \$333 46

INDIANS.

INDIANS OF QUEBEC.

246 To provide grant for relief for unforseen cases of distress amongst the Indians of the Lower St. Lawrence..... 2,000 00

INDIANS OF THE NORTH-WEST.

247 To provide for payment of further annuities under Treaty No. 4..... 7,265 00
 248 do do No. 6 17,945 00
 249 do do No. 7 3,601 00

250 To provide for further expenditure for agricultural implements, cattle, etc., under Treaties Nos. 4, 6 and 7, owing to a large number of Indians being desirous to commence the cultivation of the soil..... 20,000 00

251 To provide for further expenditure incurred for purchase of provisions, in consequence of threatened famine amongst the Indians.. 10,000 00

252 To provide for further expenditure in connection with the general expenditure for the North-West Superintendency, being for salaries of instructors of farming for 1878-79 2,000 00

253 To provide for probable expenditure for construction of houses and farm buildings for instructors of farming..... 15,000 00

INDIANS OF MANITOBA,

254 To provide for probable expenditure for construction of houses and farm buildings for instructors of farming..... 2,500 00

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

255 { Pay, supplies and miscellaneous stores to complete the service for the year 32,000 00
 { Improved arms and ammunition to complete the service for the year..... 3,000 00
 { Mail service between Fort Benton, Montana, and Forts Walsh, McLeod, Calgary and Saskatchewan..... 6,000 00

MISCELLANEOUS.

256 To pay to Hon. T. W. Anglin, salary attached to office of Speaker of House of Commons, from 1st October, 1878, to 12th February, 1879..... 1,476 19

257 Miscellaneous Printing—Further amount required for this service..... 3,000 00

258 To pay for 350 copies of the *Parliamentary Companion*... 700 00

259 To pay T. D. Harington, Esq., late Deputy Receiver-General, gratuity on his retirement, after 47 years' service, through the abolition of his office..... 800 00

260 To pay for proportionate cost of testimonial to be presented to His Excellency M. Delfosse, for services on the Halifax Fishery Commission (remainder to be paid by United States and Newfoundland)..... 2,389 65

MR. MUTTART said he did not object to the item, but he wished to express his regret that the Government had not seen fit to allow Prince Edward Island the sum which was justly due to her out of the Fishery Award. At the time the fisheries were ceded, Prince Edward Island was not in the Confederation. The treaty was ratified by the Government in 1872. Between that time and July, 1873, there could be no question that the Island could have got her separate amount if she had insisted on it. The union of the Island with the Dominion was on condition that this amount should be paid. He was aware the terms were silent on that question, but the delegates from the Island submitted a memorandum, in which they stated that, if the conditions of the memorandum were agreed to, they were prepared to submit a further memorandum in regard to the fisheries. This memorandum was not submitted, but they took it for granted that the intentions were that the Island should receive its fair share of the award. He did not think the Dominion intended at the time that this amount should be thrown into the general revenue. He had reason to believe that, if the people of the Island supposed that that award was going into the general Treasury, they would never have entered Confederation. The Halifax Commission

took into account the Island fisheries, and he asked if it was fair the Government should distribute this award for general purposes? Manitoba and some other Provinces could have no claim to a portion of this award, because their fisheries had not contributed to swell the amount. He trusted the Government would see its way to pay what was due the Island, which he believed was equitably, if not legally, due.

Vote agreed to.

261 To pay for expenses incurred in connection with the arrival at Halifax of His Excellency the Governor-General and Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise, and train hire between Halifax and Ottawa.....	\$7,000 00
262 To pay expenditure incurred on account of Special Trade Mission to France and Spain.....	11,000 00

In answer to Mr. MACKENZIE,

MR. TILLEY said the instructions to the delegates and their report had been prepared to lay before the House; but the correspondence included communications Sir A. T. Galt had had with the Imperial Government on the subject, and when it was submitted to His Excellency, he thought it desirable to ascertain whether there were any objections to these communications accompanying the papers. He (Mr. Tilley) expected to have had a cablegram yesterday, and, as he had heard nothing from His Excellency on the subject, he had not felt himself in a position to submit the papers. Sir A. T. Galt was appointed a Commissioner, and Col. Bernard, an Assistant Commissioner. In Spain they had to employ a Spanish interpreter, and had to incur several other items of expense, the whole being about \$6,000; \$3,000 had been allowed to Sir A. T. Galt for the five months he was engaged in the matter, and \$800 to Col. Bernard, and the whole amounted to a little less than \$11,000. Sir Alexander's salary was on the same footing as that of a Cabinet Minister.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman could not, by law, pay a super-

annuated officer in that way. Compensation and salary could not run concurrently.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. gentleman, when in power, had superannuated Customs officers and still employed them at a large salary. Did the hon. gentleman remember the case of Mr. Yarwood, of Clifton?

Vote agreed to.

263 To pay F. X. Prieur, late Director of Penitentiaries, expenses incurred by him on his removal from St. Vincent de Paul to Ottawa.....	\$500 00
264 To pay Sheriff of Montreal for services as Commissioner in issuing and refusing licenses to carry arms under Better Prevention of Crimes Act.....	100 00

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

CUSTOMS.

For the following amounts required to complete this service:—		
265 } Ontario	\$7,430 00	
	Quebec.....	6,690 00
	New Brunswick.....	1,290 00
	Nova Scotia.....	1,150 00
	Prince Edward Island.	180 00
	Manitoba and North-West Territories...	1,000 00

MR. BURPEE: Does this amount contain the extra quarter for the Maritime Provinces?

MR. BOWELL: Yes, that is, about \$1,200.

MR. BURPEE: I notice, in our last year's Estimates, we omitted to provide for collection in the North-West Territory.

MR. BOWELL: That is not included in this sum, because it was 10 per cent. paid on the amount of collections, and consequently does not appear.

MR. BURPEE: In the year 1872, the charges were put into the revenue, and a supplementary vote was taken last year for the service. I fancy, under the present law, there requires to be a large expenditure for weights, scales and measures. Are they provided for in this amount?

MR. BOWELL said no, these accounts were to make up the amounts expended over the estimates of his hon. friend, and he would give him the particulars of every item if he desired it. He did not desire the country to think that this sum was made up by any items of expenditure or any increase in the service since the present Government came into power; the items were made up exclusively of over-expenditure, which occurred during the last year of the hon. gentleman's tenure of office.

Vote agreed to.

EXCISE.

266 Preventive Service, amount required to complete..... \$800 00

PUBLIC WORKS.

Canals.

267 Welland Canal, rebuilding weir, Port Dalhousie..... 16,000 00

Railways.

268 Intercolonial Railway, amount required to complete working expenses for the year.. 200,000 00

269 Prince Edward Island Railway, amount required to complete working expenses for the year..... 20,000 00

Slides and Booms.

270 { Saguenay District—For repairs to slides made in 1876-77..... 3,596 37
 Ottawa District—To pay for rent of service ground in connection with Springtown Boom, Madawaska River, from 5th December, 1873, to 2nd July, 1878..... 457 12

POST OFFICE.

271 { To pay Grand Trunk Railway for daily transport of mails, over 149 miles of railway, between the Canada boundary line and Danville Junction (Maine), from 1st July, 1867, to 31st December, 1874, when, by postal convention with the United States, the conveyance of these mails was assumed by the United States post-office (Revote)..... 7,776 22

MR. BURPEE.

271 { To pay Mr. Jos. C. Crosskill for certain printed forms which were in his hands at the time (22nd November, 1873) when the printing for the post-office in Nova Scotia was withdrawn from him.. \$1,067 35
 To pay Mr. F. J. Barnard, contractor for the Barkerville and Yale Mail Service, British Columbia, the difference between the contract rate and the rate actually paid to him from 1st April, 1877..... 11,250 00

UNPROVIDED ITEMS, 1877-78.

272 *Vide* Public Accounts, 1877-78, part ii., page 318..... \$207,768 93

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. TILLEY delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

“LORNE.

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1880; and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, 7th May, 1879.”

House adjourned at
 Ten minutes after
 One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 8th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BETTER PREVENTION OF CRIME ACT,
1878, CONTINUATION BILL.

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD READINGS.

The following Bill was introduced, *read first, second and third times, and passed* :—

Bill (No. 115) To continue in force for a limited time the Better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

moved :—

"That on Saturday next the House do sit from two o'clock P.M., and that Government measures take precedence next after Routine business."

MR. MACKENZIE: The motion of want of confidence of the hon. member for Bagot ought to have precedence, even of Government measures.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We will have an opportunity of discussing it next Monday.

Motion agreed to.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES LAWS CONSOLIDATION BILL.—[BILL 87.]

(Mr. Baby)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. BABY said this Bill was the consolidation of the two Acts now on the Statute-book relating to weights and measures. Some very important amendments were here made to the existing laws. He had already alluded to the fact that the number of inspectors was to be considerably reduced. By this Act no deputy inspectors were to be appointed, but there were to be seven inspectors for Ontario, four for Quebec, four for Nova Scotia, three for New Brunswick, and one each for the other Provinces, with divers assistants. By this Act the Government hoped to make a considerable reduction in the expenses. \$14,000 would be saved in salaries

alone, and between \$10,000 and \$12,000 would be economised in office rent, fuel, contingencies, etc., on the whole, about \$40,000, without diminishing in any respect the efficiency of the Act. He would now indicate the principal changes intended by the new law. By the 18th section heaped measures were prohibited. This was taken from the English Act now in force, which enacted that when a bushel was sold it should not be heaped. It would be, as said in French—*mesure rasée*, and would be a protection to the farmer. Moreover, the Act made it imperative to use but one measure; the Imperial doing away with the wine measure, the use of the two, as permitted by the now existing laws, having been a great source of trouble and inconvenience, if not of fraud to the consumers. From the official reports it would appear that from all parts of the Dominion this change was asked as a proper step in the right direction. However, as this radical change might somewhat disturb certain traders, this Act contained a proviso by which the use of the wine measure would be tolerated until the first of May, 1880, which date was the original one on which the Weights and Measures Act introduced formerly by his hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was to have gone into operation. Thus ample time was given to the traders in some parts of the Maritime Provinces principally, where the Imperial measure was not much in use, to prepare to the final adoption of the same. By the 23rd section, exceptions were made in favour of those who sell liquids by the vessel instead of by the ordinary measure. This was to meet the case of those liquids contained in demijohns, carboys and other vessels, so that when an article was sold by the bottle or by the demijohn, it was not necessary that it should contain the exact quantity mentioned in the law. By the 38th section it was provided that the inspector, as well as his assistants, should be allowed to adjust. It had been found that the greatest objection heretofore made to the Weights and Measures Act was that the inspector was followed by an adjuster, who very often charged three times as much as the inspector. By this section that difficulty was obviated, by allowing the inspectors to do that

business themselves. Everybody who was experienced in the matter knew perfectly well that that was, to a great extent, the principal objection to the Act, and that traders objected to the adjusters being employed, and the onerous fees charged by them. It often happened that the inspectors were not the right men for the place, and frequently the adjusters connived with the inspectors to charge people what they liked. By the Act the inspectors were not bound to adjust, but it was intended to place that duty upon them by an Order in Council. There was a notable change in the 43rd section. Heretofore the trader was obliged to have his scales and weighing machines verified every year, but under the new Act he would only need to have them verified every two years, making the verification and stamping biennial instead of annual. The 44th section enacted that dealers in scales and other weighing machines should not be obliged to have them stamped when in stock, but only when they were sold by retail, so that the party who bought should know that the scales or other weighing machines were made according to law. These were the principal changes in the law, and he hoped they would meet with the approbation of the Committee. Some such law was absolutely necessary in a civilised country. It was found in the Statutes of all the great European nations, and should also find its place in ours. By this Act, the Government had the right, by Order in Council, to make such rules and regulations for the guidance of the officers, and fix a tariff of fees. Hon. gentlemen might rest assured that the utmost care would be taken in the framing of the said rules and tariff as would not bear too heavily upon the people. The Government had endeavoured to make this Act as efficient as possible, and they hoped the amendments he had mentioned would make it more popular in the community.

MR. HOUDE said that he would take the liberty of drawing the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to the fact that there were a good many farmers and traders who thought that it would be better to put the bushel of oats at 32lb. instead of 34lb., the bushel of turnips, carrots, parsnips, beets, at 56lbs.,

MR. BABY.

instead of 50lbs., as now, and onions at 60lbs. As to the inspectors of weights and measures, he would have preferred, for his part, to have the number increased instead of decreased, and he thought that it might be done without any additional cost to the country. By appointing inspectors in the different counties, the salaries might be reduced to a very small sum, whilst securing at the same time the services of competent persons; this would be more convenient for the public.

MR. BABY said that, in answer to his hon. friend, he would state that he had forgotten to mention that, by an article inserted in the law, the merchant or the trader would not be obliged to go to the inspector, but the latter would be obliged to go to the former. This was an important article that would certainly meet with the approval of the House. Heretofore, the inspectors went to a certain place designated a little beforehand, and persons wishing to have their scales, weights and measures verified, were obliged to go and meet the inspectors at the places designated, and sometimes to travel to no purpose long distances, undergoing thereby much trouble and expense. The present law did away with those difficulties. Now, as to the weights of different grains and vegetables, he would say that they had been in existence for the last twenty-five years. If the hon. gentleman would refer to the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, he would therein find the same provisions when the hon. the ex-Minister of Public Works introduced this law a few years ago. No objection was then raised to the weight of grain and vegetables as then fixed by law. He could not, therefore, venture to meddle with them, at least for the present. Lastly, he did not think that it would be possible to appoint a larger number of inspectors than the Government intended to appoint after the passing of the Act, without increasing the expense, and without rendering the successful working of the law very doubtful. The experience of the past was there to prove it.

MR. BÉCHARD said a short time ago he called the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the people in the rural districts complained that the mer-

chants had to fee the inspectors when their weights and measures were perfect. He desired to know if that was provided for in the Bill.

MR. BABY said it was not provided in the Bill, but it was the intention of the Government to remedy that evil by Order in Council.

MR. BOURBEAU said that he approved of the provision that obliged the inspectors to go to the houses of those who had weights and measures to be verified, for there was cause of complaint in several counties in the Province of Quebec, especially in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, because the deputy-inspector of that locality resided in the farthest corner of the county, and being obliged to go to him to have their weights and measures inspected, certain merchants were obliged to cross the whole county of Drummond, and then the whole county of Arthabaska, in order to reach his residence. It was true that after a while it was discovered that this was displeasing to the merchants, and the inspector was ordered to travel. As to the inspection of weights and measures, it had been noticed, in his county, that the inspector was obliged to take with him a person to adjust the weights and measures. But this manner of proceeding was very costly, for this person who followed the inspector charged sometimes too dear for adjusting the weights and measures; and, in the county he had the honour of representing, a great many complaints were heard. All those who had weights and measures to be adjusted, complained that they had been charged exorbitant prices. He would suggest that the inspector should have at his own expense, or at the expense of the Government, an assistant, capable of adjusting the weights and measures. Heretofore, they had been obliged to pay ten cents for every weight or measure inspected, and that ought to be sufficient to remunerate those who inspected and adjusted the weights and measures without it being necessary to pay them a salary. He thought that scales should not pay more than weights, at least when too much work was not required. Heretofore, inspectors had been in the habit of using lead for adjusting weights; unfortunately

this metal was not solid enough, for pieces were often detached three or four days after inspection, and then recourse had to be had to the inspector, in order to have them re-adjusted. Another observation he wished to make was, that, under this Act, and as it had been practised under the former law, they would not have the privilege of having their weights and measures inspected and adjusted by another inspector than the one appointed for the particular district in which those whose weights and measures were to be inspected lived. He would have desired more liberty for the merchant. For instance, when a merchant living in the country, had business either in Quebec or Montreal, if he discovered that he had a weight that was not correct, he ought to have the privilege of taking it with him in order to have it adjusted. He hoped that the hon. Minister would pay attention to this point. Merchants, and those who had weights and measures to be inspected in his division, complained that too high a price was charged for the levels that had to be adopted to platform scales, and many persons, who understood the matter, thought that these levels were superfluous. He trusted that the hon. Minister would take these suggestions into consideration, and that the inhabitants of the Province of Quebec would not have to complain of the new law.

MR. LAURIER said the hon. gentleman's motive in making these changes was avowedly one of economy, which was certainly very laudable, but he questioned much if these changes would secure this object. No doubt there would be a good deal of saving in the salaries, but that saving would be more than counterbalanced by the expense in travelling. Take the Province of Quebec, for example. The hon. gentleman proposed in that Province only four districts, with an inspector in each, and three or four agents. At the same time, this Bill proposed that the inspection should not take place at the centre of a division, but at various localities in the division. There was to be one resident officer in Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, and Sherbrooke, and whose position, to all intents and purposes, would be a mere sinecure. The actual work of inspection

would be done by the agents, who were to travel from place to place. Take the District of Quebec, for example, containing at least twenty counties, and two hundred and fifty municipalities; did the hon. gentleman pretend the travelling expenses of these agents for such distances would not amount to much more than the salaries now paid to the inspectors and their deputies? It would be the duty of the agents to be constantly on the road to make this inspection. If the agent was to travel to the Magdalen Islands, on the one shore, to the coast of Labrador, on the other, the expense would, evidently, be a very serious item. He would rather favour the view of the hon. member for Maskinongé, and instead of diminishing the places of inspection, he would multiply them as far as possible. At the same time the inspection could not be so efficient. At present if an infraction of the law took place in Gaspé, for instance, the complaint could be made to the resident officer with very little trouble; but, according to the provisions of this Bill a person who wished to make a complaint would have to go all the way to Quebec, and the probability was that justice would fail to be done. Another feature of the Bill was, that it provided that adjusting should be done by inspectors, but if the inspectors were to be adjusters themselves they should have a knowledge of mechanics and a practical knowledge of the whole subject. He thought, moreover, that it would be better to have an open system of competition than the present system of having weights inspected by the inspectors themselves and by nobody else. He thought that if the inspectors were constantly on the road, the system must prove more expensive than the present one. He was of opinion that the better plan would have been to have increased the staff and decreased the salaries.

MR. KAULBACK said it was worthy of the consideration of the House whether parts of this Bill might not be amended, placed as we were geographically with our American neighbours across the border, and considering the great dissatisfaction the Weights and Measures Act had been to the country

MR. MAURIER.

the last few years. He thought they should adopt the measures now in use in the United States, the four quart wine measure instead of the Imperial gallon, it being what they were more accustomed to, considering that the Dominion had a larger interchange of trade with the United States than with Great Britain. Under the Weights and Measures Act, the last few years, much dissatisfaction arose among the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, they having to part with their fish oil to the merchant by the Imperial gallon, and getting in return molasses or other commodities measured to them by the smaller or wine measure, and, in the sale of fish, the fisherman had to part with them to the merchant by the quintals (112lb.), and get in return from the merchant the 100lb. net of any article he might require. A pleasing feature of this Bill was the provision for uniformity of weights and measures, and consequently the dissatisfaction between the merchant and fisherman would be removed, but still he would much prefer the wine measure. He thought section 36, appointing inspectors, could readily be dispensed with, and the country saved so much money. The present Weights and Measures Act had been a very expensive one to the Dominion. In 1875 the expenditure was \$69,969; in 1876, it was \$99,784, and in 1877 the expenditure was \$111,084, and the only return was \$50,423. Last year, by some unknown circumstances, the outlay was slightly less. He contended that the benefits derived from this service was not sufficiently adequate to this immense outlay, and if this House considered a Bill of some description necessary to prevent unfair dealing, let the section referred to be struck out, and the Dominion furnish weights and measures to each municipality or county, and allow them to carry out the further intentions of the Bill in their meetings of council, as they from time to time might think proper. By this means many a poor trader would be saved the expense of the large annual tax now imposed upon him.

MR. BOLDUC said that he desired to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to the third paragraph of the twentieth section of

the Act now submitted to the consideration of the House. Under this section a person selling his products by any other weight than the Imperial pound would be liable to pay a fine of twenty dollars. He believed that it would have been preferable to impose this fine upon the purchasers who obliged the sellers to sell their goods by the old French weights. The hucksters in the Quebec market dealt unfairly with the farmers by this means, and took advantage of their good faith in order to deceive them, and he thought that the only means of doing away with this abuse, was to impose a fine upon buyers who should continue to oblige the farmers to sell their produce by French weight, for they were the ones who were interested in perpetrating this abuse. The means proposed might appear radical, but he thought it was the only way of making the hucksters cease from dealing unfairly with the farmers, and to great evils strong remedies must be applied.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman ought to have introduced this Bill ten weeks ago, and if he was not prepared with it then it was obvious he was not prepared with it now. It was perfectly obvious that it was not in the public interest this Bill was introduced. But the hon. gentlemen opposite had not the courage to dismiss all the inspectors appointed by the late Administration, and so they introduced this Bill to provide indirectly for the dismissal of all those appointed as inspectors of weights and measures by the late Administration. He found that the new provisions of the hon. gentleman were already law, and yet he introduced them as new measures. Evidently he had not given this Bill very careful consideration.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman opposite said they had no moral courage; well, they did not desire to have the pluck of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had taken \$40,000 more than was required from the public chest, in order to make places for their political friends. If this Act had become unpopular, it was owing altogether to the way it had been administered by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and not from any inherent faults of its own. It was called for by the numerous frauds and the in-

creasing diversity between the various weights and measures. It was absolutely necessary that a standard should be introduced. The measure introduced by his hon. friend would diminish the expense of the administration of the law without decreasing its efficiency and without weakening the protection which the measure was intended to afford the people from fraud. The grouping of the counties, the diminution of the number of employes, and the easing off of the stern aspect of some of the clauses, would be attained by the Bill of his hon. friend. He was sure the enormous expense of the original measure would be reduced by this Bill. He did not mean to say that the late Administration was responsible for much of that expense. They carried out, by their appointments, the measure of their predecessors, and, therefore, their predecessors must bear the blame of any expense which experience had proved to be uncalled for. He should suppose the hon. gentlemen opposite would gladly hail these amendments and support them. He should hope that hon. gentlemen opposite would greatly hail the amendments, which experience called for, and which would give a diminution of expenditure without a decrease of efficiency. As regarded the question of appointments, he did not think, in this age of the Dominion, that it should be discussed here. It was scarcely worth while for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to say that this Bill was introduced simply for the purpose of dismissing one set of officials and appointing another. This Bill had been introduced with a sincere desire to make the law more workable, and popular, and economic in expenditure.

MR. LAURIER said it was very fine to hear the hon. the Premier say that no officers would be dismissed, except so far as compatible with the working of the Act. He hoped that would be the case, because, if otherwise, a serious question would arise for the consideration of the Government. All the officers at present appointed under the Act were civil servants, and could not be dismissed, under the law, without proper compensation. This consideration would have to weigh with the Government when they would come to the serious task of appointing

officers under the new Act. He took issue with the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue on the principle of the Bill—that this was a matter calculated to diminish the expenditure. The hon. gentleman had said that he was acting in conformity with the suggestions made by an officer of the Department; but if he (Mr. Laurier) understood the suggestions, they were not made so much with the views of diminishing expense as of providing a uniform administration of the Act. It was impossible to provide for the principle of uniformity, and at the same time diminish the expenditure. He did not see how in administering this law by means of agents travelling from place to place, whose travelling expenses would have to be paid, that expenditure could be diminished. The diminution in the number of salaries would be more than counterbalanced by the extra expenses of these officers in the discharge of their duty. In the case, for instance, of an agent who, started from Quebec, travelled as far as the Magdalen Islands, 600 miles distant, and thence along the Labrador coast, the expenses would exceed his salary. He dissented from the opinion of the hon. gentleman that this Act was calculated to diminish the expenditure.

MR. MCCUAIG said in the part of the country where he resided, the people considered the law was necessary, but found great fault with its administration. The expenditure was greater than they expected, and he was glad the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had introduced legislation upon the subject, with a view to reducing expenditure.

MR. BOULTBEE said he did not think there was any piece of legislation brought in by the present Government, more satisfactory to the country than this. The late Act, when worked, was found to be an intolerable nuisance. The men who had the carrying of it out, seemed to have been appointed chiefly as a reward for political service, and seemed to try and make as much out of it as they could. For the most part they were not at all civil or obliging, and there was no uniformity whatever in the system. This Bill secured uniformity, and even if the cost were a little more than under the present law, which he

MR. LAURIER.

did not believe would be the case, the country would be satisfied. The present Government would take care that proper men would be appointed, and they would be instructed to do their work in a proper manner, not like the others, harrasing the people needlessly.

MR. BABY said, in answer to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), who stated the object of the Bill decreasing expenditure would not be attained, he would say that he had been guided in framing this Bill, in a great measure, by the very efficient officers who were at the head of the office. The report was made by Mr. Johnson, and corroborated by the other officers of the Department, who were conversant with the matter, and who had devoted considerable time to its study, to the effect that this system would make a great saving to the country; and he based upon this report, in that respect, as he did in several others, the Bill which he now submitted. The hon. gentleman said the reduction made in the salaries would be more than counterbalanced by the additional travelling expenses. This was not correct, and, at a glance, he would see that he was in error. The Act, as it now existed, and in the loose way in which it was carried out, was a loss to the country of about \$50,000 per annum. The revenue derived from the fees collected on stamping and verification by the officers, was about \$33,000, whilst the expenditure under it was above \$81,000, including salaries and contingencies, such as office rents, fuel, light, travelling expenses, etc. Now, under this Bill, they would have but a small amount to pay in salaries, &c., say \$40,000. There was a very small margin, and he did not doubt that it would bring about the contemplated reduction of about \$40,000. The object of the Government in making a verification biennially, instead of annually, was to obviate the necessity of keeping the officers continually moving about, and thus entailing a large expenditure in travelling expenses. The Government would see that those officers did their duty in an economical manner, without diminishing in any way the protection the public had a right to look for at their hands. The hon. member for Bothwell, in that off-hand style which so-

called philosophers occasionally adopted, said the promoter of the Bill did not know exactly its contents. The hon. member concluded from the particular to the general, in saying, because he thought the scale-maker could not sell his scales unstamped under the old law, that the promoter of this Bill did not know its contents at all. This was strange logic in the mouth of that gentleman assuredly. It was the hon. gentleman who was ignorant of the contents of the Bill, for, by referring to the forty-fourth clause, he would see the difference indicated, that was to say, that by the new law the manufacturer could keep his scales in his manufactory without being obliged to have them stamped; but the moment he gave them up to the trade he must have them verified, a provision certainly not contained in the law now existing. Now, curiously enough, the hon. member said that the Bill contained nothing new, and, in the same breath, hurled his objections against it, alleging that there was no time at this late period of the Session to look into the many new enactments contained in the Bill. With regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc), the Government would certainly take them into consideration, but he could not see his way to do all that his hon. friend suggested. With respect to the case of the Quebec hucksters, who contrived to get the country farmers to sell their provisions by the old French measure, which was a clear loss to them, he (Mr. Baby) would represent to him that it would be difficult to say to the buyers: "You shall not buy what the seiler wishes to sell you," because he could sell in bulk and always defeat the law, by saying, "I cannot sell by the pound or the measure, but I will sell you the articles you require in bulk." He had met, as far as possible, the views of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), which were exactly the same as those of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc). By the law introduced, any contract which was made without a measure, contrary to the Act, was null and void. That was the only clause that could be introduced under the circumstances.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said that he had always thought that one of

the great defects of the Weights and Measures Act, was the permission of the use of two different standard gallons. He saw no good reason why two different measures of capacity should be allowed.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he concurred in the view of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. The parties interested had had sufficient time to prepare for a change. Those two measures had been before the country for two or three years, and it was high time for a change.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought the feeling of the business community was against the use of the Imperial measure, the introduction of which was a great mistake, that had produced great inconvenience in business. He thought that, in New Brunswick, the old measure was the one preferred. The old measure was used in the United States, with which we dealt largely.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said, if it would be a good thing to adopt the standard from the 1st May, 1880, it would be a good thing to adopt it from May, 1879. He thought it was very desirable that either the wine or Imperial measure should be adopted for all sales and purchases. Fraud was often perpetrated through the use of those different measures.

On section 19,

MR. BOURBEAU asked if, after a bushel of oats was measured *rasée*, or even with the top, it did not weigh 34lb., would the buyer have the right to demand enough more oats to make up the 34lb.?

MR. BABY: If they are bought by weight they must weigh 34lb. to the bushel; if they are bought by the measure the full bushel will suffice. If there is no agreement, the bushel by weight can be exacted.

MR. BOURBEAU said there ought to be a special clause put in to that effect. He hoped that not only the retail dealers would be obliged to sell by measure, but the wholesale dealers also.

MR. BABY said the law made no exception between dealers. In reference to

a remark of the hon. gentleman from Gloucester, he would say that he believed the great majority of the traders in New Brunswick were in favour of the Imperial measure. What they wanted was a uniform measure, although, in certain parts of New Brunswick, the Imperial measure was unknown. In the city of St. John, a great many merchants had told him they would prefer to keep the wine measure, because they bought by the Imperial measure from England, and they retailed by the wine measure. The proviso in the law was to meet that difficulty. The hon. gentleman from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) and other hon. gentlemen representing the border counties, had asked him to introduce this proviso, because they dealt largely with the United States, where the wine measure was the measure of the country.

Section agreed to.

On section 28,

MR. WRIGHT said the second subsection might be amended. It allowed manufacturers to keep on hand, or in store, certain scales without being inspected, but did not allow them to sell them without inspection. They could not inspect a Fairbanks' hay scales till they were put up. Besides, by the adjusters, in the best scales, one could, with a few turns of a screw, secure an incorrect result. The inspection of those scales could do no good. This Act might be useful for wine or dry measures, but, when applied to weights or weighing machines, he did not see it was of any use, while imposing a tax for nothing.

MR. BABY said there was an Order in Council respecting those scales, and it was for the Department to see that they were correct. A great many things called scales were forfeited and not allowed to be sold.

MR. HOOPER said he would like to know with regard to the 27th clause, if it was the intention of the Bill that every beam in the possession of farmers should be stamped.

MR. BABY said the Act would apply only to trailers.

Section agreed to.

MR. BABY.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 105) Further to amend the Acts therein mentioned respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Bowell*.)

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the safe keeping of dangerous lunatics in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *McDonald*, *Pictou*.)

SUPPLY.

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

273 To provide a grant to assist in giving to the forthcoming Ontario Exhibition (to be held at Ottawa) a Dominion character; the distribution of the grant or any part thereof to be applied and apportioned in such way as to satisfy the Minister of Agriculture \$5,000 00

MR. TILLEY said the object of this grant was to give this Exhibition a Dominion character, and to distribute medals to the different competitors. Circulars would be addressed to the different Provinces to induce them to enter their products at the Exhibition.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not consider that people in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick would send any products in animals or perishable commodities, to Ottawa, merely to enter into competition with the people of this neighbourhood. It was very difficult, even in Ontario, to get people to bring from the extreme west to the extreme east the products of

the farm for competition. The Agricultural Society of Ontario, at its last Exhibition here, had great difficulty in inducing people having costly herds of cattle to send them to this place, and far less would it be possible to induce them to send from the different Provinces to one centre. A Dominion Association had been organised some two or three years ago, but so far as he was aware very little was done except to have a few of those appointed directors who took some interest in the breeding of a certain class of cattle. Had any concerted action taken place with the Dominion Association, or was this merely a vote without any definite plan.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was sorry the Minister of Agriculture, on account of indisposition, was unable to be present. Very strong representations had been made to the Government on behalf of the Agricultural Association of Ontario, that this exhibition, to be held at the seat of Government, should be given a Dominion character. Mr. Wilnot, the President of this Association, and Senator Christie, had been in communication with the Agricultural Association of the Province of Quebec, with whom they were, he understood, acting in concert. The Province of Quebec had given up their exhibition in order to join with Ontario in a joint exhibition. Communications had also been opened with the Maritime Provinces to induce them to send here specimens of their various products. No doubt, as far as their valuable animals were concerned, not many could be sent from the Lower Provinces, but their productions of all other descriptions could well be sent.

MR. MILLS said the danger of the proposition was that it would be difficult to lead the people of other Provinces to believe that this grant was not for a purely Provincial Exhibition, inasmuch as it would be impossible for them, without great cost and risk, to send many of their products here; and, whenever an exhibition would be held in any of those Provinces, a demand would be made on this Government for a similar grant. Why should Manitoba, British Columbia, or Prince Edward Island be called on to contribute—for, this being paid out of the Dominion Treasury, they

did contribute—towards an exhibition to which, owing to the great distance and expense, coupled with the uncertainty of success, they would be precluded from sending their products?

Vote agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS CHARGE-
ABLE TO CAPITAL.

274 Pacific Railway, west of Red River, including Bridge and Branch to Winnipeg. \$1,000,000 00

MR. TUPPER said the object of putting this vote in the Estimates was to carry out the engagement made by the Government and communicated to the Railway Committee. The members of that Committee would remember that application was made to obtain a charter to construct a line of railway from the Canadian Pacific Railway, where it was to cross the Red River at Selkirk, and running in a south and westerly direction for some hundred miles or more, after it had reached a certain distance south of Lake Manitoba. The Government, when they came to consider this question, found there would be reason to apprehend that, in the design of carrying the Canadian Pacific Railway line by the narrows of Lake Manitoba, if the charter was granted for this line, which seemed to be urgently demanded in the interests of colonisation, it might form a very serious competing line with the Canadian Pacific when constructed. But, after considering the subject, it was decided that, at present, at all events, with a view to promote the flourishing communities on lands in that direction, it would be better to carry the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway south of Lake Manitoba. It would serve the double purpose of getting extension westwardly, and affording facilities to carry on the business of the settlements that were already being established to the south of the lake. Under these circumstances, as he had already stated in the Railway Committee, it would be impossible for the Government to refuse to allow a charter for the line which they considered likely to come into competition with the Canadian Pacific, and, at the same time, take no measure to carry on the work. This vote was for the purpose of bridging

the Red River and extending the line westward. In the charter which was asked for by the hon. member for Selkirk, no extension was proposed from Winnipeg to strike this main line when constructed. The Government considered it would not be desirable that that connection should be in the hands of private individuals; that it would be better, as it would be a third branch from the main line, that that connection from the town of Winnipeg should be made by the Government, and he (Mr. Tupper) proposed to ask in the resolutions he had already laid on the table, the authority of Parliament, not only to make a contract without submitting it to Parliament previous to its becoming effective, for the western extension, but also for the extension of a branch from that main line to the town of Winnipeg.

MR. MACKENZIE said then the Committee was to understand that the Government had deliberately determined, in spite of the reports of the engineers, to change the route at this place.

MR. TUPPER said he intended to convey no such idea. He was disposed to concur in the views of the engineers and of his predecessor, as to the best line for the Pacific Railway, provided they were in a position to go on vigorously and rapidly constructing the line from Lake Superior to the shores of the Pacific; but when they came to consider the question, either of refusing a charter to these parties, or of allowing them to establish a line which bade fair to come into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, it had been decided to deflect the main line south of Lake Manitoba. Ultimately, when the country became settled, and it became a matter of importance to shorten the distance, it was quite possible that the original idea might be carried out. In the meantime, this line was to form a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE: For what distance does the hon. gentleman propose to ask the House to allow the Government to let the contract?

MR. TUPPER: For one hundred miles, reaching beyond Portage-la-Prairie.

MR. TUPPER.

MR. MACKENZIE said if it was Portage-la-Prairie that it was proposed to reach, it would be better to state that in the resolution.

MR. TUPPER said this line would carry them in close proximity to Portage-la-Prairie, and the 100 miles were merely mentioned, as it was necessary to give some limit to Parliament. It did not necessarily involve the immediate putting of the 100 miles under contract, or any further section than was required by the settlements.

MR. MACKENZIE said this was the first time that Parliament had been asked to give authority for building a railroad, the route of which had not been surveyed, and it would be necessary for the Government, in taking that authority, to define, in some way, the points to which, and through which, the road was to pass.

MR. TUPPER said there was no location, but a good deal of country had been surveyed.

MR. MACKENZIE said people had walked over it, and they knew the country, generally, very well, and it had been ascertained principally that it presented no physical difficulties. He observed from the resolutions—the discussion of which he would not anticipate to-night—that it was proposed to examine other passes in the Rocky Mountains, from 100 to 200 miles further north than the one selected some time ago, as the most open pass to be found, and now, while they were going north at the west end, they were going south at the east end. By diverging southward from Selkirk, it would make the route a great deal longer than Mr. Fleming stated would be the length of the road by the Northern route. Mr. Fleming had placed the additional mileage to Yellow Head Pass at thirty miles, and the additional expenditure at \$1,000,000. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was wholly opposed to deflecting the line for any ordinary local advantage to such an extent as to increase the mileage expenditure so much. It was the old, settled portions of Canada that had to pay all these bills, and their interest as taxpayers ought to be considered quite as much as those of the settlers who had gone in-

to that country under more favourable circumstances than those under which the settlers of the old Provinces of Canada settled. He had always said that, if the cost was trifling, local interests should be considered, but, in a matter where the cost would be \$1,000,000, and the additional mileage thirty, he thought it was a great technical mistake that, when the whole line would be constructed, the people would have to pay for thirty miles additional freight and passenger rates for all time. Where the country was open, and the roads perfectly natural in all directions, they ought to pay the greatest possible regard to those considerations which related to the ultimate trade and prosperity of the country. He could not help feeling that the Government had made a mistake in thus acting. Of course he could do nothing more than utter his protest; his advice was not sought or heeded. The hon. gentleman had a majority behind his back, able to carry through anything he chose to propose. He regretted that such a course should have been followed, in spite of the advice of the engineers, and in spite of the proposal, which was shadowed in the distance, of the hon. gentleman taking the Northern route, in order to pass through the Rocky Mountain range. He would like to know whether any estimate had been made of the cost of crossing the river at Selkirk, and what proportion of this vote was intended to be devoted to that, what proportion to grading the road, and also what was to be the length of the branch from this railroad into the town of Winnipeg?

MR. DAWSON said that the engineers whose opinions were best worth having, had never been consulted in reference to the route to be adopted. The present system, if system it might be called, precluded the opinions of the field engineers from reaching the public, or even the Government, until it was too late to correct the blunders which a desire of making the line conform to preconceived notions, as to the route, without reference to the character of the ground, had occasioned. This had led to the great and unnecessary expenditure taking place in the Rat Portage section. There should be a Board of Engineers, or

a Board of Commissioners, to supervise such a vast expenditure; a Board which could analyse the reports of the engineers, and place all the circumstances fairly, and without prejudice, before the Government. To his (Mr. Dawson's) knowledge, engineers who knew anything of the country between Lake Superior and Manitoba, were generally averse to going north by Rat Portage when there was every evidence of a better and shorter line to the south; a line, too, which, in opening it in the first instance, would have cost \$10,000,000 less than the one adopted would. There was, at present, a very bad, a very unsatisfactory state of things existing at Rat Portage; and, between that place and Manitoba, a state of things which could never have arisen if there had been a competent Board to look after the work. He would, however, say no more on this matter, as it was understood that an investigation was to be made. But he could not insist too strongly on a complete change in the system of management. The cost of a competent Board would be a small matter where such a vast expenditure was being made. He meant a Board in communication with, and acting directly for the Government.

In answer to Mr. RYAN (Marquette),

MR. TUPPER said it certainly was not desirable that, before the resolutions were submitted, there should be any expression of opinion on them. He merely took the opportunity of saying that his predecessor (Mr. Mackenzie) was very wrong in supposing that his advice was neither desired or heeded. He (Mr. Tupper) felt extremely anxious to have the benefit of the assistance and experience of every hon. gentleman who had given this subject any consideration. In saying that, because the Government had a majority at their back, they could do anything they pleased, the hon. gentleman mistook the temperament of the majority of the House. While the Government had a considerable majority in support of their general policy, they felt that, in order to retain the confidence of that majority, they must bring forward measures that commended themselves to their independence. The hon. member for Lambton had drawn attention to the fact

that this work had to be constructed by the older portions of the country, and, therefore, objected to the line being extended south, because that would increase the cost. He (Mr. Tupper) would merely remind that hon. gentleman that there were two things to be considered. First, that the line had to be constructed, and, secondly, that it had to be maintained, and if, by lengthening it a little, it could be carried through a fertile country that would be rapidly settled, and in which it would maintain itself, it was undoubtedly desirable to do so.

MR. MILLS said he regretted that the hon. gentleman should have combined his Pacific Railway scheme with provisions embodying a colonisation scheme. They were wholly distinct. The result would be to largely increase the expense of railway construction, and put impediments in the way of the progress of the work. The hon. gentleman had just made a statement that was inconsistent with itself. The hon. gentleman told the House that the only reason for departing from the located line across the Narrows of the Lake of the Woods, was that the country through which the road would run in that direction was unsettled. It was perfectly obvious that, if the road were taken over a settled country without any previous arrangement, it might injure this colonisation scheme. Speculation would be incited by the division of saleable land, in order to increase the fund for railway purposes. He would say, further, that, if the hon. gentleman took the road north of the Riding Mountains, he would, of course, strike the line already located, at a point that would be most desirable to take the road, in the Peace River district. But, if he took the west, as he must do if he was going in any way to accommodate settlers, he would carry his road to a point that would make it extremely inconvenient. He did not agree with the Minister of Public Works that the building of a branch railway from Winnipeg or Selkirk into the country now being settled, the Little Saskatchewan, was in any sense a rival or competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway as located. He believed it would be a valuable tributary of the road from Selkirk east-

MR. TUPPER.

ward to Lake Superior. A year and a half ago he had pointed out to the people in that district, if the road had been run westward to the south of Lake Manitoba, and into the Little Saskatchewan country, that they would not have received their lands as homesteads on the payment of a fee of ten dollars, but would have had to pay the value of those lands in aid of the construction of the road; and that, if a road tributary to the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, they would be subjected to no hardship or injustice in being required to contribute one or two dollars an acre towards the cost. He never met anyone who objected to that idea. The Minister of Public Works was taking the road into that country at the expense of the Public Treasury without any assurance that the people who received so much benefit from it would contribute anything towards it. If he had left that undertaking to some private company receiving aid in public lands along the line of the road, it would have been built at once without any cost to the country. Last year gentlemen, offered to pay into the Treasury 10 or 12 per cent. of the construction capital as an assurance that they would proceed with the work at once. What would have been done at once and without any charge upon the Public Treasury, the hon. gentleman now proposed to accomplish by its funds. His proposal was to take possession of roads that would be better managed for the public generally, as well as for the people in localities particularly interested, by private companies, than by the Government.

Vote agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS CHARGE-
ABLE TO INCOME.

IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGABLE RIVERS.

275	{	Upper Fraser River, B. C.— Removal of rocks in Cottonwood Canyon.....	\$10,000 00
		Assiniboine River, between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie—Removal of obstructions and construction of Dams	2,500 00

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS.

276	Point du Chêne—Shediac, New Brunswick.....	4,000 00
-----	-----------------------------------------------	----------

277 Colville Bay, Prince Edward
Island \$5,000 00

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

278 { Kingston Military College
and Fortifications..... 2,000 00
Windsor Post Office and
Custom House..... 4,000 00

PENITENTIARIES.

279 { Manitoba and British Colum-
bia—Heating..... 4,000 00
Kingston, St. Vincent de
Paul, Dorchester, Mani-
toba and British Colum-
bia—For purchase of Bab-
cock Fire Extinguishers. 880 00

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

280 To provide for nine months'
subsidy to be granted, at the
rate of \$50,000 per annum,
to line of steamers to trade
between Canada and West
Indies and Brazil (provided
a like amount is paid by the
Brazilian Government).... 37,500 00

In answer to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the way in which this project arose was through a visit of an official of the Brazilian Government to Canada. The Roche line of steamers, that formerly plied between ports of the United States and Rio, having been refused a subsidy formerly received from the United States Government, had ceased running, when it was suggested that the present would be a good opportunity for the Canadian Government to take up this project in the interest of Canadian trade. They were assured that the Brazilian Government would readily co-operate, with a subsidy, for the support of that line, which could be established between Canada, Rio, and the West Indies. The steamers would ply from Halifax or Montreal in summer, and Halifax in winter, as might be determined, calling at St. Thomas, which was a point of distribution for the West Indies, and thence proceeding to Rio. They were informed that, in addition to this, there would be no difficulty in establishing a branch line to the Argentine Republic, a coast line connecting the River Platte with Rio. It was not proposed that this projected Canadian subsidised line should go fur-

ther at present than Rio, and the trips would be monthly.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: How many steamers will be required? The voyage proposed would be tolerably long.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is proposed that three substantial steamers will do the work.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Of what size?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: From 1,800 to 2,500 tons burthen. It is believed that, with a certainty of the establishment of a Canadian line, touching at St. Thomas twice a month, going and returning, we shall induce the West Indies, or the British West Indies at all events, to meet it with another line.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that would be a very considerable advantage. The subsidy would have to be for a term of years.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Three years.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that any information as to the extent of trade that might be expected with Brazil would be very desirable. Of course, a considerable quantity of sugar could be brought back to Canada, and it would be interesting to know what kind of trade could be carried on with that country.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that Mr. Darling, the Brazilian Consul-General at Montreal, had furnished a very interesting memorandum on the subject, and as to what he believed should be the chief object of such an international trade. He proposed the establishment of a museum in Montreal, for example, for the exhibition of agricultural implements and other manufactures consumed in Brazil and the West Indies, which would show our manufacturers the kind of market they might supply. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) presumed that a museum could be opened at Rio for the exhibition of the commodities of Canada required.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Will the hon. gentleman lay that memorandum on the table of the House?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The line, as I understand, that it is intended to establish, formerly plied between Brazil and the United States. It is not intended it should be allowed to touch at United States ports?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: They will not call at United States ports. Roche's line formerly had a grant from the United States and Brazil. But they failed to obtain a renewal of it by the United States Congress the last two Sessions, and I understand the proprietors, having abandoned hopes of the subsidy, have given up that service. It was thought, therefore, that it was worth while trying this experiment, the subsidy being so small.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that he agreed that, if the Brazilian Government was going to subsidise that line, the experiment was worth trying.

Vote agreed to.

281	To provide for subsidy for steam communication between Halifax and Cork...	\$ 10,000 00
282	For steam communication between Halifax, Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island	4,000 00
283	For steam communication between Nova Scotia and St. Pierre.....	4,000 00

FISHERIES.

284	{ Fish-breeding, Fish-ways and Oyster-beds.—Amount required to provide for building new Fish-breeding establishments at Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton (Revote) do Quebec and New Brunswick do for maintenance of same.....	5,000 00
		5,000 00
		3,000 00
		3,000 00

INDIANS.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

285	To provide for grant for relief of Indians, Lake St. John.....	1,000 00
286	To provide for grant for additional aid to Indian Schools, Ontario, where most required.....	1,200 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said these two items were inserted by mistake, and should be struck out.

MR. ANGLIN said he proposed to avail himself of the opportunity afforded by this error of offering a suggestion to the right hon. gentleman. He thought the hon. gentleman would find if the Indians were to be taught agriculture, that some of the religious associations formed for the purpose of teaching useful arts, such as agricultural and mechanical arts, would impart this knowledge at a very cheap rate. They were persons who devoted themselves to this kind of life from philanthropic motives, and merely required sufficient to provide themselves with food and clothing.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was satisfied that the best civilizers were missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant, and the matter would be taken into consideration.

MANITOBA.

287	Estimated amount required to provide for the erection of houses and farm buildings for the use of the Instructors in husbandry to be sent to the Indians in Manitoba.....	\$ 2,500 00
-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

NORTH-WEST.

288	Estimated amount required to provide for the erection of houses and farm buildings for the use of Instructors in husbandry to be sent to the Indians in the North-West.....	15,000 00
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

CUSTOMS.

289	To meet probable expenditure in connection with the establishment of a Board of Experts, and Outside Service.....	\$10,000 00
-----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked how many persons were supposed to compose the Board of Experts, and what were their duties and salaries to be.

MR. TILLEY said that matter had not been finally settled. It was contemplated that such persons should be added to the number of employés here at

Ottawa. The scheme, however, had not been properly worked out. Then, persons would be employed for the purpose of ascertaining the value of goods from the different parts of the world, and the proper value upon which they should be entered when received into the Dominion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman had said nothing with regard to the outside service.

MR. TILLEY said at present it was impossible for them to say that their arrangements would be in that respect. Officers would be placed at the principal ports, and the most vulnerable points in the Dominion.

Vote agreed to.

EXCISE.

290 Amount omitted from former estimates for Preventive and Outside Service.....\$ 4,000 00

POST-OFFICE.

291 Estimated amount required to maintain increased frequency of steam communication with the Magdalen Islands, and between the Magdalen Islands and Gaspé 3,600 00

PUBLIC WORKS.

Canals.

292 { Rebuilding superstructure of north-west pier, Burlington Bay Canal, destroyed by fire..... 12,000 00
For necessary repairs to the north-eastern side of the Canal Basin, Rideau Canal, Ottawa 4,000 00

DOMINION LANDS.

293 Estimated additional amount required for township subdivisions, inspection of same, and surveys of timber berths 27,500 00

III.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT (*completed.*)

2 The Governor-General's Secretary's Office.....\$ 10,800 00

VII.—LEGISLATION (*completed.*)

42 Expenses of Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c... 10,300 00

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there ought to be a distinct supplementary vote for sessional clerks, otherwise there could be no sort of control over them, as there was no doubt, under the present system, very considerable abuse had been committed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said no doubt the whole system wanted reform. The expense of this House was excessive. The Government were endeavouring to establish what would be the best mode of avoiding it in the future, and had come to the conclusion there should be no extra sessional writers or messengers at all. They should be considered permanent officers to be employed only during the Session, and paid for the Session, the rest of the year being free to them, but would be required to attend every Session, and to do night work when there was a rush of work to be done. By this means, hon. members could inform those who solicited them for positions as sessional clerks or messengers, that they had no patronage in that respect, that the positions were all filled by permanent employes, and that no additional men would be taken on outside of the assigned number.

MR. MILLS said he did not think the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald) had succeeded in accounting for the extravagance of the expenditure on extra clerks this Session, by the change in the system. He might as well have engaged one hundred as seventy-five. The doors of the House were literally besieged in the early part of the Session by applicants for these situations. Last Session the number was forty-one, the largest ever employed before; but several were dismissed when there was nothing for them to do. This Session for five weeks those clerks had nothing to do for their pay. The Clerk had applied for six or seven, and got over seventy. Last Session the present Premier insisted on the vote being cut down some \$8,000 or \$10,000; but this year \$20,000 went for sessional clerks. A number of them were newspaper writers, who had denounced the policy of the party in Opposition, and had supported that of the party on the Treasury benches. Those writers, therefore, had been paid

for their services out of the Pub Treasury.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : No.

MR. MILLS said yes ; many of those clerks had nothing to do up to this hour. The member for King's, N.B., had had two of those clerks assisting him as private secretaries in his private business at the cost of the Public Treasury, and other hon. gentlemen opposite had received similar benefits. It was not desirable that the hon. Premier should ask the House to make the additional appropriation, or to interfere with the strict audit of the accounts at the inception of the new system. The only excuse for the payment of sums of this sort without any appropriation was some unforeseen circumstance necessitating an expenditure subsequent to a Session.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he believed they could economise other votes connected with Parliament sufficiently to pay this extra expense. The hon. gentlemen opposite followed a similar course. The Government would undertake to submit a scheme next Session securing a more strict audit of the accounts.

MR. ANGLIN said that, if the leader of the Government, as he had promised, made the sessional clerks permanent members of the Civil Service for the future, he hoped he would remember the claims of clerks who had served the country efficiently during the last five years, and not pursue a one-sided system in the appointments.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that some of the old servants ought to be considered, and would be.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLY.—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply considered.

MR. MILLS.

Resolutions 3 to 41, 43 to 60, and 62 (April 25th), read the first and second times and agreed to.

Resolutions 61, 63 to 76 (April 30th) read the first and second times and agreed to.

On Resolution 77, Intercolonial Railway extension to deep water at St. John, \$100,000,

MR. DOMVILLE said, in bringing up the matter he now proposed to bring before the House, he had no other object than to do his duty to the Lower Provinces. It was felt that a grievance existed there in regard to the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway. The other night he brought the matter before the Minister of Public Works, but he was sorry to hear that things were so ordered that nothing could be done to benefit the people of those Provinces in this direction. They complained that it was a grievance that the freights from Ontario to the Lower Provinces should be higher than the freights from the Lower Provinces to Ontario. He (Mr. Domville) did not bring this matter up as a complaint against the Government. His past action showed, and the country was aware, that he was entirely in accord in every way with the present Government. He felt that the Minister of Public Works, when this matter was thoroughly considered by him, would exert his influence in order to place the people of the Lower Provinces in a better position. He (Mr. Domville) trusted his action would not be considered antagonistic to the Government. At this late hour he did not wish to take up the time of the House, further than to state his objection on the parts of the people of the Lower Provinces, more especially of New Brunswick, and of King's County there, against any discrimination in freights on Government railways, and, therefore, he would move that the following words be added to the said Resolution :

"And in the opinion of this House all rates for freight to any station in Canada shall not be greater than through rates from Chicago or any point in the Western States of America ; also, through rates for freight to any intermediate station on the Intercolonial Railway shall not be greater than rates for similar kinds of freight to terminal points of the said

Railway. That no preferential rates of freight shall be given to anyone, manufacturer, farmer, merchant or trader, over another for similar class of goods over the same distances on the Intercolonial Railway; that the rate per mile shall be so adjusted from the Maritime Provinces to the Upper Provinces by the Intercolonial Railway that no one shipper will be able to convey his goods at a lower price than his neighbour."

MR. OLIVER said he would suggest that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) should so amend his motion as to make it include all railways under the control of the Government.

MR. TUPPER said it was somewhat strange that the hon. member for King's, N.B., should have taken the present occasion to make this motion. He (Mr. Tupper) quite accorded to that gentleman, and to every other gentleman in the House, the right to use their own independent action in relation to what regarded public interests, and he had no doubt whatever that his hon. friend the member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville), in making this motion, believed he was acting entirely in the public interest. But he thought it rather strange that the hon. gentleman, who announced himself in sympathy with the Administration, should take the present opportunity of putting upon the Journals this resolution, having taken no such action on this subject during the past five years when on the Opposition benches. The hon. gentleman had the same opportunity of knowing what the business of the country required then as now, and he was not now in position to state that the freight rates were not as favourable to the country at this moment as during the past five years. The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that this question of rates on the Intercolonial Railway had from time to time been the subject of discussion, but the hon. gentleman was content merely with an expression of his opinion, and never made a hostile motion in the interest of the country in connection with that question. He (Mr. Tupper) could only say he must beg the House to vote down the resolution of the hon. member for King's. He asked the House to take that course, because it would be impossible to allow this motion to be carried, without completely changing the whole system under which the Inter-

colonial Railway was managed, and bringing upon the country an enormous additional expenditure. The hon. gentleman had undertaken to affirm a proposition in relation to the management of the railway, which his hon. predecessor and every hon. gentleman in the House, who had any acquaintance with the subject, knew to be practically impossible. It was perfectly well known that, in order to manage railways, they had to change the rates of freight in accordance with the competition, or lose the business. The effect of adopting this resolution would be to entail an enormous additional cost on the country. If the House and the people of the country were willing that the railway should be run at the cost of a million dollars instead of half a million dollars, he would not have a word to say, and would submit with the best possible grace. But he did not believe that either the House or the country was prepared to adopt such a policy. Take the article of pig iron. What would be the result of adopting the policy the hon. gentleman proposed, that of increasing the rates upon that kind of freight? The result would simply be to drive that kind of traffic away from the line. Would that be any benefit to the country? Would it be any benefit to the iron manufacturers at Londonderry, or at St. John? Such freight came together with freight of a general character, a large portion of which was remunerative, and from which they derived a fair and legitimate return. The result of refusing iron at the present rates, would be to send all that freight which came over the Intercolonial to United States ports. The motion of his hon. friend he believed to be ill-advised, and one which would result in reducing the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway. The Government had not increased the rates, but the hon. gentleman knew that wherever a change had been made, it had been made in the other direction. In regard to ocean cargoes, the Government had ventured further than their predecessors, and they had done everything that they could to endeavour to direct business to the Intercolonial. They had used every possible means for the purpose of reducing the expenditure of operating the road, and had endeavoured to bring about a nearer

equilibrium between the receipts and expenditure of the road than had existed before. And they were prepared, wherever it was possible, to foster the trade or business of the country at as cheap a rate as they possibly could, without utterly disregarding the principles upon which a great work like that must be run.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was quite impossible that the motion of the hon. gentleman could be carried if the House had any regard for the principles upon which trade must be conducted. They must see at once that, by carrying a motion of that sort, they must either impose very heavy burdens on the country or drive the trade to other seaports than Halifax or St. John. He was quite sure, from the attention he had given this matter himself, that no one living on the line of the Intercolonial Railroad had any fair right to complain in regard to the rates. No railroad on the continent carried traffic so regularly or so cheaply as they had been carrying traffic on that road. The country was already sufficiently taxed in order to operate this road, and it was utterly impossible for any great line of railway to avoid entering into traffic arrangements with the lines at its termini. They would destroy their traffic by doing so, and he felt bound to support the Government and vote against the motion of the hon. member for King's.

MR. DOMVILLE said he hardly thanked his hon. friend the Minister of Public Works for the castigation he had given him that evening. He desired to state that the reason why he had not brought this up before, under the former Administration, was that he did not see any possibility of the motion being carried. He did not think the hon. gentleman had given an answer to the part of his motion relating to preferential rates being given to one man over another. He did not think the hon. gentleman had any right to characterise him as an independent member. He (Mr. Domville) wished to stand by his party, even if the party did not stand by him. He thought that, in bringing this matter forward, he had merely done his duty, and he would not have made the motion

MR. TUPPER.

had he thought that he would embarrass the Government.

MR. TUPPER said there was no member of the House more anxious to meet the spirit of the resolution than he was himself, and, if he asked the House to reject the resolution, he did so from a constrained sense of duty. The hon. gentleman said he had not answered the last part of his argument in reference to parties doing business at places on the line. He maintained that, in the policy upon which the Intercolonial was administered, there was no discrimination. From station to station every individual stood in precisely the same position. There might be distinctions in favour of parties creating a great industry, but that was done for the purpose of promoting the interests of the country, and in order to carry on and sustain a great industry. That was a principle recognised in all the commercial transactions in the world. All parties stood in precisely the same relation to the road, provided their business was of the same character.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: As my hon. friend has had an opportunity of explaining his views, and has heard the acceptance of what he considered the most important branch of his resolution, I would ask him to withdraw his resolution.

Amendment (Mr. Domville), with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

Resolution read the first and second times and agreed to.

On Resolution 78, Intercolonial Railway, nutlocks, \$40,000.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had looked over the papers in connection with these nutlocks, and his conviction was that the Government had made a bad bargain. They had been imposed upon in some way, or were made the victims of a conspiracy. Mr. Senecal was well known to be one of a class of railway speculators, who lived by their wits in connection with contracts. He was well known as the gentleman who succeeded in defeating the member for Quebec East in Arthabaska by a profuse use of means

in some of the parishes of that county. He was well known as one who was constantly engaged in work of this kind for the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was found in these papers that the request was made that this patent should be used. The person who had the patent went about telling his story not long ago, here and elsewhere ; but he had, like the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), been arranged with, and had disappeared. The fact was that, while Mr. Senecal asked \$100 per mile, the Government offered \$55 per mile, without having a computation made by any practical engineer as to the cost of the article, the necessity for it, or its utility. He was informed also, that, while Mr. Senecal had a contract at \$55 per mile, he was sub-letting the doing of the work for about \$16 per mile, and that there were altogether 750 of those bolt locks to be put on each mile of the road, each of which was not worth over one cent, with another cent for putting on. The Government should have advertised for tenders for these articles. The sum was a large one, \$40,000, and \$40,000 would not be sufficient at \$55 per mile, if all the Government railways were to be done over. If it was thought desirable to have these nut-locks on the bolts, tenders should have been asked, and the Government should have seen, by application to the Mechanical Engineer at the head of the workshops, that the article was a useful one, that the price was a fair one, and that it could not be as well and as cheaply supplied in their own workshops as by this person. Besides getting \$55 per mile, Mr. Senecal was to be supplied with the means of travelling over the line free ; he had two cars specially placed at his disposal. The whole thing was practically useless, and if it were of any use, it could have been done at our own workshops by our own men. It should, at all events, have been submitted, as everything of the kind should be, to the Mechanical Engineer for approval. The opinion, on a question of this kind, of a mere civil engineer, who was unacquainted with plain mechanics, was valueless. The transaction was one, so far as his knowledge extended, that was not justifiable. The price paid was excessive, and no proper plans were taken to ascertain the value of the work.

MR. TUPPER said he could only say with reference to this that the hon. gentleman's knowledge of Mr. Senecal was greater than his. He knew nothing of that gentleman whatever until he came to him with his proposition to apply this patent to the Intercolonial Railway. He (Mr. Tupper) dealt with it in the manner best calculated to secure the interests of the country. He took the opinion on the matter of two gentlemen, as one that necessarily and naturally belonged to them—one, Mr. Fleming, the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the other, Mr. Schreiber, the Chief Engineer of the railways in operation. Both these gentlemen were well known to the hon. gentleman opposite. They had been entrusted by him with quite as great responsibilities, and their judgment adhered to in matters of quite as great importance as the one under consideration.

MR. MACKENZIE : Never anything of this kind.

MR. TUPPER said he wanted to know if a gentlemen who spent his life as a railway engineer, whose business it was to devise rails, patterns, fastenings, and everything of the kind, was not the person of all others who was competent to speak in reference to the value of an invention of this kind. It was all very well for the hon. gentleman to sit in his place in the House and *ex cathedra* say what he believed to be the value of these articles.

MR. MACKENZIE : I said I was informed.

MR. TUPPER said he would like to know where he got the authority for the statement that this could be put on and manufactured for a cent. He knew, in the first place, that the right was a patent right, and they had not the right to have them made in the Government workshops, and applied to the road without payment for the patent. He (Mr. Tupper) applied to these gentlemen for their opinion of the character of the work, and they stated in their report, which was on the table, that in their judgment the contrivance was an admirable one, that the object was a most important one, that the operation of a railway involved a tendency of these

nuts to become loose and unscrew, and it cost a large amount for the purpose of watching to see that the nuts did not become unscrewed. He had also the evidence of Mr. Light, Chief Engineer of the Provincial Railways in Quebec, that it was a most valuable contrivance, that he had actually applied it, and found it to work satisfactorily. He (Mr. Tupper) had made a calculation of the number of men he could dispense with on the railway, by the adoption of the patent, and found he could save a large number of men by its adoption. The Chief Engineer of the railways in operation, reported it was worth \$55 per mile, that was for the McKay patent; the model which he had brought down to the House would give the House an opportunity of seeing whether it was worth a cent a piece. It was made of spring steel, and there was an improvement on it, which caused it to be more simple in its operation, more easily managed, the road altered and repaired with the greatest facility, and the difficulties which applied to the patent were altogether avoided. The application of the patent would save a large sum in the maintenance of the road per annum.

MR. MACKENZIE said why the Government did not acquire this patent themselves, and get the articles made at their own workshops. The road had to be attended to by their own men, at any rate, by whom the work could be done at much less expense than it was possible to make arrangements for with another person. Why was it not sent to the mechanical engineer at the workshops to report upon? Did the hon. gentleman ascertain what Mr. Senecal paid McKay for the patent? Had he done that, they would have known at once what the value of the patent per mile would be and the total sum paid for it, then the actual cost of the article to be purchased. Spring steel was one of the cheapest articles they had. Their own workshops should have been applied to to know what the article could be produced for. This was not done, and, from the information he had obtained, he believed they were paying three times the value of the thing at the very least.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I should like to be informed by the Minister of Public

Works if this particular nut-lock is used by any of the other great railroads or not, or if he knows what they have paid for a similar patent?

MR. TUPPER: I am not aware that it is.

MR. KILLAM: What is to be done in the case of Mr. Wiser, whose patent has been used on the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial?

MR. TUPPER: That matter is being investigated. The Government have no right to use a patent without acquiring it.

MR. MACKENZIE: The Government can use a patent in the first place if they like to pay the value of it. They have done so repeatedly.

MR. TUPPER: The Government can use the patent, and, on the report of the Commissioner of Patents, pay the patentee.

Resolution read the first and second times, and agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messrs.

Arkell	Farrow
Baby	Ferguson
Bannerman	Fitzsimmons
Benoit	Fortin
Bergeron	Fulton
Bill	Gault
Bolduc	Gigault
Boultee	Gill
Bourbeau	Girouard (J. Cartier)
Bowell	Girouard (Kent, N.B.)
Brooks	Grandbois
Bunster	Hackett
Bunting	Haggart
Burnham	Hay
Caron	Hesson
Cimon	Hilliard
Cockburn (W. Northld.)	Hopper
Colby	Houde
Connell	Jones
Costigan	Kaulback
Coughlin	Keeler
Coursol	Kilvert
Cuthbert	Kirkpatrick
Daly	Kranz
Daoust	Landry
Dawson	Lane
DeCosmos	Lantier
Desaulniers	Little
Desjardins	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Doull	McDonald (C. Breton)
Drew	McDonald (Pictou)
Dubuc	McDonald (Vict., N.S.)
Elliott	Macmillan

MR. TUPPER.

McCallum	Rochester
McCuaig	Ross (Dundas)
McDougall	Rouleau
McInnes	Routhier
McKay	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
McLennan	Rykert
McLeod	Shaw
McQuade	Sproule
McRory	Tassé
Massue	Tellier
Méthot	Thompson (Caritoo)
Mongenais	Tilley
Muttart	Tupper
Orton	Vallée
Perreault	Wade
Pinsonneault	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Platt	Wallace (W. York)
Plumb	White (Cardwell)
Pope (Compton)	White (E. Hastings)
Pope (Queen's, P. E. I.)	White (N. Renfrew)
Richey	Williams
Robertson (Hamilton)	Wright.—111.
Robinson	

NAME:

Messrs.

Anglin	Gillmor
Bain	Gunn
Béchar	Guthrie
Bourassa	Holton
Brown	Huntington
Burk	Larue
Burpee (St. John)	Laurier
Burpee (Sunbury)	Mackenzie
Cameron (S. Huron)	Merner
Cartwright	Mills
Casgrain	Oliver
Chandler	Olivier
Christie	Paterson (S. Brant)
Coupal	Rinfret
Domville	Rogers
Dumont	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Fiset	Rymal
Fleming	Scriver
Galbraith	Strange
Geoffron	Thompson (Haldimand)
Gillies	Trow.—42

Resolutions 79 to 87, and 89 to 102, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

On Resolution 103, Ottawa Drill Shed, \$15,000,

MR. MACKENZIE said he observed that in the Supplementary Estimates there was a sum of \$2,000 for this drill shed within the current year. They were told, after the vote in Committee, that this, with the \$5,000 from the city, would be the cost of this building, but now \$2,000 more was asked. The cost to the country would be \$17,000.

MR. TUPPER: It will make \$17,000, but that gives it to us in the current

year. The architect reports they have met with difficulties in the foundation which will increase the expenditure and necessitate the use of a different class of bricks.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not think the hon. gentleman should have commenced the work before he got the money.

Resolution read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolutions 104 to 120 read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolutions 121 to 180 (May 1st) read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolutions 181 to 191 and 194 to 196 (May 2nd) read the first and second times, and agreed to.

On Resolution 197, Post Office, \$1,758,000,

MR. McLENNAN said he noticed that the cost of the Post Office beyond the revenue had increased from some \$91,000 in 1868, to \$590,000 in 1877—something like 15c. a head to every man, woman and child in this Dominion, and, as there was a large number of men, women and children in the country who derived no direct advantage from the Post Office, he thought it was worth while enquiring whether they had value for this large expenditure. He found that the increase in the three years, from 1874 to 1877, had about doubled, that was, from \$247,000 to \$590,000.

MR. MACKENZIE: What was that increase in?

MR. McLENNAN: In the cost of the Post Office Department, beyond its income.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. McLENNAN said he could easily see the process in his own county by which it grew to those proportions. He could easily see it was one of those evils that grew by what it fed on. He knew it was a very unpopular thing to say a word against it, from his experience of it in his own county. He believed that a great number of the post-offices had

been established at cross-roads, corners and by-ways, where there was no real necessity for them, and where the people derived no advantage from them. But of course they gave political strength to the Ministry of the day, and everybody knew the process that went on at these corner post-offices. There was a class of literature disseminated through the post-offices that formed the staple of mail matter that he had seen among the people.

AN HON. MEMBER : *The Globe*.

MR. McLENNAN said the *Daily Globe* was an important element, no doubt. The process was very well known. The corner postmaster, who was very likely to be a political partisan, retailed the news, just as the itinerant philosopher and bard of old used to do, but with the difference that there was nothing original. There was nothing useful or amusing in those newspapers. Since he had been in the House he had received, as, no doubt, others had received, applications from men in his constituency, who very naturally said there were post-offices at the next corners or cross-roads, and why should they not have them? He (Mr. McLennan) had asked them where they got their letters, and they replied that they got them at a railway station several miles off, where they went to market. He believed that, a good many years ago, when the Post Office expense did not exceed \$90,000, there was quite as much facility for any necessary postal requirements as there was at present. The same objection arose with regard to the distribution of letters in the cities. There was a great hue and cry raised, a few years ago, about the great advantage of cheap postal communication with the United States. He did not know that any business man who had correspondence with the United States begrudged to pay five cents for his letters. He believed the delivery of letters in towns and large cities did not facilitate that necessary or important correspondence that was desirable to be delivered. Because, as far as he could understand, people who carried on important and urgent business still kept their boxes in the post-offices, and sent for their letters, and the other handful of correspondence

that reached the outskirts of the city, and which was delivered by the postman, would be almost equally valuable whether delivered to-day or to-morrow. He did not know that the family correspondence, or the correspondence of domestics, was of so urgent a character that a few hours in the delivery was a serious matter, or that it was worth while paying for it what it cost the country. He called attention to this matter because he believed it was very important that members in this House should fortify the Government in any attempt that might be made to retrench, and, if \$500,000 or so could be saved, it was very desirable and important that it should be done. He thought it was worth while for the Government to consider the experience related a few evenings ago, when the leader of the Opposition explained, in connection with the expenditure on canals, that under a very large expenditure the Government had very few supporters on the route of that expenditure. He thought that, perhaps, as a matter of policy, it might be worth the while of the Government to consider the advisability of making an effort in this direction. He would take the liberty to say to his friends on the Treasury benches that they might, as an experiment, try what the good effect would be of saving a little money.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Just for the novelty of the thing.

MR. McLENNAN : Yes, just for the novelty of the thing. He thought, if it did not accomplish any political purpose, such a saving would have some virtue. He recommended to the notice of the Government the possibility of making a saving in connection with this very large Post Office expenditure.

MR. HESSON said he thought, if there was any part of the administration of the Government that was worthy of commendation, it was their efforts to keep pace with the wants of the country in the new settlements. He was of opinion that they had no right to complain of this expenditure, unless it could be pointed out that the expenditure was not in the interest of the people.

MR. McLENNAN.

MR. HUNTINGTON said there was no doubt that the Post Office expenditure would be much more satisfactory if the deficits could be replaced by revenue returns. They had to consider, as the hon. gentleman had placed the matter fairly before the House, whether they would give the country the best facilities they could derive, or whether they should return to the state of things which formerly existed. The hon. gentleman had condemned the system of free delivery because he did not see the advantage of it. But it must be borne in mind, that the system of free delivery was introduced because it was believed it would produce such an increased correspondence in cities as to make it self-sustaining. Although it had not reached the extent anticipated, there was no doubt the system had increased the correspondence, and had largely facilitated the business of the Post Office Department. The hon. gentleman complained, also, that in certain places in Canada there were post-offices at the corner roads, and that postmasters were appointed for political considerations. He (Mr. Huntington) had no doubt politicians had been appointed postmasters, and that they would be appointed postmasters in time to come. But the postmasters at the corner roads had only a mere pittance for salary, which was no comparison with the benefit which accrued. The post-offices the hon. gentleman referred to had nothing to do with the deficits of which the hon. gentleman complained. It was the railway service and various other Departments which were expensive, as the hon. gentleman would find when he came to deal with the figures. He admitted that the system was expensive, but, if they were to keep pace with other countries, and afford the facilities which were afforded in other countries, they must incur this expenditure. Of course some discretion must be employed in order to see that they did not go too fast. Our railway system was enormously expensive, but he did not suppose the hon. gentleman would ask that stage coaches should be restored and railways ignored. If the hon. gentleman believed there were too many postmasters in his county, it was an easy matter to make a representation to the Government and get rid of them.

But he thought the hon. gentleman would find that these offices contributed very little towards the deficits of which the people complained. At this late stage of the Session, he had no intention of entering into a discussion of the whole question, which was an important question, and which, he thought, might be fairly discussed on this proposition. But, if the money which was expended was fairly expended for the purpose of affording facilities to the people, in regard to the postal arrangements, the expense was not too much, and the people could well afford it. They had not gone faster than the rest of the civilised world. They had increased the facilities of postal communication between Canada and the United States. They had an opportunity of affording the cities a free delivery system, of which he had not heard a complaint, and he thought the House might be asked, in the interest of the intelligence of the country, to wait a little, and to stem the tide during the period of adversity until there was an opportunity for those ameliorations to be justified by a more happy state of business relations. The hon. gentleman had alluded to a speech made in another Chamber, in which speech he believed it was represented, speaking from memory, that in the eight city post-offices, which had a free delivery, there was a deficit in the revenue of from \$107,000 to \$108,000. In that speech, however, the sale of postage stamps was regarded as a source of revenue. He (Mr. Huntington) desired to call the attention of the House to this fact. The sale of postage stamps was not an indication of the revenue derived from the office where the sale of these stamps took place. The office at Toronto, for example, might sell a great many postage stamps, but a great number of letters might be posted, the stamps of which might have been purchased at other offices. If the distinguished Senator would make enquiries, he would find that, instead of there being a deficit in these various offices of \$107,000, there was really an increase of some \$56,000 or \$58,000. There ought to be some means of remedying this means of acquiring information. He had indicated that the sale of stamps did not show the revenue of an office. When, during his time, they discovered this deficiency,

they undertook to remedy it by counting the letters, and they found enough to verify the fact that the sale of stamps was not a criterion by which to judge the revenue. But they did not go so far as they hoped the hon. gentleman hoped to go in making the test complete. He had this to say, that, so far as he knew the administration of the Post Office Department, it was directed by able officers, and officers who understood the work of the Department. The head of the Department might exercise his influence as he liked, but there was there the machinery by which the Post Office Department was directed. And he believed the money voted to that Department was honestly and usefully expended for the public service. It was a fallacious idea that the Post Office Department, in its expenditure, showed an enormous increase, and he wished to call the attention of the House to the fact that he was satisfied the present Government would find there was no necessity for such a reduction as was indicated by the hon. member. So long as the money which the House voted was within a reasonable limit, and was fairly and honestly expended for increasing the facilities in postal communication, there need be no cause for complaint, and the best evidence that the Government had not found the extravagance of which they had preached was to be found in the fact that the Estimates did not propose reduction. When the Estimates were before the House, he told the hon. gentleman who presided over the Post Office Department that he would on concurrence ask for information in regard to the mail service between Campbelltown and Paspébiac. The late contractor for that service and his family had carried this mail for forty years, and the contract was re-let to him for the sum of \$4,000 or \$5,000. It was represented to him (Mr. Huntington) that this contractor did his duty as well as it was possible for him to do it. The contract was for four years, but was annulled at the end of two years, when the present Government came into power. When the contracts were again invited, the late contractor tendered \$1,700 below the present contractor, but the contract was let for the larger sum. If this were true, some reason should be given for the

MR. HUNTINGTON.

acceptance of the higher tender—why, in the first place, the contract was taken from the late contractor at all? and why, in the second place, the higher tender was accepted?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What is his name?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Carr. And I am told, further, that the present contractor was a postmaster who was dismissed by the late Government for reasons which appeared to be apparent, and no one was dismissed except for reasons.

MR. BABY: Hear, hear.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the hon. gentleman said "hear, hear," but he desired to state that he never—and he did not believe the hon. gentleman himself would do it—dismissed a man because he was a politician, or for political reasons.

MR. BABY: I said "hear, hear," because I remember my postmaster was put aside because he was a good, sound Conservative.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he stated to the House some time ago, and he stated it now, that, during the time he was Postmaster-General, no postmaster was dismissed for political reasons. More, no one was dismissed except for good cause. He was quite willing that a Committee should be appointed next Session to enquire into any of the dismissals that took place during his administration, and, if this were done, it would be found that all allegations of this kind were groundless.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) said he had occasion to bring to the notice of the Department before that there was something very loose in the matter of carrying out the system of registration. Money letters had been lost, conductors dismissed, and no effort made to recover the money. Mail contractors were taken on without any security being given by them to guard against loss. He remembered an occasion, during the term of the late Minister of Customs, when three money letters were lost. The conductors admitted they had the letters in their possession between Iroquois and Montreal, and that they did not leave their

place except to take their tea at Cornwall, and yet three registered letters were abstracted, and there was no opportunity to recover the amount lost from these conductors. One of them was dismissed. Employés in such a responsible position should be required to give bail. He knew plenty of young men who would take such a position, and give security against loss. With reference to the statements of the hon. member for Gleggarry, that county was more fortunate than others. In Dundas there were not sufficient post-offices. There was no money better spent than the paltry sum given to postmasters.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said, by an order issued in January last, all productions of the electric pen were classed as correspondence and charged full postage. In the United States these were classed as ordinary printed circulars, and the same rule should be adopted here.

Resolution read the first and second times and agreed to.

Resolutions 198 and 199 read the first and second times and agreed to.

PUBLIC BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 113) To provide for the liquidation of the affairs of Building Societies in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

The following Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time, and passed.

Bill (No. 81) Respecting official arbitrators.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

House adjourned at

Thirty-five minutes after

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 9th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY.—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply considered.

On Resolution 192 (May 2nd), Inter-colonial Railway, \$1,500,000,

MR. TUPPER said the hon. member for Lambton had asked for information with reference to this item. It would be seen that the estimate for the coming year was \$1,500,000. The amount appropriated for 1877-78 was \$1,600,000, and the amount asked for by Mr. Brydges, the then manager of the railway, was \$1,750,000. The result of the year's operations showed that Mr. Brydges had not at all over-estimated the amount he would require, as the actual expenditure was \$1,811,273, including steel rail renewals \$200,000. In 1878-79, Mr. Brydges again estimated the amount required at \$1,750,000. The Parliamentary appropriation was as before, \$1,600,000. The expenditure for the first eight months was \$1,387,112, and the last four months he (Mr. Tupper) estimated at \$412,888, a very great reduction, compared with the first eight months. This would make the total expenditure for the current year, \$1,800,000. Now, the amount appropriated for the steel rail renewals charged off, and which completed the suspense account, was \$143,000 for the current year. That charged off the whole expenditure, which, as the hon. gentleman knew, had been incurred some time ago, but had been charged at the rate of \$200,000 for the two preceding years. Deducting that \$143,000 from the expenditure of the current year left a balance of \$1,657,000. He had asked for \$1,500,000, from which it would be seen that he proposed to effect a saving of \$157,000, irrespective altogether of the question of renewal with steel rails. Deducting the whole amount for renewals of steel rails charged against the current year, his estimate was \$157,000 below the amount of expenditure for the current year, and it was greatly below the actual expenditure of the year 1877-78. The details of the savings which he hoped to accomplish during the coming year, he might state briefly to be the steel rail renewals, \$143,592, the account having been

closed and the work done; a saving on the salaries of the staff of \$42,000 per year by dispensing with officers, and reducing the salaries of those who remained; and, in the Mechanical Department, and labourers' wages, he hoped to effect a saving of \$91,000.

MR. MACKENZIE: By doing less building?

MR. TUPPER said no. By providing for the same service as formerly, but having it done in a more economical manner.

MR. MACKENZIE: How?

MR. TUPPER: By dispensing with the services of a vast number of employes who had not half enough to do.

MR. MACKENZIE: Where were they?

MR. TUPPER: In the workshops and along the line.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no work done along the line, except that by the ordinary staff.

MR. TUPPER said there were workshops at Rivière du Loup, St. Flavie, Campbellton, Newcastle, Moncton, and Halifax.

MR. MACKENZIE: But you said work done along the line.

MR. TUPPER said the saving in salaries of the staff, exclusive of station masters, would be \$42,000 per annum, and in the Mechanical Department \$91,000; in maintenance of way, and in material in the shops, \$23,408, making a total saving in the coming year of \$300,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Will the hon. gentleman state how many employes there are?

MR. TUPPER said he would lay on the table a statement of the number of employes. The amount paid for the staff, including station masters and telegraph operators, was, on the 1st July last, \$254,689; on the 17th September it had increased to \$263,240, an increase of \$8,551. The amount paid for the staff to the 1st July, exclusive of station masters and telegraph operators,

MR. TUPPER.

was \$133,163. Under the new organisation the amount proposed, exclusive of station masters and telegraph operators, was \$89,376, making a saving of \$43,787.

MR. MACKENZIE: What rolling stock has been provided for this year?

MR. TUPPER said the same number of locomotives as before was provided for in the estimate of \$1,500,000. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) had asked him whether the serious accident which had occurred was covered by this expenditure for this year. He (Mr. Tupper) had made enquiries with reference to that, and might say that accidents was included. Since the change of management, but one accident had occurred. That would involve an expenditure of about \$7,000, which was included in the estimate for the coming four months, because, of course, the repairs would be gone on with to the locomotives that were damaged. He expected to save a very large amount annually, by the application of the patent nut-lock, by a very large reduction in the number of men employed in watching the track. He was informed that that could safely be done, that one of the most fertile sources of both accidental and intentional mischief on railways, was the facility with which these nuts unscrewed themselves, and the readiness with which evil-disposed persons could unscrew them.

MR. MACKENZIE: There will be no difficulty in taking off the other.

MR. TUPPER said that, suppose it were discovered, on the inspection of the track, that the nuts were loose, and that, on a curve, the train would be dashed to pieces because, these fastenings to the rail being gone, it would go beyond the embankment, there was no means of proving that the nuts were loosened maliciously, or that, through oscillation of the train, they became unloosened; whereas, with the patent nut-lock, the screw could not become loosened, except it was done maliciously, and the fear of detection would avert the danger. The hon. gentleman referred to the value of this article. He (Mr. Tupper), as he had already said, did not profess to be a judge of that, but he had made enquiry as

to the correctness of the hon. gentleman's estimate, that one cent would furnish the material. He was told the material was of the best spring steel, that each one of these appliances weighed six ounces of the best spring steel. If the hon. gentleman could purchase that for a cent, he (Mr. Tupper) would be obliged if he would put him on the scent to do the same. It would cost, at present rates, something like 7c. per pound. The hon. gentleman occasionally charged him (Mr. Tupper) with exaggeration; in this case the hon. gentleman could not be charged with exaggerating.

MR. MACKENZIE: I gave an estimate that was given me.

MR. TUPPER: Did the mechanical engineer at Moncton give that estimate?

MR. MACKENZIE: I never had any communication with any of the officials of the Government since I left office.

MR. TUPPER said he had not insinuated anything of the kind, but, as the hon. gentleman had stated that he (Mr. Tupper) should have ascertained the opinion of the mechanical engineer, he merely wished to ascertain whether the hon. gentleman had applied to the same authority. The hon. gentleman had said that he (Mr. Tupper) should have charged that to the current expenditure of the coming year. Why should he? It was not a renewal or a repair. It was a new appliance, an addition, just as a new mile of railway would be.

MR. MACKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman gets a new sort of pump to a locomotive, it would be charged to capital account.

MR. TUPPER said, if the Government were to obtain the use of the Haggis patent, now offered to it, it would be perfectly proper to charge it to capital expenditure, because it was an addition, the effect of which would largely reduce the annual expenditure. He had taken every care with the Public Accounts, and public interests were consulted in the course adopted.

In answer to Mr. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. TUPPER said the cost of the staff, on the 17th September, was

\$263,240, and now a very large reduction had been made, the operation still continuing. The number of employes was being steadily reduced, till they should reach the point he had mentioned.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What is the income up to the present date?

MR. TUPPER said a comparative statement of the receipts showed that they reached, from the 30th June, 1877, till the 20th February, 1878, \$919,781.98, and from the 30th June, 1878, till 20th February, 1879, \$895,192. The decrease in the seven months of the current year was \$24,749.

MR. ANGLIN said it was to be regretted they had not these returns a day or two ago, as this was a matter in which they all felt a very great interest. Sometimes, a Minister of Public Works could effect a very large saving without impairing the efficiency of such a service, or allowing such a road to run down, when he would deserve very great credit. He was not aware, and was not yet satisfied, that there was much room for saving in such departments. He did not think there was any room for a reduction in the number of station masters, and, as far as he was acquainted with the matter, in the salaries of the station masters at the smaller stations. He did not think, in fact, there was any reasonable room for the reduction of salaries. He knew some of them complained that they were worked excessively, and that their salaries were not adequate to their responsibilities and labours. Repeated applications had been made for increase of salaries, and sometimes for additional assistance, under the late administration and management of Mr. Brydges, without success. If the employes or their salaries had been reduced, he did not think the public service would be promoted, while in very many cases very great injustice might be done to individuals. With regard to many of the employes on the track, he thought there had been, at various times, great complaints from ardent supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Public Works had complained very bitterly of the reduction of the wages of the labourers, while the salaries

of the high officials remained at a high figure. He (Mr. Anglin) now saw it was not proposed to cut down their salaries. Before they could fairly consider the effect of those readjustments, and whether any saving had been effected, he thought they must learn how the new Department of Public Works, the Department of Railways, was to be constituted, and what number of employés were to be devoted to the work formerly done by parties whose salaries were charged to the Intercolonial Railway account. He saw that Mr. Schreiber, who formerly was paid from the construction account of the Intercolonial, was now entered as one of the staff of the Public Works at a salary of \$4,000, which was not charged to the Intercolonial, but to the Public Works account. That might be all well enough, but evidently his services were still connected with the Intercolonial, though no longer with its construction, but, so far as he knew, with its management. That ought, in any estimate of the saving to be effected, to be fairly taken into consideration. He had no doubt they would find, by-and-bye, a great many other thousands ought to be taken into account in the same way, and debited to the Intercolonial Railway. With regard to the discharge of a great many of the men from the workshops, chiefly at Moncton, they must depend on the statement of the Minister of Public Works, given in good faith, no doubt; but, unless those men did not do half the ordinary amount of work in former years, the large reduction he proposed must seriously reduce the number of cars and locomotives kept on the road, and so impair its general efficiency. They could not say otherwise, without evidence to the contrary. No doubt, employés on the Intercolonial not wanted should be dismissed. But, so far as he could learn, great pains were taken to keep down the staff of the Intercolonial workshops at Moncton. He had failed to obtain the employment of persons in whom he took an interest when there was not sufficient work for them, and he believed there could not be such a crowding of the departments as the Minister of Public Works imagined. When it was necessary some time ago to

MR. ANGLIN.

discharge a number of those men, loud complaints were made by papers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite of the harshness of their treatment; no matter on what principle they dismissed them, complaints were always made. He (Mr. Anglin) did not suppose that, in the present case the action of the Government, if justifiable, would be treated similarly. He thought they should all be glad to find proper and reasonable economies without impairment of the efficiency of the service, or the railway, or its stock. There ought to be no difficulty in ascertaining, at the very start, how many men were required to keep the railway track in proper order, and provide safety for the travelling public and all the traffic. The experience of the whole country ought to be sufficient to guide the managers of the road in all respects. He doubted very much the wisdom of reducing the number of men below the well-known standard. They could not expect a road through such a country could be properly maintained and worked by less than the usual number on such railways. Some of the reductions of the staff had been very extraordinary; the reduction of road-masters, or track-masters was very material. He thought it would be impossible to expect one man to supervise sufficiently some hundreds of miles of railroad—to be responsible for 200 or 300 miles, which he was supposed himself to continually examine. He (Mr. Anglin) believed that such men would have to depend on their deputies. He was sorry, in one instance, to learn of the dismissal of a very desirable workman, who had fairly earned promotion as a track-master, another having been appointed in his stead, who had no special claim to the consideration of the Government or public. He thought it was a mistake to remove that man, as it would be difficult to find one so efficient and trustworthy. He had been removed under this fit of economy. They did not know whether the hopes of the Minister of Public Works would be realised. They should have had these items submitted for some day to enable them to discuss this question more intelligently before passing the item.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was quite impossible to discuss intelligently the

various items connected with this road, without having had sufficient time to look over the information furnished by the Minister of Public Works. Certain things were apparent on the face of the papers and reports, which changed very materially the statement of that hon. gentleman as to the saving effected. He said that he had saved a certain amount in wages by dispensing with a large number of men at the various workshops; but, owing to reductions made a year ago on the completion of the 400 new railway cars, there was little to be accomplished in that respect.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman must not forget that that was charged to capital account.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was quite aware of that. The stock being thus complete, from that time out, the working expenses had to embrace the repairs to cars and the re-building of a sufficient number to replace the old. For instance, in the last year, in addition to the three locomotives, there was a somewhat expensive mail car built. He did not know whether there was anything of that kind in the present Estimates; but, having a large stock of cars—and as the hon. gentleman had shown a decrease in traffic during the current year to the extent, in seven months, of \$25,000—there would be less necessity than formerly for the maintenance of a staff to keep up the car stock. This, however, might be carried to too great an extent. It was an easy matter to shunt past a number of cars requiring repairs, instead of sending them to the shops, and, although a temporary saving might be accomplished in that way, it would be at the expense of a heavy expenditure in succeeding years. He did not believe that ample provision had been made, if so many men had been discharged from the workshops, as would be sufficient to keep everything up to its present standard. By whatever amount the stock was reduced, the efficiency of the road would be impaired. Then, the hon. gentleman would observe, by his own report, that during last year they found it necessary to expend a large amount of money upon ballasting, the ballasting provided for by the contract in the Intercolonial Rail-

way not being deemed sufficient to support a heavy traffic. There was during last year expended for ballasting \$52,000; they put in three miles of additional sidings, which ought properly to have been charged to capital account, but the whole was charged to the working expenses, embracing \$20,000. He also adopted new semaphore signals, which should have been, and would have been, ordinarily charged to the capital account, at an expense of \$3,500. They put up additional station buildings to the extent of \$4,500, and increased the water supply, fencing, car-shops, machinery and works of that sort, \$25,000 more, being last year an expenditure for these objects of no less a sum than \$105,000, for what was much more legitimately capital expenditure than the \$40,000 which the hon. gentleman had taken for nut-locks, and charged to capital account at the present time. Then, there was the decrease which the hon. gentleman mentioned in the purchase of materials. That was not a saving at all, because the material was required for the building of cars, for the supply of repairs to engines, boilers, and everything else, and it was simply an anticipation that less material would be required, and was based on the calculation that there was material on hand at the expense of previous years, to suffice to a great extent for that of the proximate year. In that case, the material had been provided for the previous year, and therefore saved the hon. gentlemen \$25,000 in the expenditure of the proximate year. It was an easy matter to put up accounts in this way, so as to show a material saving. Then, the train mileage must, of necessity, be higher, as there was a decrease in revenue. The true test of economy in running a railroad was the amount per train mile of the road. When he came into office, he found the expenditure for train mile was about \$1.02, as given in the report. In 1876-77, this was reduced to 82½c.; in 1877-78, it was further reduced to 74c., or a decrease altogether during the time he was responsible for the expenditure of running the road, of 26·87 per cent., although they ran much heavier trains over the line than ever before. This showed a real saving, and it was the only true test, and, when he had time to examine the

accounts the hon. gentleman had referred to in round numbers, he would have no trouble whatever, he believed, in establishing the fact, that there was no saving whatever in the Estimates for the proximate year, that had been presented to the House; but he believed that the expenditure per train mile next year would be larger than it had been during the current, or even the past, year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, perhaps, the hon. the Minister of Public Works would be able to give the details later on. This was another proof of the inconvenience of passing by the discussion in Committee of Supply, and reserving it for Concurrence. In order to form even a guess at the value of these savings, they ought to know the exact number of men who were employed under the former régime, and the exact number whom the hon. gentleman now proposed to employ. Possibly he could obtain a rough statement from the engineer, who was present, of the gross number of men engaged in the several services. The accounts which the hon. gentleman was good enough to send down, did not include the large majority, numerically, he presumed, of those employed. He would like to know to what extent there was a reduction in the number of men actually employed in preserving the tracks.

MR. MACKENZIE said he understood, from some remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper), that he was under the impression that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had said something derogatory to the Chief Engineer in connection with the nut-locks.

MR. TUPPER: Oh, no.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was glad of that, because that gentleman had been of great service to himself when Minister, and he might say at once, frankly, and he did it with the greatest pleasure, that he did not know any more faithful, zealous public officer than the present Chief Engineer, who had charge of the railway. He had placed the utmost confidence in him, as he did in all the chief officers of his Department, and had no doubt, whatever, that he would do everything conscientiously, and to the best of his ability.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. TUPPER said he had no idea the hon. gentleman had said anything else, but he said he was not satisfied, although he had the opinions both of the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of the Engineer of the Government railways in operation. He thought the hon. gentleman ought to have been satisfied that he had discharged his duty on the evidence he had obtained. The hon. gentleman for Gloucester had said it was not a new appointment. The appointment of Mr. Schreiber to the position he now occupied took place more than five years ago. The then Government, after careful examination, thought the management of the Intercolonial Railway and the Government railways in operation required the presence in the Department here of an engineer of standing character and experience; and in 1873 Mr. Schreiber was appointed Government Engineer of railways in operation—the very position he occupied now—and he had been discharging a variety of duties in connection with everything the Minister had to do with the railways under charge of the Department. That gentleman had been called upon to discharge the practical duties of Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, in regard to its construction, but then there had not been much work in that Department for some years past, and the position therefore was unaltered, the only difference being that the salary which had been charged to construction, was now charged in the Department of Public Works, as they intended five years ago it should be when they made the appointment.

MR. MACKENZIE said the work was wholly different; Mr. Schreiber had nothing to do with the running of the road—that all fell to Mr. McNab.

MR. TUPPER said Mr. McNab's place was filled by Mr. Archibald, who was previously Assistant Engineer in charge of the road.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then it is a new office.

MR. TUPPER said it was not a new office. He filled precisely the same position Mr. McNab had previously filled. The position which Mr. Schreiber held

was that to which he was appointed five years ago, that was Chief Engineer of the Government railways in operation, and he was the person to whom the Government looked, just as they looked to Mr. Page in regard to everything in connection with the canals, and to Mr. Fleming in regard to everything in connection with the Pacific Railway; in the same way, the Government looked to Mr. Schreiber and held him responsible for everything in regard to the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Therefore, there was no transfer of salary that was not already borne by the country outside the Railway Department. He had placed in the hon. gentleman's hands papers to show that they had effected a saving in the salaries of officers of \$43,000 per annum. The hon. leader of the Opposition was hardly in a position to say that the work could not be as efficiently done after this reduction was made. The hon. gentleman was hardly, therefore, in a position to say it would be no saving at all. It was an actual, tangible saving which had no reference to the amount of business. But, if they found they could not operate the road efficiently with the present staff, they would have to increase it and admit that they had made a mistake. But, finding the annual deficit of the Intercolonial Railway averaging half a million, he felt it his duty to give the subject the most careful examination to see whether they could not effect a large saving without impairing the efficiency of the road. He would say at once, however, that, if any saving was effected at the expense of efficiency, if the road was allowed to run down, if the rolling stock was allowed to deteriorate, then it was altogether a delusive saving which would prove to be the very reverse in the end. But what they aimed at was the operation of the road without impairing its efficiency in the slightest degree. They might be mistaken, but, if so, they would have to ask the House to increase the appropriation, so as to enable them to work the road with the same efficiency as at present. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) had asked him for fuller details with reference to the saving he proposed to effect. In regard to that, he would say, first, that he had obtained the services of a gentleman

whom he had never previously seen, but who, he was informed, was an expert in such matters, and had a thorough acquaintance with everything connected with machine shops, and the maintenance and operation of a railway. This gentleman was detailed to go over the road carefully from end to end, to go into the shops, and to make a detailed report showing what saving, if any, could be effected. He (Mr. Tupper) had not been making a hap-hazard change, but everything that had been done was based upon the best information the Government could obtain. The gentleman he referred to was Mr. Tandy, who had had vast experience in connection with machine shops in Kingston, and was recommended to him, after he had made enquiries, for a most able, reliable, and efficient person. He was going upon the estimate which Mr. Tandy had given him of what would be necessary in order to maintain the road in a state of efficiency. He reported they could reduce the number of engine men from ninety-four to eighty-six; the firemen from one hundred and four to eighty-six; the cleaners, or persons who simply rubbed up the engines, from one hundred to fifty. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman opposite if he had the least idea what the country was paying for the services of these cleaners? It was \$36,000 a year, but, upon Mr. Tandy's report, this item would be reduced to \$18,000.

MR. HOLTON: Is that gentleman an engine builder, or an experienced railway manager?

MR. TUPPER said he was a mechanical engineer of the highest capacity in the country, as he was informed, and experienced in the building, operation and repairing of locomotives, and everything connected with them. If he had been simply a railway manager, he would not have employed him for that purpose. He had never heard of the gentleman's name, until Mr. Schreiber, who had gone over the road himself, had recommended him very highly as just the person needed. Mr. Tandy was then detailed to assist, and these alterations in the Mechanical Department were based upon the report he had given as to what was necessary to maintain the road and the rolling stock,

and everything connected with it in its present condition of efficiency. At Moncton, he proposed to reduce the machinists from eighty-one to seventy; the boiler-makers from thirty to fifteen; blacksmiths from forty to twenty-eight; labourers and fuel men from ninety to sixty; pattern-makers from four to two; watchmen from eight to two; carpenters from ninety to sixty. He felt it to be the most painful and unpleasant duty which, as a public man, he had ever been called upon to discharge. The dispensation of patronage was not an agreeable matter, for the reason that, for one friend for whom an hon. gentleman procured office, he made an enemy of twenty, and, perhaps, he made that one only half satisfied with his position. But, to have to dispense with the services of a valuable public servant, against whom there was no complaint whatever, was an extremely distasteful duty. It was, therefore, with this feeling, that he acted as he was doing, though he was doing what he conceived to be a duty in the public interest. If, as had been said by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, it proved that this was done at the expense of the rolling stock and permanent way, it certainly would not be a proper course; but, if \$43,000 could be saved in the salaries of the staff, who were not engaged either in keeping up the rolling stock, or in maintaining the public way of the road, and the work could still be efficiently performed, it was certainly a duty which should be performed.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he would be extremely glad if the hon. gentleman could make the reduction. But there must have been either a very large staff before, or an enormously less amount of work to be done in future, if an expenditure of \$130,000 could be reduced by \$95,000, leaving scarcely one-third. He thought the House ought to have some information to show how far the proposed saving might be expected to be permanent, and how, after these reductions were made, the road would compare with other roads. He believed it would be in the true interest of this country that the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway should be absolutely closed. If he (Mr. Cartwright)

MR. TUPPER.

understood the Minister of Public Works, he expressed the opinion that he might be induced to re-open the capital account.

MR. TUPPER: No; it has never been closed.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Does the hon. gentleman propose to close it within the next year?

MR. TUPPER: Entirely, except for the construction of new roads.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, as he understood the position taken by the hon. gentleman, he proposed, at an early date—within the next year—to close absolutely the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, with the single exception of the purchase of new roads such as the Rivière du Loup branch, or the construction of any sidings or distinct branches. That was the position the hon. gentleman took.

MR. TUPPER: Yes.

MR. ANGLIN said he hoped that when the statement was brought down, it would be printed, so that hon. gentlemen would have an opportunity of watching the matter, the next year or two, and seeing how far the proposed arrangements would be carried out. He presumed the hon. gentleman would not object to a careful scrutiny of the matter, with regard to Mr. Schreiber. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had stated distinctly that Mr. Schreiber during the last five years was employed in the work of superintendence; also, that Mr. Schreiber's salary was charged to construction account. He presumed that, in the proposed arrangement, salaries against construction, whether charges or other expenditure would cease. Mr. Schreiber, no doubt, rendered valuable services, and, no doubt, it was necessary he should be retained, but he (Mr. Anglin) thought the hon. the Minister of Public Works had stated that a very great part of the work performed by Mr. Schreiber was such work as Mr. Brydges performed when in charge of the road as Superintendent. Mr. Schreiber went over the line, determined what reduction could be made in the Mechanical Department, readjusted all the other branches, and in that man

ner rendered such services as Mr. Brydges was supposed to render. Therefore, he thought it would be but fair that, in any estimate of the saving by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Schreiber's salary should be added to the expenditure on staff account. He also thought, that in regard to the office of travelling agent—\$3,000 a year, exclusive of travelling expenses—the salary of that officer, Mr. Black, should be added to the cost of management.

MR. TUPPER said it was true that Mr. Schreiber discharged a portion of the duties of Mr. Brydges, but the bulk of those duties were now discharged by the Superintendent of Moncton, who was on the line instead of being absent from it. Mr. Black's office was not a new one. Mr. Black was a gentleman of great experience and had been connected with the Grand Trunk Railway. He was employed as travelling agent, and visited localities along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, with a view to bringing as much traffic on the road as possible. His salary of \$2,500 was embraced in this reorganisation, which still admitted of a reduction of \$43,000. So it was not to be considered in the way of additional expenditure.

Resolution read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolution 193 read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolutions 200 to 209 (May 7th) read the first and second times, and agreed to.

On Resolution 211, To pay a gratuity to E. U. Piché, Esq., late Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons, on his retirement, \$1,000,

MR. ANGLIN asked what was the cause of Mr. Piché's retirement. The House had never been informed that he had ceased to be the First Assistant Clerk of the House. Mr. Speaker had informed the House that Mr. Piché had not been dismissed. He thought the House should receive some formal information on the matter.

MR. TUPPER said he presumed the hon. gentleman was not in the House when this painful subject was discussed before, or he was certain he would not have brought it up again. The matter was then explained to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was only stated that his retirement was caused by ill health, and he thought he then remarked that he was one of the most robust invalids he ever came across. There ought to have been a letter or certificate from a physician certifying ill health. There ought to have been a letter of resignation, or an intimation from the Speaker if he was dismissed. If he was dismissed for ill health what was his ailment? He might doubt the veracity of the hon. the Minister of Public Works in some things, but the hon. gentleman understood calomel and all its concomitants. Again, he would ask what was his ailment? When did he take ill? Was there any prospect of his getting better; or of his resuming the duties of his office? He was sorry when any gentleman's health failed, and would like to know if a little leave of absence might not restore his wonted elasticity of body and mind. They would be glad to see him back again. Was there any prospect?

MR. TUPPER said he was very much surprised at the tone in which the hon. leader of the Opposition approached a serious subject of this kind. He knew perfectly well that, when he was leader of this House, the health of this gentleman whom they were discussing was very indifferent, and his fits of indisposition so frequent that very constantly his place was vacant at the table. He was sure it did not require much information to show that the interests of the service required that a change should be made.

MR. HOLTON said he thought that the Speakers, both past and present, were entitled to have an explanation of the circumstances attending this removal made in the House.

MR. PLUMB said he had had occasion, within a few weeks, to know something about superannuation during the administration of the late Government.

MR. HOLTON : I call the hon. member to order ; he is not speaking to the item we are now considering.

MR. PLUMB : I think I am in order. I shall not be put down by the majestic way in which the hon. gentleman rose.

MR. HOLTON : I rise to a point of order. It is a well-known elementary principle that, in discussing items in supply, the observations of an hon. gentleman must be confined to the point under discussion. The hon. gentleman's remarks had reference to the general question of superannuation, which was not at all in debate.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the subject under discussion.

MR. PLUMB said he had a perfect right to say that those gentlemen who were pressing the Government so earnestly now upon that principle did not apply the same sort of pressure to themselves, when they, as they frequently did, dispensed with the services of public officers upon the ground of ill health, or for other reasons which were not always justified by the facts. He thought he would be able to show that he was arguing that it was improper for the hon. gentlemen to press the Government with that sort of pertinacity upon this subject. If the hon. gentleman insisted upon it, it might be possible that a satisfactory reason could be given. But he had such confidence in his hon. friends on the front benches, that he was satisfied that they had acted upon just grounds, and without party considerations or prejudices. That was what he had intended to have said, and he was perfectly in order in saying it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the facts of Mr. Piché's removal were these : It was considered by the Committee of Internal Economy that, before the new Speaker was elected, some selection and some preparation must be made for the present Session. That Committee, who were members of the Government, had considered that it would not advance the public service if Mr. Piché, whose health had broken down, was continued as an officer of the House. He was, therefore, informed that it was con-

MR. PLUMB.

sidered that he was not an efficient officer, and he agreed to retire, and he got his gratuity and superannuation.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : That is new information. I was going to call the attention of the House to that. What superannuation is he to get ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The superannuation is very small. \$500 a year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : When was he appointed ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : In 1872.

MR. CARTWRIGHT : Then he got four years' extra allowance, or how many ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could not tell, but he would get the information for the hon. gentleman. They thought it was for the efficiency of the public service that Mr. Piché should retire. His superannuation allowance being small, they agreed to give him a gratuity of \$1,000.

MR. MACKENZIE said this was a very important question, and he wanted to know whether this removal took place before or after the election of Mr. Speaker. It seemed that the Internal Economy Commissioners had assumed the duties of Speaker, either as against Mr. Speaker or as against his predecessor. It was also whispered by a little bird, and he thought the hon. gentleman would recognise it at once by its plumage, that more persons were employed by the Internal Commission than by Mr. Speaker, and that Mr. Speaker had either to discharge them or accept the responsibility of appointments he had never made. That was currently reported about the House, and he thought they all knew that a number of parties were employed about the House that were not employed by the late Speaker, and could not have been employed by the present Speaker. This was another specimen of the interference of the Executive in the obligations and privileges of the Speaker of the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not see how the late Speaker

could well interfere in the selection of sessional officers or clerks for the present Session. He had certain authority under special Act until his successor was appointed, but could not consider himself responsible for the selection of officers for this Session after he had ceased to be Speaker. The hon. gentleman said it was an unwarrantable interference on the part of the Government. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not think there was any warrant under the Act for that statement. The Committee selected to assist the Speaker, as soon as he was appointed, had every right to make provisional arrangements until the House selected its Speaker. Those arrangements were, of course, subject to reversal when the Speaker was appointed. The efficiency of the Parliamentary Service had been improved by the retirement of Mr. Piché.

MR. ANGLIN said the Commissioners of Internal Economy could only sit and act when the Speaker was present. With respect to Mr. Piché's frequent absence from the table, it was owing, he believed, to the severe illness of his wife. Though he (Mr. Anglin) considered that those absences were very awkward, he could not refuse permission under the circumstances, and, he might add, Mr. Piché's wife died later. The impression would remain that hon. gentlemen opposite had determined to get rid of Mr. Piché, as he had in some way incurred their displeasure.

Resolution read the first and second times and agreed to.

On Resolution 210, To meet the cost of printing and preparing catalogue of the Library of Parliament, \$5,300,

MR. MACKENZIE said this item was excessive, and the work was done without authority. The hon. gentleman had promised to bring down a statement of the account.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not think he had promised that, but said he would endeavour to find out how the matter stood. It was simply that the Librarian thought he had the authority to put the matter

under contract. As the work could not be done in time by the contractor, he divided it, giving a portion to somebody else.

MR. MACKENZIE said he regretted Mr. Todd had taken the responsibility to give this work to the printers himself. On a former occasion, in 1878, he did the same thing, and the House very reluctantly paid the account and placed on record their condemnation of the transaction. It was impossible the account could be correct, unless the most extravagant prices were given.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said this method of having the printing done was not only irregular, but was likely to be expensive. He had made a calculation of what this work would have cost on the basis of contract rates, and found that it had cost double the regular contract prices. If the House allowed these irregularities to creep in, the result might be very serious. He was strongly of opinion, besides, that the contractor could have done the work in sufficient time. In no single instance during the past five years had he delayed his work. He (Mr. Ross) proposed to move that this item be not carried, but be referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to reduce the same to \$2,535, being the amount for which the same work could be performed by the contractor for the Government printing.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said such had been the pressure of work on the contractors that they had not been able to complete their portion of the catalogue. As to whether Mr. Todd was right or wrong, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) could not say. When he arrived here, Mr. Todd wrote him, saying this work was in progress, and that he was anxious that a portion of the work should be given to somebody else, as the contractor could not get it ready in time, and he (Sir John A. Macdonald) consented to that arrangement being made by him.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he took this opportunity to call the attention of the House, and especially of the Minister of Justice, to another branch of this printing question, which was worthy of consideration, the printing of the reports of the Supreme Court. He hoped the

Government would enquire into the reason why the very important judgments delivered by that body had not yet been printed and put in the hands of the profession. The contractor for the Government printing, who was charged with the printing of these reports, was overloaded with work, and the same difficulty arose as with respect to the printing of the library catalogue. As far as the public was concerned, it mattered little who had the work, provided the rates charged were reasonable, and the work should be given to some other competent printer to perform. It would be a great advantage to the public if the House or the Government had initiated a proposal to do their own printing, to have a printing office of their own and a superintendent of printing. They had such an establishment at Washington; they had one in France; and that system was, to a great extent, followed in England.

MR. HOLLION said there could be no doubt Mr. Todd had acted irregularly in this matter, but he should vote with great reluctance for a motion conveying censure upon so valuable an officer as Mr. Todd was known to be, and he hoped his hon. friend would withdraw his motion. He happened to be named on that Committee for two consecutive Sessions, and had never discharged any duty whatever, which was very much the case, he was afraid, with many of the members. He thought the fault was with the Committee of the Library. At all events, he hoped his hon. friend would see it consistent with his duty to withdraw the motion.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, during the last Session, the Librarian ought to have called the attention of the Speaker, or the Committee, to the necessity of having a new volume of the catalogue printed, when it could have been submitted to the Printing Committee. He was quite as loth, as the hon. gentleman to say anything against Mr. Todd, but such an irregularity had occurred before, and ought not to have been repeated. If the calculations of the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) were correct, the printing of those

documents had cost twice as much as in the contractors' hands.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No.

MR. ROSS: The member for Lambton was quite correct.

MR. MACKENZIE said, as he was quite correct, then there must have been some serious mistake; but they knew nothing about it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said no doubt there had been some irregularity; but he thought the hon. member for Chateauguay had attributed it to the right cause,—Mr. Todd's enthusiastic interest in his library,—which induced him to believe that, every ten years, at least, there ought to be a new catalogue, showing the treasures of their library. Evidently he had put the catalogue in hand without having received instructions from any Committee, or from the House, doubtless with the best intentions; and, although his act was an irregularity, no loss had accrued. At all events, they had got the catalogue earlier than otherwise. The expense had to be carefully looked into. Whether that sum had been paid or not, he did not know. They would take care there should be no excess in the payment allowed for the work. He understood it was merely a division of labour, owing to the contractor not being able to perform it.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said that, if the hon. Premier would abide by his promise that the work would be paid for at contractors' prices, the purpose of his motion would be satisfied. His only object was to defend the House against any imposition for printing. With that explanation, he would withdraw his motion.

Resolution read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolutions 212 to 220, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

On Resolution 221, Pacific Railway, To pay Mr. Wallace as compensation for his loss of time whilst employed in this service, \$1,750,

MR. MACKENZIE said the Minister of Public Works had promised to give the dates and the months for which it was proposed to pay Mr. Wallace.

MR. TUPPER said that Mr. Wallace, while a member of Parliament, rendered services to the Canadian Pacific Railway from the 1st September, 1872, to the 1st March, 1873, and during June and November, 1873—in all eight months, and his travelling expenses included five trips between Ottawa and home—\$1,750.

MR. ANGLIN : Was he not paid for those services ?

MR. TUPPER : He never received a farthing for them.

MR. MACKENZIE said, when this subject was before a Committee of the House two years ago, the Accountant handed them a statement, and another had been recently sent in by Mr. Fleming, showing that the total payments in the year 1873-74, after July, 1873, reached \$1,025.76, on account of wages, increasing the balance against him to \$1,772.95, leaving a balance of \$800, after his getting a salary for all the months mentioned. Those facts were proved to the Committee.

MR. TUPPER said that that was an entirely new subject. All that the hon. gentleman had asked him to bring down, was the dates of the payments. He did not ask him (Mr. Tupper) to account for the settlement with Mr. Wallace, or he would have brought down a statement showing that, after those accounts were satisfactorily adjusted by Mr. Taylor, referred to, and Mr. Tims, it was found a balance was due Mr. Wallace of some \$400 or \$500, apart altogether from those services, which was the only question he (Mr. Tupper) had been asked to furnish any information upon, Mr. Fleming had had addressed a letter to Mr. Braun, dated 28th September, 1878, upon which they put the item on the Estimates, and that was outside of any accounts, all of which had been thoroughly settled up, and after the most careful examination by Mr. Tims, in addition to the Auditor engaged on it, who found this amount was due Mr. Wallace on the old account.

MR. MILLS said the returns brought down showed that, while Mr. Wallace was a member of Parliament he had received compensation for his services in the North-West.

MR. TUPPER : No.

MR. MILLS said Mr. Wallace did not pretend to deny it, and the evidence taken before the Parliamentary Committee showed that Mr. Wallace had received money.

MR. TUPPER : Not a dollar.

MR. MILLS said he had produced the testimony of Mr. Wallace to show that he had received compensation—whether adequate or not—in violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, as a clerk of the Public Department, while a member of the House.

MR. TUPPER said that he had not said anything of the kind, but had proved the contrary. The letter of the Chief Engineer stated that Mr. Wallace was entitled to payment for his eight months of service, and he gave all the time that he was engaged, while a member of Parliament, for which he said he received no compensation whatever.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the extracts from the books showing differently were in the hon. gentleman's hands.

MR. TUPPER said that this matter had been investigated and the accounts balanced and settled entirely irrespective of any services performed by Mr. Wallace, the small balance due him being paid.

MR. MILLS said that that would depend on what was allowed Mr. Wallace for disbursements, the account of which was lost. Mr. Wallace had been liberally dealt with, the Government of which the present Minister of Public Works was a member having paid him for services after he was a member of the House.

MR. TUPPER : No.

MR. BOWELL said that what the hon. gentleman stated was that large sums were paid to Mr. Wallace, that they were charged to his private account, having been paid to

him for the purpose of paying debts on behalf of the Pacific Railway. Mr. Wallace had denied positively and distinctly that his private account, as presented to the Committee by Rattan had been appropriated by himself. The accounts had not been adjusted. It was unfair to say that the books of Mr. Wallace were in such a state that it was impossible to balance them, thus leaving the impression that he had kept them improperly. He (Mr. Bowell) had already explained that those books could not be balanced at that time for the reason that the returns had not been made to the Board of Works, one of the clerks having died, and another run away.

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

After Recess.

ELIZA MARIA CAMPBELL RELIEF BILL.

[BILL 99.]

(*Mr. Macdougall.*)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole and reported.

MR. MACDOUGALL moved the third reading of the Bill.

MR. MILLS said he was not going to discuss the merits of this Bill, but he was satisfied that, if his hon. friend went into Court, under a general law, to obtain what he here proposed to accomplish by legislation, he could not have succeeded upon the merits of his case. He was opposed to this Bill, in the first place, because Parliament had no jurisdiction in the matter. This Parliament had jurisdiction over the subjects of marriage and divorce, but this Bill related to an entirely different subject—it was an attempt to give to a woman a part of her husband's property, against his will, while she was living apart from him. He did not at all admit that that was a power they possessed. In order that the House might understand this question, it was necessary to enquire how it stood prior to Confederation. Every one of the Provinces, before that epoch, had control over the subject of alimony and other rights of the wife. If they looked

at the condition in which the subject stood in Great Britain, it would be clear that, when the word divorce was used in the Act of Confederation, it referred to divorce *a vinculo*, and not to divorce *a mensa et thoro*. It was not divorce from bed and board, but an absolute divorce from the marriage bond. In all Catholic countries, and in Great Britain prior to the Reformation, people looked upon marriage as a sacrament, and considered the bond one of perpetual obligation. In no case could divorce be obtained, except in the case of parties whose affinity was such as to forbid the relation of marriage. Consequently, they found that marriage had been dealt with as a sacrament, and the jurisdiction in Great Britain on this subject was vested in Ecclesiastical Courts. These Courts could deal with the subject of judicial separation, because that was recognised in certain Courts as a thing right or proper in itself. After the Reformation, a change came over public opinion in England, but they did not find that that Parliament changed the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts so as to make them correspond with the change in the opinion of the nation. That was the condition of things down to a recent period. The same policy was extended to the Colonies. This subject was referred to in the Instructions given to the various Governors of the Colonies, showing that divorce in no instance had the slightest reference to the subject of separation from bed and board. Bills upon the subject of divorce were reserved for the consideration of Her Majesty, for the reason that they related solely to the Marriage Law. Judicial separation was not considered as coming within the meaning of the term divorce. When the Act of Confederation was passed, it provided that the subject of marriage and divorce should be reserved to the Government of Canada. Now, it was clear that expression must be understood with reference to the past policy of the Mother Country. They knew it was a rule of legal construction that, whenever general power was conferred, and express exception made to that power, the exception was to be strictly construed. In the British North America Act the subject of property and civil rights was conferred on the Local Legislature, and if there

MR. BOWELL.

had been no exception made, that term was broad enough to include the marital relations. Not only so, but they found that, in the same Act, the power to deal with the subject of marriage and divorce was expressly carved out of this general power; these terms, therefore, must be strictly construed. But, whether they construed the expression strictly or not, it was perfectly obvious that the term in that Act had not the slightest reference to the subject of divorce from bed and board. The Royal Instructions showed that fact, and the powers that were possessed by the Ecclesiastical Courts in England, and that had been conferred upon the secular Courts in this country, made it equally obvious. But, however that might be, the question was not really involved in the Bill submitted to the House. This Bill was a Bill to give alimony, and was, therefore, something that the Courts had the power to bestow. There was nothing else in the Bill but the subject of alimony. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdougall) said he proposed to provide for the separation of the parties. Now, there was no necessity in this country, at all events as far as Ontario was concerned, that there should be any Court decreeing a separation of the parties. The position of parties in Ontario was not the same as in England; the husband had no power to compel the wife to live with him. The matter of separation was a simple matter of fact, and, the fact being once established, all that was necessary that the Court should have the power to do was to decree alimony where the party was entitled to it. The party who sought relief by this Bill had already been to Court asking for alimony; the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) argued the case on her behalf, and the Court refused to entertain her petition. Now, the hon. gentleman in effect appealed from the Court of Equity in Toronto to the Parliament of Canada, and he (Mr. Mills) contended that this House had no jurisdiction over the subject whatever. If it had, it could deal with the subject of dower, it could deal with the question as to how far a married woman should have an interest in the property of her husband; it could deal with her rights to make contracts: with her control over her sepa-

rate estate. If it could so deal with the wife and her property, it could also deal with the husband and his property; it could deal with the children; it could deal with the subject of guardians and wards. As an incident of a special and restricted power, the whole subject of property and civil rights within the limits of the domestic relations would be usurped. It was obvious that this House had no power to pass such a Bill as the hon. gentleman had submitted. He, therefore, moved that this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read a third time this day three months.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said he did not desire to enter into the merits of this particular question. He believed that few members of this House had familiarised themselves with the evidence on which the promoters of this Bill desired that this House should vote on a question affecting the social standing of the two persons before the House. They had not merely to consider the question whether Mr. and Mrs. Campbell should be separated as to bed and board, but to determine whether this House had power and jurisdiction to legislate in the direction proposed by this Bill. He was sure the members of this House would deprecate hasty legislation in a direction not authorised by the Constitution. He did not mean to say one word with reference to the merits, although he had read the evidence in the case and had formed a strong opinion on those merits. If he were asked to decide whether the petitioner had made out a case in her favour, he would be obliged to declare that she had not. But a much more important question for this House to decide was the question raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), as to whether, under the Constitution, they had authority to grant the relief prayed for. It would certainly be something to be deplored, if, from any sentiment of sympathy, this Legislature should be led beyond its domain. The important question was whether they had authority to decide on this matter before them. The hon. gentleman had dealt with the question as to whether the word divorce in the British North America Act meant divorce *a vinculo* or whether it related solely to judicial separation. He was much dis-

posed to agree that the word divorce meant the separation of the marriage tie. From the best consideration he had been able to give to the question, he had arrived at the conclusion that their authority under this Act did not allow them to legislate in the manner proposed. Admitting the doubt in relation to the subject raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to be the case, he (Mr. McDonald) submitted there were other clauses in the Bill which were so entirely beyond the jurisdiction of this Legislature, and so completely within the cognisance of the Local Legislature of Ontario, and which the Local Legislature was constituted to determine, that this House could not, without overstepping its authority, pass this Bill. He was of opinion that the rights of the Legislature of Ontario would be invaded by the passage of the clauses of the Bill which involved the payment of alimony, and the disposition of the children of this marriage. The Bill involved the question as to whether this Parliament had the authority and power, on the judicial separation of man and wife, to declare that the husband should pay to the wife what was called alimony, or, in other words, should set aside a portion of his estates in order to support her for life. He contended that power was entirely and solely within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature of Ontario. Alimony, it was argued, must be within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, because it was incident to and connected with the question of divorce, and this argument was advanced on the ground that the British North America Act gave jurisdiction to this Legislature over the questions of marriage and divorce. Now, it must be recollected that before Confederation the Province of Ontario had made provision within its own Courts for the granting of alimony in the case of the judicial separation of man and wife. At that time, there was no divorce, as he understood it, in the Province of Ontario, as there was in some of the Lower Provinces. Where it was necessary to obtain judicial separation, or separation *avinculo*, it was necessary to go to the Legislature of that Province, and the Court of Chancery had entire jurisdiction on the question of alimony. They had also provided that in all matters where the

disposition of children was involved, that same Court should determine as to which parent, or either of them, should have the disposition of the children. These powers had not been taken away since the Union. The Act passed before the Union confirming the power of the Court of Chancery, was still in force, and that power, as had been stated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), had been exercised in this very case. The suppliant in this case recognised the authority and power of that Court by seeking in it the relief which was now asked from this Parliament. The petition was refused in that Court on the grounds that, by her own misconduct, the suppliant had forfeited the right which the law gave her to be supported out of the estate of her husband. He agreed with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that this Parliament had no jurisdiction in this case, on the ground that the questions of alimony and the disposition of children came clearly and completely within the provisions for civil rights, which the Constitution granted solely and entirely to the Provincial Courts. Was alimony a civil right, or was it not? If it were a civil right, if it were not in any way incident to the question of divorce, then he fancied the House would feel that there could be no doubt in the world that they would invade the just rights of the Local Legislature if they sought to pass this Bill. Alimony was described by the highest authority as that apportionment of a husband's estate which, by the decree of the Chancellor of the Court of Chancery in Ontario, was allowed to the wife for her maintenance. It could not be contended that alimony must be included in the word divorce. It had nothing whatever to do with it; because there might be divorce without alimony. If alimony followed in all circumstances after the separation of man and wife, there would be grounds for saying that the passage of this Bill, would be constitutional. But, inasmuch as alimony was the right of a wife to some portion of the estates of her husband, and that right not being dependent upon divorce, it surely could not be contended that alimony must follow as a matter of course from, or be incident to, the separation of husband and wife.* He maintained, therefore, alimony being

purely a civil right, that the question could only be adjudged by the decree of the Court of the Province in which the parties resided. This Bill provided, not only that a separation should take place, against the will of the husband, but that a portion of his estates should be taken, against his will, and given to the woman whom he declared, and who in his (Mr. McDonald's) opinion had been proven to be, unworthy to associate with him. Now, the question to be determined first was whether this were a civil right? How could it be contended that the disposition of this property was not a civil right? How could it be contended that this Legislature could take away property from one man, against his will, and give it to another? He could not understand how the hon. gentleman who so ably defended the Bill could take the ground he did. There was another very important question, and that was the rights vested in the several Provinces, and the judiciary of the several Provinces in relation to this particular subject. In the Province of Nova Scotia, before the union, by the powers vested in the Legislature of that Province, a Court of Marriage and Divorce was duly constituted. He admitted frankly that this Parliament had the power to repeal that legislation, but up to this moment they had not done so, and there existed in that Province a Court having the power not only to grant divorce, but to make provision for alimony, and possessing all the other powers incident to these questions, as adjudged in the Court of Divorce in England. Now, if the Legislature of the Dominion had the power to deprive a husband of a portion of his estate, what was to prevent their ignoring altogether a divorce in Nova Scotia, or of undertaking to say a divorce should be given where it had been refused by the decree of that Court? The Divorce Court in Nova Scotia would be a nullity if, by an Act of Parliament, passed by gentlemen who had, in all probability, not read the evidence nor had an opportunity of seeing the witnesses, and comparing the respective merits of each party, the solemn decision of the Court, duly constituted and vested with full authority to determine these questions, could be set aside by this House. In many States in the

neighbouring Union, it had been determined, and rightly so, that, when the legislative authority had once parted with its power in the question of divorce, and other kindred questions, and conferred such powers on the judicial authority appointed by them, the judiciary was vested with full power and authority previously held by the Legislature, without interference by the latter. And it must be so; otherwise, the Legislature would be continually setting aside the decisions of Courts legally constituted for the very purpose of giving such decisions. And that would be exactly the position of the Legislature in respect to the Court of Chancery of Ontario, if the Bill now before the House were passed. The disposition of property being a civil right, this Parliament had no authority to say that the property of an individual, separate from his wife, should be transferred, by the legislation of this House, to a third party. He was, therefore, of opinion that it would be unconstitutional, and in excess of the authority of this Parliament to decree the payment of alimony, in any form, by the man Campbell to the suppliant, Mrs. Campbell. The competency and jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery in Ontario was recognised to determine this question; had been recognised by the suppliant in this case, as she had gone into that Court and endeavoured to assert her right. She gave what she thought was necessary evidence; but the decree of the Court showed that the suppliant was not entitled to this portion of her husband's property, not because the law said she was not entitled to alimony, but because she had forfeited the rights which she would otherwise have. This Act went further. Not content with declaring that Mr. Campbell's property should be taken from him, it declared in what form it should be done. Such legislation on the part of this Parliament would clearly be *ultra vires*. If he understood the Constitution at all, nothing was more sacredly reserved to the legislation of the Provinces, than the control and management of the property of the inhabitants thereof. But this Bill, after declaring that Campbell should pay a certain amount to his wife, declared, also, if he did not pay it—even if misfortune should sweep away his property, and he should become unable to do so—

that he should, on the action of the Courts, be confined to jail for life. because they said that the non-payment of the money would be contempt of Court, subject to imprisonment. This Bill further declared that the real estate and property should be mortgaged by an Act of Parliament; that was, that the land owned in the Province of Ontario, governed by the laws of Ontario, the title to which was fixed by the laws of Ontario, should be subject to a lien created by this Government. He humbly submitted that the Bill was *ultra vires*. He thought this Parliament should hesitate before assuming these powers. With reference to the disposition of the children, he thought the Statutes of Ontario made the most free and ample provision. They declared that the Court of Chancery of that Province, on the application of either the father or the mother, should determine, after ascertaining the facts upon the merits, to whom the custody of the children should be committed. His opinion was that this Parliament had not the power to take this matter out of the hands of the Court of Chancery in Ontario; but, even if they had the power, he should think they would hesitate before asserting it. He trusted, in view of the duty they owed to the Constitution, irrespective entirely of the merits of the case—and he desired to say nothing whatever on the merits as between these parties—that this Parliament would not usurp the powers of the Local Courts in dealing with this matter. With reference to the mode of procedure in this case, this was the first occasion upon which he had had any experience in reference to matters of this kind, and he thought the House would be somewhat surprised at the summary mode in which they were asked to assume jurisdiction in a matter of such vast importance. He presumed every member of this House, and he was sure the people of the country would feel that few questions of a graver character came before Parliament than those which separated and dissolved the marriage tie between man and wife, and which struck at the root of the social ties and the happiness of individuals, at the very root of the happiness of the children which God had given them;

MR. McDONALD.

therefore, he thought they ought to approach a matter of this kind with due consideration, and he would ask members of the House in what position they were upon which to judge on the merits of the case. They were to determine whether or not this woman ought to obtain the alimony she sought. He desired to know how many members of the House had made themselves masters of the evidence sufficiently to determine whether Mrs. Campbell was the woman she asserted herself to be, or whether she was the character her husband asserted her to be. He, after examining the evidence before the country, could only say that he had formed an opinion so adverse to Mrs. Campbell's claims, independently of the relations which now subsisted between them—after the evidence adduced before the Courts, where the question had been thoroughly sifted and discussed, and irrespective of the question of jurisdiction, which he thought inseparable—that he could not, as an honest man, declare she had any right to come to Parliament and complain of the conduct of her husband. He was bound to say that she had forfeited, by her own conduct, the redress she sought there, and which she had sought elsewhere and failed to recover. He had no feeling whatever in the matter, but he thought this Parliament should not forget the important position they occupied as legislators and judges, and that they should not invade the rights of the Provincial Courts and the Provincial Legislatures.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he was considerably surprised that the hon. the Minister of Justice should have waited until the third reading of the Bill to explain to the House his strong objections on constitutional grounds to their entertaining the Bill at all. The measure had been before Parliament since 1876. It had been discussed in the other branch of the Legislature to which, by their rule of practice, they had assigned the duty of investigating cases of this kind. It had been discussed every Session but one since. The constitutional question had been discussed, and they had declared that there was no question but that Parliament had authority to deal with the question of marriage and divorce, and incidents which belonged to

marriage and divorce. It had been suggested that they ought to dispossess themselves of this inconvenient question connected with marriage and transfer it to judicial bodies. He was quite of that opinion after the long experience they had had. But, if they had no constitutional power to deal with the question, how could they give that power to a judicial body which they did not possess themselves? As to the merits of the case, he thought the evidence was abundant. There was no judgment of any Court declaring that this woman had committed the crime of adultery. The evidence satisfied those who heard it that Mrs. Campbell had been the subject of a conspiracy, and that the witnesses had sworn themselves. That point had been determined. Now, what were they asked to do. They were asked to separate these two parties from bed and board; to do precisely that which, by the law of Lower Canada, was done by a decree of the Court, the separation of the marriage tie, in so far that the parties lived separate, were not under the control of each other, were entitled to a share of the marital property, and were restrained from again entering into marriage. Parliament was the only tribunal in this country which could grant her that to which she was entitled, and in this case, what it was within the power of Parliament to do, it was its duty to do. Its duty was to separate these parties, in the form of a Bill, leaving it to them to become reconciled, and declaring it should have no force or effect if they did become reconciled and resumed their original relations.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he must ask that this matter stand over. His opinion was very strong in the same direction as that of the Minister of Justice, and he desired some opportunity of expressing himself at some length. He did not think the public business could be detained longer for the sake of this case.

The hour allotted to Private Bills having expired, the further consideration of the motion was *postponed*.

SUPPLY.—CONCURRENCE.

House resumed the further consideration of Resolution 221, reported from Committee of Supply (May 7th).

MR. MILLS said he must ask for a division, as the papers brought down did not sustain the case of the Government.

MR. McCALLUM said he was surprised at the position taken by the Opposition. Both the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell now wanted to go back on the Government Engineer, under whose directions Mr. Wallace had been employed. They had been glad, on a former occasion, to shelter themselves under the wing of that gentleman, when they gave him as their authority for buying 50,000 tons of steel rails without the sanction of Parliament. As an excuse for this unwarrantable Act, they stated that the engineer had thought they should purchase those steel rails. In the Goderich Harbour matter, in which \$30,000 were squandered, they sheltered themselves under the engineer, and got a letter from him. The hon. member for Bothwell spoke of the independence of Parliament. For the five years the Government were in power, they never heard a word about the independence of Parliament, but now that they were in Opposition, where they would long remain, in the interests of the country, they advocated the independence of Parliament. Mr. Wallace had been sent for by the engineer, to act in the public service; he worked eight months, paid his own expenses, and the engineer certified to his account. Did the people expect a man to work eight months for nothing? He (Mr. McCallum) held in his hands that infamous letter that was written to John Stewart by a Prime Minister, and shown to the electors of Norfolk when Mr. Wallace was a candidate for that county, in which letter it was intimated that Wm. Wallace was a defaulter to the amount of \$59,000; and now, when, after an investigation had taken place, he stood before the country as an honest man, his character cleared of the slanderous imputation, and it was proved the Government owed him a large sum of money, they tried to make a point, and to show that they had some grounds for writing this letter.

Question *put*, and motion to concur in the Resolution *agreed to*, on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messrs.

Allison	Lane
Arkell	Lantier
Baby	Little
Baker	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Bannerman	McDonald (C. Breton)
Benoit	McDonald (Pictou)
Bergeron	McCallum
Bergin	McCarthy
Bill	McCuaig
Bolduc	McInnes
Boulthbee	McKay
Bourbeau	McLennan
Bowell	McLeod
Burnham	McQuade
Caron	McRory
Cimon	Massue
Colby	Merner
Connell	Mongenais
Costigan	Montplaisir
Coughlin	Mousseau
Coupal	O'Connor
Coursol	Orton
Currier	Quimet
Cuthbert	Patterson (Essex)
Daoust	Perreault
Dawson	Pinsonneault
DeCosmos	Platt
Desaulniers	Plumb
Desjardins	Pope (Compton)
Dewdney	Richey
Domville	Robertson (Hamilton)
Drew	Robinson
Dubuc	Robitaille
Elliott	Ross (Dundas)
Farrow	Rouleau
Ferguson	Routhier
Fitzsimmons	Ryan (Marquette)
Fortin	Rykert
Fulton	Shaw
Gault	Skinner
Gigault	Sproule
Gill	Stephenson
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Strange
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Tellier
Grandbois	Thompson (Cariboo)
Hay	Tilley
Hesson	Tupper
Hilliard	Valin
Hooper	Vallée
Houde	Wade
Hurteau	Wallace (W. York)
Jones	White (Cardwell)
Kaulback	White (E. Hastings)
Keeler	White (N. Renfrew)
Kilvert	Williams
Kranz	Wright.—114
Landry	

NAYS :

Messrs.

Anglin	Cartwright
Bain	Cassey
Bourassa	Casgrain
Bunster	Chandler
Burk	Christie
Burpee (St. John)	Cockburn (Muskoka)
Burpee (Sunbury)	Dumont

MR. MCCALLUM.

Fleming	Oliver
Galbraith	Olivier
Geoffrion	Pickard
Gillies	Rinfret
Gunn	Robertson (Shelburne)
Guthrie	Rogers
Holton	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Huntington	Rymal
Killam	Scriver
LaRue	Thompson (Haldim'nd)
Mackenzie	Trow.—37
Mills	

Resolution read the first and second times, and agreed to.

On Resolution 222, Intercolonial Railway, \$132,474.02,

MR. MACKENZIE said, with regard to this item, it embraced the sum of \$101,753 for the payment of the award in the case of Boggs & Murray. He had stated briefly, the other evening, what he had to say on this point, with the expectation that concurrence would not be taken on this item for two or three days yet. He had been utterly unable to read the documents, they were so voluminous, and on account of the pressing work of the House. At the present moment, he must content himself with saying that he believed a fatal blunder was made in this case. He was firmly convinced that the public suffered a grievous wrong by taking the case out of Court, and disregarding the order of the Judge as to the remittance of this subject to the Registrar, and then taking it back to the Court to be dealt with on its merits. He need not discuss it now further than to enter his protest against this mode of settling a case which was once entered in the Exchequer Court, to be dealt with, as all other cases were dealt with, under an order from the Judges. He believed the case was mismanaged in not having sent from the Department of Public Works the Chief Engineer and his assistant, the present Chief Engineer of that road, both to attend to the evidence that was being given and to give evidence themselves. Sending subordinate engineers in a case where there was \$100,000 involved, seemed to him a very extraordinary act of negligence on the part of the Government. He believed it had resulted in the country being amerced in a large amount for damages where there was, perhaps, none, or if any, an extremely

small sum, due. He would, therefore, content himself for the present with this brief statement of his views, and allow the item to pass on a division.

Resolution read the first and second times, and agreed to, on a division.

Resolutions 223 to 234 read the first and second times, and agreed to.

On Resolution 235, To pay arrears of wages to L. D. Audy, \$230,

MR. MACKENZIE: I want that item to pass on a division, because I do not believe it is due.

Resolution read the first and second times, and agreed to, on a division.

Resolutions 236 to 252 read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolutions 253 and 254, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

Resolutions 255 to 272 read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Resolutions 273 to 293, 2 and 42, (May 8th) read the first and second times, and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that on Monday next Government notices of motions, and Government Orders have precedence next after Routine business.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Tilley.)

Bill (No. 63) To grant certain powers to La Société Permanent de Construction du District d'Iberville.—(Mr. Mousseau.)

MOIRA RIVER TIMBER DUES BILL.

(BILL 49.)

(Mr. McCuaig)

THIRD READING.

Order for House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill read.

MR. HOLTON said this Bill caused considerable discussion in the commencement of the Session, and he had been led to understand that some compromise had been effected, and that the Bill had been dropped.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the matter had been settled, and it had been agreed that the Bill should be allowed to pass.

MR. MCCUAIG said that, before the Committee, the town of Belleville was represented by its solicitor, and they came to an agreement, and this Bill was the result.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) said that the parties interested thought it would be better to get this Bill through, in order that they might have the matter finally settled.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

House adjourned at
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, 10th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INSOLVENT ACT AMENDMENT.

MOTION TO INTRODUCE BILL.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to further

amend the Insolvent Act of 1875. He said the object of the Bill was simply to carry out, as far as possible at this late stage of the proceedings, the object the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) had in introducing his Bill some time ago. It was for the purpose of doing away with the great evil under the law of official assignees. This would prevent assignees being appointed by creditors to take charge of an estate, also the discharge under the Act applying to any debt due by a person who was not a trader.

MR. HOLTON said this Bill, which was one of urgency, should have been brought in by the Government. He was entirely in sympathy with its object, but thought that, in the hands of a private member, it could be hardly expected to pass by unanimous consent. The Government, with its control of the days remaining for consideration of public business, would obtain from the House a consideration which it would not yield to an individual member.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the amendment appeared to him to be in accordance with the sentiment of the House, as expressed by their vote in favour of the repeal of the Insolvent Law. It removed the principal evil complained of in the present law, and he could not understand how hon. gentlemen, who were opposed to the continuance of the present law, should object to this amendment, which cured the defect in the present law which was the main cause of their opposition to it—the appointments of official assignees.

MR. CASEY said he quite agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for Chateaugay (Mr. Holton). The Government had, to a certain extent, committed themselves in favour of the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), and it was their duty to introduce this amendment.

MR. DREW said the House had decidedly voted against having any Insolvent Law, and, if the Senate choose to reject the Bill repealing the law which was carried here, they should bear the responsibility. He objected to the Bill being introduced.

MR. ROBERTSON.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he was therefore obliged to withdraw the Bill. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Drew) would have to take the responsibility of his course.

Motion *withdrawn*.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED.

MR. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker,—It is not my intention, at this late period of the Session, to occupy the time of the House at any great length in discussing the very important questions which these resolutions present for its consideration. I may say, in the first place, that the question is one that is rendered thoroughly familiar to the minds of all hon. members from the reports which I have presented to the House, whereby I have endeavoured to convey to hon. gentlemen the information of which the Government was in possession, in order that they might be as fully prepared as I am to consider the question; and, in the second place, important and great as is the question, I do not believe that any laboured argument will be required at my hands in order to commend the propositions which the Government submit, to the favourable consideration of hon. members on both sides of the House. It will be remembered that, after the Union of the British North American Provinces, as at first embraced, the general opinion and sentiment of the people was that it was exceedingly desirable that the North-West Territory should be added to the Dominion, and measures were taken which, I believe, met with the approval of all political parties for the purpose of acquiring that vast territory. Then it was felt on the part of the then Government, led by the right hon. gentleman who is now the head of the present Administration, that the consolidation of British North America would be incomplete; that the consolidation of British power on this continent would be incomplete if the Pacific coast Province of British Columbia were not added to the Confederation. When the addition of that Province to the other united Provinces was brought under consideration, it was found that

to have a real union between that Province and the other portions of Canada, a line of communication of some kind was indispensable, and to make that line valuable it must be a railway. The Government addressed themselves to the duty of devising measures by which that might be accomplished, but when they pledged themselves in good faith to British Columbia to promote the construction of that line of interoceanic railway, they were under the impression that the question was much easier of solution than it has since proved to be. The Government believed that by appropriating 50,000,000 acres of land, and \$30,000,000 of the public money, parties would be found who would take the scheme up as a private enterprise, and carry it to completion. It may be said that those opinions were not well founded; but the Government, at that time, believed they were well founded, and that they had abundant evidence that this great work could be accomplished in that way. Those expectations were not realised, and I need not say to the House we have been disappointed in accomplishing the construction of the work in the way it was then proposed. Hon. gentlemen opposite who succeeded us in power, recognised not only the great importance to the whole of Canada of carrying to completion the building of the great Pacific Railway, but also that in the position they then occupied, good faith with that Province involved the necessity of carrying it forward by another measure, having that object in view. That measure was very widely different from the proposal of their predecessors, which was to give a limited amount of public money and land for the purpose of constructing the railway; but the Government, of which the present leader of the Opposition was the head, brought forward a Bill and carried it through Parliament, not only recommitting the Government to accomplish the construction of the railway, but providing the means and giving the authority to construct it as a Government work. At the end of five years, my right hon. friend the First Minister, who first proposed this great measure, finds himself again charged with the responsibility of dealing with the subject, but he finds it in a different

position from that which the question occupied when he dealt with it before. When he previously undertook it, the right hon. gentleman believed that the work could be accomplished by a limited obligation on the part of this country, and not only limited, but limited within those reasonable bounds that everybody felt the country might safely undertake. It is not my purpose to offer the slightest word of animadversion upon the course which the late Government pursued on this question. I am free to confess that, when the Administration of my right hon. friend first inaugurated this policy and committed the country to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was apparently much easier of accomplishment than it has since proved to be. I am also free to confess that when the late Government were charged with the responsibility of dealing with the question, having found the country already committed to the construction of the work, and feeling compelled to carry it out by any means which might be found feasible, they directed their efforts with a sincere and anxious desire, as far as the position of the country admitted, to carry out the obligations undertaken.

MR. DECOSMOS: No, no.

MR. TUPPER: As I have already said, when the right hon. the First Minister has again come to deal with the subject, he finds it in an altered position from that which it formerly occupied. I will briefly refer to the amount of public money required in order to carry to completion works already undertaken, and contracts to which the country is now pledged. The amount of money required to complete the road from the shores of Lake Superior, at Kamistiquia or Thunder Bay, to Red River, is estimated, in round numbers, with a fair equipment, to cost about \$18,000,000. To that, of course, the country is committed. It was impossible for the First Minister to hesitate, for a single moment, when he found that 185 miles in the middle of that section of country was required to make effectual the large expenditure already incurred, both east and west, to fill in that gap as rapidly as possible, in order to make those portions

of road already built available for the purpose for which they were intended. The subsidy to the Canada Central, to which the country was committed by the late Government, is about \$1,500,000. The Georgian Bay Branch, with a canal at French River, with a fair equipment, is estimated to cost \$1,900,000. The Pembina Branch, with an allowance for a fair amount of rolling stock, is estimated at \$1,750,000. The cost of the Pacific Railway Telegraph contracts, of which 1,300 miles have been already constructed, will reach \$1,100,000. The rails delivered at British Columbia will cost \$345,000, and exploration surveys up to the end of the year \$3,861,000, making the total sum of money expended and required to complete the engagements already entered into to render the work effectual, \$28,456,000. Now, as I have said, it would be quite impossible for the Government, for a single moment, to hesitate as to what was their duty in regard to this question. First, there is still the importance of constructing this great work, admitted by all political parties; second, there is the fact of the good faith of the country being pledged to the Province of British Columbia to carry as rapidly as possible the railway to completion; and, third, the large expenditure already involved to carry it out. Under these circumstances, Sir, the Government were obliged to address themselves to the important question of how this object could be attained, good faith with British Columbia maintained, the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway accomplished, and, at the same time, measures adopted that would prevent the financial condition of this country being seriously embarrassed or imperilled. The Government have addressed themselves to the consideration of this question in the most careful and attentive manner, and the result of their deliberations is now submitted in the form of these resolutions to the House. I may say, Sir, it is not surprising that the building of a Canadian Pacific Railway should have commended itself not only to one side of the House, not only to one great party, but to both the great parties, into which this Dominion is divided, when we recollect the great facilities that existed for the construction of such a work, as well

as the great importance of carrying it to completion. Now, I may say here, as I have said before, that it is not my intention to call in question the efforts that have been made by my predecessors in relation to this work. I recognise, to the fullest extent, the serious responsibilities thrown upon them when they came into power, and I am prepared to recognise the efforts they made to carry this work forward.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. TUPPER: I know from the voice I hear behind me that their efforts have not been sufficient to satisfy British Columbia. I am aware that a great deal of uneasiness and apprehension has been excited in that Province, not only with reference to the action of the late Government, but with reference to the probable action of this Government. But I do trust that our friends in British Columbia will feel that they must not look at this question from the favourable point of view from which we were able to look at it several years ago when it was first introduced; but that they must look at it surrounded with the difficulties that have since presented themselves in carrying it out. They must remember the fact that in relation to railway enterprise on this continent a great change of opinion has taken place among British capitalists and among the capitalists of the world; that it was much easier a few years ago to bring foreign capital into this country to promote a work of this kind than it is to-day. They must recognise the fact, that in the changed financial position of Canada, we must all bow to the inevitable in relation to a question of such magnitude as this, and provided they find the Government of the day earnestly making efforts to accomplish that work, they must be satisfied, although those efforts should not be commensurate with their reasonable expectations a few years ago. I have no hesitation in saying that the work I have referred to, as involving an expenditure of over \$28,000,000 of public money, has largely contributed to remove the difficulties and promote the progress of the entire undertaking. I believe, that as we originally looked to the development of the great North-West as the only basis upon which any Government or company could undertake

MR. TUPPER.

the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so we cannot but regard the expenditure of \$18,000,000 of public money in permeating that difficult, almost inaccessible, district of country between Lake Superior and the Red River, as money expended in a way that is most likely to so develop, so improve, and so people the great fertile country of the North-West as to give us a substantial basis upon which we may hope to succeed in permeating the still more difficult and extensive region from the Rocky Mountains down to the shores of the Pacific. And, although this expenditure of public money has not been made within the Province of British Columbia, I am free to say that that expenditure, in my judgment, has been made in a way much better calculated to secure the actual realisation of this work than if every dollar had been expended in British Columbia, commencing at the shores of the Pacific, because no expenditure in British Columbia could materially contribute to the opening up of that great North-West region upon the development, and upon the peopling of which must necessarily depend the successful prosecution of that gigantic undertaking the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, I have stated that we have great advantages in the construction of such a work as this. There has been a great advance made within the past five years; not only have we accomplished an important work in providing for an early, rapid and easy communication through our own country, from the shores of Lake Superior to the Red River, but we have acquired information with reference to the North-West Territories, which is invaluable in its character. High as was our estimate a few years ago, high as was the opinion we were warranted in entertaining as to the capabilities of the great North-West, we were comparatively ignorant of the vast extent of fertile lands of that country. The surveys which have been made, though attended with a large amount of expenditure, are cheap compared with that which has really been accomplished; inasmuch as that we can only hope for the successful accomplishment of this great work, by showing to the world the value and character of that country. I hold that the explorations that have

been made, and the increased knowledge we possess of its resources, place us in a position to appeal to capitalists much more confidently and successfully for this great work, than would otherwise be the case. I do not now intend to criticise at any length the course taken by the late Government, but I may say that these resolutions propose a divergence in one particular from the policy of four predecessors, and that is, that while carrying out their policy so far as the line from Lake Superior to the Red River goes, I propose a slight deviation, going west from Red River, from that which was originally intended. I am not prepared to say that the engineers were not perfectly right in the line they located. I am not prepared to say that the original intention of locating the line by way of the Narrows of Lake Manitoba was not right and proper, provided we were in a position to carry out, as we hoped we would, the rapid construction, by means of a company, of this interoceanic railway from end to end. But we find ourselves brought face to face with the fact that a change has come over the spirit of the world in reference to railway enterprise on this continent, and that whereas it was comparatively easy, five or six years ago, to draw capital into this country for railway enterprises, it is now almost impossible to do so. That change having taken place, I think we must deviate from our original plan and, in order to secure the rapid construction of this work, combine to a greater extent than originally intended, our progress across the great prairie country of the North-West with a system of colonisation; and though that may add a few miles, here or there, to the length of the line to be constructed, it will carry it through the districts that will best afford a basis for rapid colonisation upon which we can rest, and to which alone I look, as the only means by which successfully, in our time, at all events, one may be able to achieve the construction of this railway. Now, Sir, I believe there will not be any great difference of opinion on this point. I am satisfied hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with us, that whether the line goes to the Narrows or the south of Lake Manitoba, in the first instance the true

policy of the country is to find the best line of railway for settlement across the prairie region of the North-West. I will, therefore, address myself to the third and last difficulty, that of the selection of the route through British Columbia. It is stated in the *Globe* that these resolutions indicate in a clear and unmistakeable manner that we have abandoned the line to Burrard Inlet and adopted Bute Inlet as the terminus of the road. I have no hesitation in saying that these resolutions contain no *arrière pensée*. The views held by the Government are embodied in the resolutions I offer to the House. Had it been decided to reject the location of the route established by hon. gentlemen opposite, the Government would have cancelled the Order in Council, locating the route to Burrard Inlet, and stated frankly their intention not to go to Burrard Inlet, but to Bute Inlet. They have not arrived at that conclusion. They have arrived at the only conclusion that the selection of the Burrard Inlet route was premature. I am not prepared to say that if I had been in the position of the late Government—for I admit the uneasiness and anxiety felt in British Columbia imposed great and serious pressure on hon. gentlemen in the selection of that route—that if I had been brought face to face with the question, and it was held to be indispensable to then select the route, I would not have adopted the route with the information then possessed, which the late Government adopted. What I do blame hon. gentlemen opposite for is this, that they rejected the suggestions made two years ago by the present First Minister and myself, that before the final location of the route, and the large expenditure involved on the Burrard Inlet route, the season should have been utilised, by having a thorough examination made of the country lying to the North of Fort George, and in the region of the Pine and Peace River passes. I think there was abundant ground for maintaining the absolute necessity of an immediate and most careful exploration survey in order to ascertain precisely the character of the country in the region of the Pine and Peace River passes, before the final location of the line was made. I do not intend to enter into the technical details of the question,

MR. TUPPER.

because the engineers' reports give the information with greater accuracy than I could give it; but I may say why I regard the location of Burrard Inlet as premature. There are practically but three routes before the House and country, for consideration. After all the examination made of the subject, it has resolved itself into a choice between three routes, Burrard Inlet, Bute Inlet at Waddington Harbour, or the route to Port Simpson to the north. I leave out of the question the easier, shorter, and, perhaps, the best line of all, that to the Dean Channel, because the reports go to show that navigation to that point will be obstructed by an archipelago of islands in that neighbourhood.

MR. MACKENZIE: You mean that navigation is obstructed during the winter.

MR. TUPPER: The navigation of Dean Channel is so obstructed by an archipelago of islands as to render it practically unfit for the terminus of the Pacific Railway. There is, moreover, the further difficulty that the approach is obstructed by ice during the winter. There can be no doubt that Burrard Inlet possesses many advantages over the Bute Inlet route.

MR. BUNSTER: No.

MR. TUPPER: I hear an emphatic "No," but perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to state the impression on my mind, and I will listen with great attention to any information which may be given on that question by any hon. gentleman who holds a different opinion. I regard the Burrard Inlet route as preferable to that by Bute Inlet, in regard to distance. It is fifty-seven miles shorter to Port Moody at Burrard Inlet than to Waddington Harbour at Bute Inlet, taking into account the three miles saved in consequence of the exploration of last summer, and if the railway were at Burrard Inlet, there would be only eighty miles of navigation from Port Moody down to Victoria or Esquimalt, while you have to add about 180 miles more of navigation from the Bute Inlet Terminus at Waddington Harbour to reach Esquimalt. I am also free to admit that in point of gra-

dients, a most important point, the Burrard Inlet route, so far as our information goes, has a great advantage over that to Bute Inlet. It will be difficult to obtain on a portion of the last named route, grades easier than 100ft. to the mile, while on the Burrard Inlet line the grades will not exceed 52ft. to the mile.

MR. DECOSMOS : What about curvature ?

MR. TUPPER : I am not informed that the Burrard Inlet route involves any serious curvature which would materially interfere with the operation of the line. There is a considerable section of wheat-growing country in the region of Kamloops, to which the late Government proposed to construct 125 miles of road from Yale. But while I admit there is a great advantage, both in point of distance and of grades, in favour of Burrard Inlet, I cannot conceal from myself that there is a very grave objection to that route. The approach to Burrard Inlet involves the passage of the island of San Juan, and although, today, and I hope for many years to come, we will enjoy the most amicable and peaceful relations with our friends to the south of us, yet, as this will be a great national highway, and as a great expenditure of British capital will be involved, I feel we ought not to lose sight of the fact that at some remote period those who come after us may find our friends to the south not animated by those purely commercial and peaceful sentiments which, we are glad to know, at present prevail. I regard, therefore, the possession of that island by the Government of the United States, and the fact that communication from the sea to the terminus of the railway would be under the control of the fortifications of a foreign power, as serious obstructions. And I cannot regard with indifference the fact that, when we have expended a hundred millions on the extension of the line to the Pacific, and before we have reached Burrard Inlet, we have reached a point at which it is perfectly easy for our American neighbours to tap our line by a road of 50 or 60 miles in length, and carry our traffic down to Holmes Harbour, which is to be the terminus of the Northern Pacific now under construction through the United States, and which, should our line

be so tapped, would become a new San Francisco, literally built up with Canadian trade. Now, I am not willing to see the two termini of the Canadian inter-oceanic railway system in the United States, one terminus at Portland and the other at Holmes Harbour. I believe if it can be done, it is highly desirable that we should not place ourselves in such a position as that, and I look upon the points I have referred to as very important and very great obstacles in the way of the adoption of that line. But while I have stated that the length of railway by Burrard Inlet is shorter, and the grades easier, there is a more important question still than the question of length and grade, to which I wish to draw the attention of the House; and that is the question of traffic. It is better to spend our money in the construction of a longer road, involving more severe grades, if, notwithstanding the length and the grades, we are going to have a greater traffic for the road. The great difficulty that presents itself to my mind in the consideration of this question, is this: It is a long distance, by any route one can find, from the Pacific, before you reach a country that can be looked upon with any confidence as furnishing the traffic and business by which the Canadian Pacific Railway must be sustained. I regret, therefore, deeply, that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, two years ago, when my right hon. friend, Sir John A. Macdonald and I, and other members in this House, urged him to do so, did not spend the season he expended in exploring the Fraser and the present location of the line, in making a full examination of the country in the region of the Red River and Peace River passes. Had that been done, we would have been in a better position to deal with this question than we are to-day. If it should prove—as we have reason to assume it will—that by the adoption of the Bute Inlet route, or the other route to which I have referred, we can materially shorten the distance between the coast of the Pacific and a section of the country to which we may fairly look for a large amount of traffic to sustain the railway, then we would be warranted in building a longer line or taking the severe grades to which I have advert-

ed. We, therefore, propose to ask the House to allow us to make a rapid exploration of that district before we finally decide the question as to whether the road is to go by the route adopted by our predecessors or by some other route. Then there is the important question of Port Simpson. The line to Port Simpson might be somewhat longer, but there are few persons who will not admit that if a line can be found, that, though somewhat longer, that would not only cost less money, but would bring us, regarding this as a great line of interoceanic communication, a great deal nearer to the east than any other line now proposed it is worthy of consideration. It is a matter of no little importance, and it is a matter which gives us no little confidence in the enterprise, to know that any one of the routes to which I have adverted, the Burrard Inlet line, the Bute Inlet line, or the line to Port Simpson, will provide a shorter line of communication between the great centre of commerce of the United States, New York, and the eastern world, than any other route. It is a matter of no little importance to know that, notwithstanding the construction of the present Pacific Railway in the United States to San Francisco, parties from New York wishing to go to the east would shorten the distance very materially by adopting any one of the routes I have named. By adopting one of these routes they will find the distance from New York to Japan 650 miles shorter than by any route the United States can afford. So far as European traffic is concerned, the citizens of London, the citizens of Great Britain, will find that they can reach China and Japan by the line of the Canadian Pacific, and over Canadian soil from Halifax, instead of the line now existing to San Francisco, and effect a saving of over 1,200 miles. I look upon this as an important point, and one that ought to inspire Canadians with confidence in the ultimate success of this great national work. Now, Sir, I do not intend, at this moment, to go further into that question. Having laid before the House fairly and frankly, and without reserve, the position of the Government in relation to it, I may say now that we ask the permission of the House to let a contract, not exceeding 125 miles,

MR. TUPPER.

in British Columbia. We do that because, in the excited condition of feeling in British Columbia, in consequence of the long delays to which the people of that Province have been subjected, we feel ourselves compelled—just as the late Government felt themselves compelled when they adopted a location and prepared to run a line from Yale to Kamloops—I say we feel ourselves obliged to pledge ourselves to British Columbia, that the construction shall be commenced during the present season.

MR. DECOSMOS: Where?

MR. TUPPER: In British Columbia. I have already told the hon. gentleman as distinctly as I can, that we do not know where. I may say the line from Yale to Kamloops is ready for construction. The quantities have been taken out, and it is in such a condition that we may fairly invite contractors to deal with it from a practical and business point of view. I may also tell my hon. friend that at this moment the staff of the Department is engaged in taking out the quantities on a section of the line on the Bute Inlet route, in order to have it prepared to submit to the contractors, so that the contract can be pushed forward if we adopt that route, and if we decide that the interest of the country would be promoted by the abandonment of the decision of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the adoption of the more national line by Bute Inlet. I do not underrate the importance of the fact, that the line from Bute Inlet means a longer course of navigation to Victoria, or the construction of a railway on Vancouver's Island. But taking all these questions into consideration, the Government feel they would not be discharging the duty they owed to the country in relation to the railway if they did not first ask permission to make an exploration before carrying out the work which they stand pledged to carry out in good faith, and placing this season under contract a substantial part of the road in British Columbia. I have not, in my remarks, reflected on the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. They charged us with having imposed obligations on them, and called on us to aid them to carry out this great work; and now we may in turn fairly ask the support of the hon. gentle-

men opposite. They must not forget, that, although we incurred a limited liability, amounting to \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land, it was agreed that the work should be accomplished by the agency of a private company which was to provide the additional capital required, and incur all liability and risk above and beyond our contributions to carry out the work; yet when they assumed power they increased very largely that liability for the purpose of satisfying the views of the people of British Columbia and meeting the views of the Imperial Government. They placed an absolute and binding obligation on this country to construct 2,000 miles of railway, from Lake Superior to the Pacific, by 1890, within fourteen years from the date at which it was entered into, and that without any reservation whatever, and solely upon the responsibility of the Government. I only recall this fact to the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite as the ground I have for asking their aid in carrying any measures to accomplish the great work to which both political parties have been irretrievably committed by the action of the Governments representing those parties. I may be asked how we propose to build the railway without entailing on the country such financial burdens as it is unable to bear. We revert largely to our original policy. We believed at the outset that the vast fertile territories of the North-West would furnish the means to a very large extent to construct this interoceanic highway. We believe that, to-day, being now in possession of increased information beyond that which we possessed five years ago, and from the opinions expressed by authorities who are well able to judge, we have vast regions only partially explored which are not second to any lands in the West. We believe we have there the garden of the world. We believe we have something like 180,000,000 acres of land which, in regard to fertility and grain-bearing qualities, are equal to any on the face of the globe. We believe, therefore, we are justified in considering that, by a wise arrangement for the utilisation of that land, we may make it, to a very large extent, provide for the construction of the Pacific Railway without imposing, at all events, any large additional burden to

that which has been already incurred in connection with this work. I believe those who have watched the progress of that country under all the great disabilities under which it has laboured for the last few years, will feel I am not over-sanguine when I express the hope, that with these new and increased facilities, and, with the co-operation of the Imperial Government, we may rapidly fill up the country with an industrious population, which will prove a source of wealth, and provide a substantial basis for the construction of the railway. I have adverted in these resolutions to the national character of the work, and the ground Canada has for asking further substantial aid from the Imperial Government in regard to it. I have pointed to the fact that it will open up the nearest means of access between Great Britain and her dependencies in the Pacific. It will bring the Imperial authorities 1,200 miles nearer to China and Japan than by any other route across this continent, and it will provide comfortable and happy homes for the suffering millions of the United Kingdom in our North-West Territories. Hon. gentlemen are aware of the fact that, on a comparatively recent occasion, a large deputation brought before the attention of Lord Derby the unprecedented extent of distress existing among the working classes, whereupon that eminent nobleman, who has devoted much attention to the improvement of the condition of the labouring people, stated that he looked forward to a well devised and systematic system of emigration from the British Isles as the only substantial means of affording relief to that over-peopled and suffering country. I believe, when we present this policy, and say that, while thousands of people in the United Kingdom are in a state of enforced idleness, the construction of the Pacific Railway would afford them immediate employment, and, at the same time, develop on this continent a great British power, we will present a scheme which will not be regarded with disfavour. It has long been the pride of every British subject that whenever a slave touches British soil, in any part of the world, his shackles fall away. So I say we in Canada have greater pride in knowing that the thorn of the feet of the

most discontented British subjects touch Canadian soil, that discontent disappears, and no sooner do they realise the fact that they are in possession of the fullest freedom and the means of successful employment, than they become truly loyal to the British Crown. It is the pride and boast of Canada to-day that, while the great parties of this country—the party represented by gentlemen opposite, a party greater in point of influence and numbers than their relative representation in this House at the present moment, would indicate—while that great party may differ from us on political questions, and while the party led by my right hon. friend the Premier may believe that the interests of the country are safer in his hands than in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite; while we may differ on questions of fiscal policy, and as to whether Free-trade or Protection to our industries is the wiser course, there is one thing upon which we all agree, and that is pride in British institutions, and a determination to uphold them. It cannot be an object of indifference to Great Britain that this country presents an opportunity, not only of thinning the over-populated districts of the British Islands, but of attracting Frenchmen from France, Germans from Germany, and, in fact, people of all nationalities from the overcrowded populations of Europe, to settle on British soil, and become loyal and devoted supporters of the British Crown and of British institutions. Although we possess a population of but 4,000,000 at this moment, it was but yesterday that men of all parties loyally determined to spring to the support of England and the Empire in a prospective European struggle. The loyal volunteers of this country then by tens of thousands offered to go to any part of the world to assist in fighting the battles of England, and I am sure the time has come when the Empire regards the determination on the part of Canada to maintain and uphold British institutions here and British power elsewhere as a source of strength to England. The time has, therefore, come when Great Britain cannot look with indifference upon the question whether millions from the overcrowded districts of Europe shall settle here on the fertile prairies of the

North-West and build up a great British power on this side of the water, or whether they shall be transferred in another direction to promote the commercial prosperity and increase the power and strength of a country which, although at this moment enjoying the most peaceful relations with England, may at any time be in a position to imperil her interests. I believe that, under these circumstances, we may look with confidence to the action of England in this matter, and, considering that Canada is at this moment committed to a large expenditure, in permeating the best and more accessible portions of the fertile prairies of the North-West, we may ask the Imperial Government to give us substantial aid, or to give us a guarantee, which will cost the Empire nothing, to assist us in reaching the rich prairies of the North-West by penetrating the Rocky Mountains, from the Pacific coast. And, Sir, we can go to the Mother Country with additional confidence, seeing that, again and again having received her endorsement of our bonds, we have always maintained our credit, and have never allowed England to be called upon to contribute a single dollar in consequence of any guarantee she has given us. Under these circumstances, we look with confidence to the Mother Country as a source to which we are entitled to look for substantial aid in the construction of the work. But we are not only prepared to give the sound, untarnished credit of Canada in support of any aid or assistance we may ask, but we are prepared to place at the bottom of that national credit of Canada one hundred millions of acres of the most fertile land in the world. Exception may be taken to the appropriation of such a large extent of land for the building of this road, as exception was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to the appropriation of fifty million acres of land to be under the control of a company. We do not propose here to put the land under the control of a company, although I confess, so far as I am concerned, I would be glad, did the condition of things permit of it, if a company liberally aided could be found to take this work up, and, at their own responsibility and risk, carry it to completion. But, in the absence of that means of attaining our object, we believe we are right in placing in the

hands of a Commission—on which the Imperial Government shall be with us jointly represented—a hundred million acres of land for the construction of this work. Why, if we gave the whole of the land in the North-West for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it would be better than to leave those immense fertile districts untrodden, for I may say an age to come, neither contributing to the benefit of the world or the consolidation of British power and the extension of British interests on this continent. That being the case, Sir, I believe we have a substantial basis to which we can look for the building of the road. Exception may be taken to the minimum price of two dollars an acre, but who is there who will not say, looking to the character of that land in the North-West, that the settler will prefer to give two dollars an acre for land within twenty miles of a railway that will carry his produce to market, than have as a free gift land without railway facilities. We may, therefore, fairly utilise that great work in such a way as will thus promote the settlement of these lands. I may be told that the purchasers of this land will lock it up. They cannot afford to do that, Sir. It is only by settlement that the purchaser can make the land more valuable; and if they do lock it up they will only be contributing to build the railway and to give railway communication to the rest of the country still left untouched. The House will see, Sir, that we have not increased the amount since our former proposition. Then we proposed to give a company fifty million acres in alternate blocks, the Government reserving the alternate blocks. Now, in the changed condition of things, we utilise the whole immediately, and propose to make it form a substantial basis for the building of the road, not quite covering the views of my friend from South Norfolk, but looking in the direction of making the land and the road the basis of credit upon which to obtain the money necessary for the purpose of accomplishing the construction of this great national highway, which alone can make the land of any value. I do not, Sir, intend, at this late period of the Session, to detain the House any further, but feeling that

hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to give their cordial support to the Government on the main features of this great question, however we may differ on some of the minutiae; feeling that we are agreed in the necessity of immediate action, and in such a way as to promote the prosperity of our country, and looking to hon. gentlemen opposite as not prepared to take any serious objection to the proposals I submit, I beg leave to submit the following Resolutions:

"1. *Resolved*, That engagements have been entered into with British Columbia as a condition of union with Canada, that a line of railway to connect the Atlantic with the Pacific shall be constructed with all practical speed.

"2. *Resolved*, That the Pacific Railway would form a great imperial highway across the continent of America entirely on British soil, and would provide a new and important route from England to Australia, to India and to all the dependencies of Great Britain in the Pacific; as also to China and Japan.

"3. *Resolved*, That reports from the Mother Country set forth an unprecedented state of enforced idleness of the working classes, and the possibility of a scheme of relief on a large scale being found indispensable to alleviate destitution.

"4. *Resolved*, That the construction of the Pacific Railway would afford immediate employment to numbers of workmen, and would open up vast tracts of fertile land for occupation, and thus would form a ready outlet for the over-populated districts of Great Britain and other European countries.

"5. *Resolved*, That it is obvious that it would be of general advantage to find an outlet for the redundant population of the Mother Country within the Empire, and thus build up flourishing colonies on British soil, instead of directing a stream of immigration from England to foreign countries.

"6. *Resolved*, That in view of the importance of keeping good faith with British Columbia, and completing the consolidation of the Confederation of the Provinces in British North America, and for the purpose of extending relief to the unemployed working classes of Great Britain, and affording them permanent homes on British soil; and in view of the national character of the undertaking, the Government of Canada is authorised and directed to use its best efforts to secure the co-operation of the Imperial Government in this great undertaking, and obtain further aid by guarantee or otherwise, in the construction of this great national work.

"7. *Resolved*, That it is further expedient to provide (1) That one hundred million acres of land, and all the minerals they contain, be appropriated for the purposes of constructing the

Canadian Pacific Railway. (2) That the land be vested in Commissioners to be specially appointed, and that the Imperial Government be represented on the Commission. (3) That all the ungranted land within twenty miles of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway belonging to the Dominion be vested in such Commission; and that when the lands along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway are not of fair average quality for settlement, a corresponding quantity of lands of fair quality shall be appropriated in other parts of the country, to the extent in all of 100,000,000 of acres. (4) That said Commissioners be authorised to sell, from time to time, any portions of such land at a price to be fixed by the Governor-in-Council, on their recommendation, at the rate of not less than \$2 per acre; and that they may be required to invest the proceeds of such sales in Canadian Government securities, to be held exclusively for the purpose of defraying the cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

"8. *Resolved*, That the withdrawal for sale and settlement of lands for twenty miles on each side of the located line of the Pacific Railway, has, in part, had the effect of throwing settlements south and west of Lake Manitoba.

"9. *Resolved*, That in the existing state of things, it is desirable to combine the promotion of colonisation with railway construction on the Canada Pacific Railway west of Red River.

"10. *Resolved*, That the Government be authorised and directed to locate a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the Red River westerly, running to the south of Lake Manitoba, with a branch to Winnipeg; and if they deem it advisable to enter into a contract for expending a sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 in constructing the said railway without previously submitting the contracts to Parliament.

"11. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to make further explorations in the Peace and Pine River Districts, and other sections of the country not yet examined, in order to ascertain the feasibility of a line through the largest extent of fertile territory, before beginning the work of construction in British Columbia.

"12. *Resolved*, That in the opinion of the House the selection of the Burrard Inlet terminus was premature.

"13. *Resolved*, That it is necessary to keep good faith with British Columbia, and commence the construction of the railway in that Province as early as is practicable.

"14. *Resolved*, That the Government be authorised and directed to make such further explorations as they may deem necessary for the said purpose, and so soon as they have finally selected and located the line, to enter into contracts for constructing a portion of the same, not exceeding 125 miles, without the further sanction of Parliament, so that the work of construction may, at latest, be commenced during the present season, and, there-
after, be vigorously prosecuted."

MR. MACKENZIE: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. gentleman, but I only regret he has brought up the subject in the last days of the Session, because it is impossible, at this stage, to discuss it in that full and exhaustive manner which the serious changes the hon gentleman has proposed render necessary. I will, before I sit down, refer to the very difficult method which he proposes to adopt, and to the difficulties that must necessarily present themselves to any person in giving to the Government of the day the power which is here solicited. Whatever may be thought of the confidence which the House may possess in the Government, that Government should never presume upon the mere strength of a majority to violate well known constitutional principles.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: One of the resolutions which is here submitted proposes that the House should give the Government the power to give out a contract to build 125 miles of railway, in one of the most difficult countries in the world for railway construction, without a knowledge of the location of the 125 miles, without giving a hint or an idea, far less explicit information, as to the position where it is to commence or where it is to end. Such a power was never solicited, so far as I am aware, by any Government before now. We have, on former occasions, in consequence of our anxiety to proceed with the construction of some portions of this work, sought from the House explicit power to build a certain part in a place well defined; and, when the hon. gentleman last night sought a similar power in respect to a section immediately west of Red River, I did not feel, although the location of the line was somewhat poorly defined, inclined to withhold my own personal consent to his request. But, before discussing further the constitutional difficulties which are involved, I propose to devote a few minutes to considering the general principles of the resolutions, from the point of view which the hon. gentleman has selected. First, let me congratulate the hon. gentleman on the

moderation of his tone. There is nothing like placing a gentleman in a position of responsibility to force him to moderate the terms of his previous fault-finding and denunciations, and to change his style of argument. The hon. gentleman has, to-day, frankly admitted that the late Administration could adopt no other course than the one they pursued. He admitted the extreme difficulties which were placed in the path of that Administration, by the action of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, prior to our advent to office, and that the engagement made with British Columbia to construct a road from Lake Nipissing, in Ontario, to some point on the Pacific coast, within ten years, was an engagement impossible of fulfilment. When we came into office, we found that Parliament was solemnly committed almost to a treaty obligation with that Province, to accomplish this stupendous work. He repeatedly pointed out to the House, and he said it again now, that in no country in the world had such formidable difficulties been experienced in making a survey as what was presented on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Yet we were attacked, year after year by the hon. gentleman and his friends for not having kept faith with British Columbia. Now we are called upon by hon. gentlemen opposite to help them in their difficulties. They will always find that gentlemen on this side will be prepared to consider all such questions from a truly national point of view. We recognise the obligations resting upon us as Canadians, and, while I assert, in the most positive manner, that nothing could have been done by any Administration during our term of office that we did not do, or try to do, in order to accomplish, or realise those expectations which were generated by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, in their admission of British Columbia into the Confederacy, I say, at the same time, that we endeavoured, not merely to keep the national obligations, but we ventured, to a great extent, our own political existence as administrators; we risked our political position for the sake of carrying out to completion, in the best way possible, the course which hon. gentleman opposite had promised should be taken. We knew that, no

matter what course we took, we would be subject to blame either from hon. gentlemen opposite, or from our own friends. We had, on the one hand, to maintain that which was equivalent almost to a treaty obligation with British Columbia, whose population only reached a few thousands.

MR. DECOSMOS: I hope my hon. friend will place British Columbia as it should be before this country. She pays to-day, *per capita*, more than Ontario or any other Province.

MR. MACKENZIE: If I placed some of the British Columbia members in their proper position before this House and country, it might not be a very happy one. Whatever other portions of Canada may have to say in regard to the policy of the late Administration, British Columbia has no ground for any other feeling than one of extreme gratitude. I was aware that there was a strong feeling throughout all the eastern portions of Canada, comprising 4,000,000 inhabitants to a few thousands in British Columbia, that we had undertaken to tax our people for the accomplishment of an object which would have taken the energies of a people of five times our population and wealth. We had to contend with the difficulties incidental to such a position and never received the slightest sympathy, assistance or co-operation from the gentlemen who are now on the Treasury benches. That, however, would be no reason why we should not extend to them different treatment. It is true they are quite independent of our votes. They have a majority which will enable them to carry almost anything they desire, and to plunge this country into a vortex of debt which we may not get out of for half a century to come. I quite admit the serious difficulties which hon. gentlemen opposite have before them in the administration of this part of their public duties, and I warn them that it will be an evil day when we enter recklessly upon an immense expenditure beyond our means, and that, while it may be advisable for the time to continue some portions of the operations in a time when trade is dull, when there seems to be no immediate prospect of relief to our people, it is a very serious matter to undertake

enormous obligations such as those that were incurred in 1872. The hon. gentleman referred to the change of plan, as he calls it, which was adopted by the late Administration, as compared with the plan originated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The plan originated by them was this: Before they obtained any authority from this Parliament at all, they had arranged a plan of giving out a contract for the construction of the entire line to a company, without any competition whatever, paying that company 50,000,000 acres of land and the sum of \$30,000,000 of money as the entire consideration for the building of the road. If the hon. gentlemen had received, to the slightest extent, any encouragement from the capitalists of England to carry out their plan, they might speak with some confidence and assurance of their plan having been afterwards rejected, but they knew very well that, before they left office, the plan had completely broken down; that Sir Hugh Allan, as the chief of that company and some of his associate directors had visited England, had conferred with the leading bankers and capitalists there, had seen all the contractors they could, and came back without a single ray of hope that their scheme could be carried out in England. Sir Hugh Allan and his company were released from their obligations, their surety money was paid back to them, and the contract and plan fell to the ground together. It is, therefore, absurd in hon. gentlemen opposite to talk now grandiloquently of their plan and the results, if adopted. It became my duty in 1873 to consider this question. I had to consider the necessity of keeping, as far as possible, the obligations of Canada to British Columbia, and the extent to which it was possible to tax the labour and productive power of the rest of Canada, in order to accomplish that result. The Government decided at once that to keep these terms was out of the question. More than two years and a half had elapsed, the surveys were barely commenced, and it was impossible to commence construction until we had obtained ample information from surveys, and, when I say that, at that time also, over half a million had been expended upon surveys, and those entirely of a preparatory, exploratory character, and

that, to this moment, according to the statements of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the expenditure has been within a fraction of \$14,000,000, it will be seen how gigantic the work was, and how unreasoning the complaints made from British Columbia that we had not yet commenced a mile of the railway. It was impossible to commence it until the surveys had been made, and it was impossible to complete them without a very large amount of labour and time being expended upon them. The Chief Engineer is aware, as is the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, that he had liberty to employ as many men as possible for this purpose, and that the surveys have already cost \$1,400 a mile, while the average cost of surveys, exploratory and preparatory, and also for construction, on the most expensive railways, in the settled parts of the country, has not exceeded \$1,500 a mile, while here, before we were able to let a contract even, very nearly \$1,400 a mile has been spent on those surveys. Our proposal was this: We endeavoured, in the first place, to obtain some modification of the terms. We despatched an agent to British Columbia, and Lord Carnarvon ultimately offered his good services, in order to arrive at some understanding with that Province; and we reached the understanding that we would endeavour to build a railway from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean by 1890; that we should expend a certain amount per annum in British Columbia, after the surveys were completed, and line adopted. The line never was surveyed sufficiently to enable us to reach that conclusion till last year, and, as soon as we had information sufficient to guide us, we adopted the Burrard Inlet route, and immediately advertised for tenders for the construction of that line. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has spoken of our departure from the former terms of the construction of this road. Now, what was this departure? We had precisely the same provision of land, and equivalent as to money; only, instead of \$30,000,000, we named \$10,000 a mile, which would have amounted to \$26,000,000, and two-thirds of the land was to be controlled by the Government in respect of sales and management. We also then provided that, in asking for tenders, we should invite

tenderers to say upon what additional amount they would require a guarantee of four per cent. for 25 years. But, in the meantime, we felt that, while it would take some years to complete the surveys, it was of immense importance to the scheme, as a whole, that we should get into the prairie country with a road through our own territory. I was glad to hear the Minister of Public Works declare that those initial contracts which we gave out to secure a railroad from Lake Superior to Red River were as much in the interest of British Columbia as if the expenditure had been incurred in that Province itself. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is correct in that statement. It must now be quite evident to every person that the railroad must be a lamentable failure, unless means be adopted, in the first place, to throw a very large population into that country in the centre of the continent; and, without means of access to those western prairies equivalent to that of the United States to theirs, we never could hope to get a large population into that country. It was a question some time ago, however, and is a question still, whether there was any wisdom in immediately proceeding with the railroad west of Selkirk or Red River, because at that point we reach the prairie country and lines of communication in certain directions, and the colonisation schemes entrusted to those settlers themselves, probably present the best solution of the difficulty of settling up a vast country like that. Our settlers, being enterprising, naturally push forward a few score or hundred miles in advance of any railway, and, when settled in sufficient numbers, having realised the importance of transportation for their products, they would strain every nerve to get railroads constructed into their districts. The scheme submitted to the House in a tentative manner by the Minister of the Interior in the late Government (Mr. Mills) was one fairly embodying the views entertained by his colleagues on that subject. It was submitted, experimentally, in order to test the feeling of the country and the House, with the idea, however, that the country should avoid, as far as possible, any railroad expenditure in that country which might be provided by private and individual

effort, aided by municipal and other help in the localities interested, as in other parts of Canada. While we let out contracts between Thunder Bay and Selkirk, with a view to get a road opened into that country, it was with the determination to adopt this method, and I explained this several times during my administration. We intended, when we had obtained a full completion of the surveys, and finally adopted the route to the ocean, through British Columbia, to endeavour to place the entire work from Lake Superior westward under contract,—the contractors assuming the expenditure already incurred, and allowing themselves to be charged with it as part of the \$10,000 a mile to be paid to them on the contracts for the entire line. The hon. gentlemen opposite, and the whole country are aware that we solicited tenders in England for some months upon this ground, before hon. gentlemen opposite came into office; also that Mr. Sandford Fleming, the Chief Engineer, was instructed, while in London, to place himself in communication with contractors and financial men, and also to obtain the assistance of Sir John Rose, who, in many things, had been the active, energetic and patriotic agent of the Dominion, with a view to the carrying out of this scheme. But I am informed that, notwithstanding all our efforts, we signally failed in obtaining one single offer (there was one imperfect offer made) for the construction of the railroad on those terms, which were the grant of 20,000 acres and \$10,000 cash, per mile, with a guarantee of 4 per cent. upon such balance as might be represented as necessary. No terms could be more explicit; it would be difficult to mention terms more favourable, and yet the hon. gentleman seems to expect, by his speech, that the colonisation scheme, with the 100,000,000 acres instead of the 50,000,000 acres and \$30,000,000 current money, is somehow or other to succeed in getting this road built. His own remarks showed to-day that it is utterly useless at present for him to expect British railway contractors, or great financial firms to engage in any railroad enterprise on this continent. Much of this is due to the want of confidence which he tells us is experienced in finan-

cial circles in Britain, and a great deal is due to the unwise legislation in Canada and the Provinces, with respect to railway lines, and to the fact that foreign capitalists have obtained little or no return for the money they have laid out in this country. I have made up my mind long ago that it will be exceedingly difficult for a population of 4,000,000 so to conduct financial transactions connected with the building of that railroad of 2,600 miles, across an unknown and almost untrodden continent, in many places extremely difficult. I frankly say now, after my experience in endeavouring to accomplish something in that direction, that I fear we shall be incapable of accomplishing anything in that direction at present. I am convinced that what I have repeatedly urged must now be done—that the consent and co-operation of the entire population is absolutely necessary in undertaking any large expenditure of money; that, while we are bound to consider what we have engaged to do by British Columbia, we are also bound to consider still more what is due to the people we represent in this House, and whether the taxation which may be demanded is not such as no people should submit to for any consideration whatever. That is my position, and I shall take occasion, before those resolutions are adopted, to, in some way or other, place my views on record, in order that no one may misunderstand the ground we occupy on this side of the House. I believe that any obligations such as the one incurred, if at all possible, should be carried out, but not to ruin the rest of the country. But the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Tupper) has struck a mine on this occasion. He says there is a vast multitude of people idle in Great Britain, and unprecedented distress, and he is to invite those distressed people to take refuge on the prairies. This country is so pictured by the hon. gentleman now that he is in office, and so pleasant are all its circumstances and surroundings, that it appears to him a paradise to which he is to invite all the distressed people in the four quarters of the globe. But a few weeks ago, the hon. gentleman was descanting, with the greatest possible emphasis, upon the deep, universal pervading distress that had settled

MR. MACKENZIE.

down upon Canada, and we know that it was such representations that enabled the hon. gentleman and his friends—not representations, but misrepresentations like these—to settle himself down comfortably with his colleagues on the Treasury benches. Now everything is *couleur de rose*. Everything is right now, and I fear very much the hon. gentleman is much more imposed upon by his pleasant surroundings than by this affected sympathy for the distressed people of Great Britain. I have considered the distress in Great Britain, Canada and the United States, and have proved to the country and Parliament that there is ten times the distress in the United States than exists in Britain. The hon. the Minister of Public Works might learn from history that what he calls the present unprecedented distress in Great Britain is nothing compared with what existed when the doctrines of hon. gentlemen opposite were its rule of legislation. He says he cannot doubt that the British Government will show the greatest possible interest in assisting his policy by accepting his invitation to send a Commissioner to act with those from Canada in bringing those thousands of distressed people to the prairies, and getting us money to build the road, while he himself and colleagues have, within the last few days, legislated wholly against Great Britain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. MACKENZIE: And have legislated in favour of the United States, this legislation being a direct insult to the Mother Country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. MACKENZIE: This legislation has been an insult thrown in the face of British statesmen and the British people, and a defiance. Notwithstanding the hon. gentleman has not hesitated to express his belief, after legislating in this sense against the policy of the Empire, against the interests of British commerce and in favour of the commerce of a foreign people on our borders, he has not hesitated a moment to say, in the face of all this, that he expects to go to England and get the active sympathy of the British Government. As a Canadian, I fervently trust that the British Govern-

ment, notwithstanding the ill behaviour of Canada to Britain, will show us that consideration which they have always hitherto been disposed to show; but, at the same time, I must say that, if I were a British statesman, and were to act in the interest of British commerce and British workmen, it would be impossible for me to extend a particle of consideration to the hon. gentleman's proposal. It is a very remarkable thing that the Imperial Government is to be expected in this way, by the introduction of such resolutions in this House, to be influenced in their favour. When I saw the notice of those resolutions, I supposed that the hon. gentlemen opposite had been in communication with the British Government till I heard the speech of the Minister of Public Works, that he had in some way reason to believe that something of this kind would be done, and I confess I was astonished at the liberality of the statesmen of Britain, who were capable of so returning good for evil. But the hon. gentleman has given us no information on the subject. It seems these resolutions were introduced at haphazard in the hope that something would turn up. Ministers are in a strait at present; they are pressed on the one hand by the financial circumstances of the country, and, on the other, by the two members for Victoria and the members for British Columbia. We have the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government sitting for a little borough of British Columbia, and the other member (Mr. DeCosmos) sitting behind him, considering how they can bring relief to their constituents, and, at the same time, keep the responsibility to the people of the country intact. There are more than British Columbia and Victoria represented in this House. British Columbia and Victoria seem, Sir, in the estimation of the hon. member behind the Premier (Mr. DeCosmos) to be one thing, and British Columbia, Victoria and Canada seem to be convertible terms. Those gentlemen speak with the utmost coolness and indifference of the expenditure of millions; they speak of it as the smallest possible thing. Now, I propose to refer for a moment to the engineering question involved in the resolutions; I propose to refer to what was said regarding the question of route, and I think

it is a very unfortunate matter that the leader of the Government should be in a position to have—what shall I call it?—his fealty to his constituents and his fealty to the Dominion antagonistic to each other. No one can read the newspapers of his constituency without observing this.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not read them.

MR. MACKENZIE: If he does not read them, I read them very diligently, and I observe the newspapers published in the hon. gentleman's constituency say frankly and plainly that they elected him for the purpose of bringing the route by Bute Inlet to Esquimalt and Victoria. That is the very purpose and object for which the hon. gentleman was elected, and, no doubt, he accepted the nomination and election with the intention of complying with the request of his constituents. I cannot reconcile the hon. gentleman's well-known honesty in political matters in any other way. Everybody who knows the hon. gentleman's political career knows that he would not, on any account, lead his constituents astray in regard to political matters, and we are, therefore, bound to believe that he accepted the nomination and election for Victoria on the express condition that this was to be accomplished, and we have the first instalment of it here. We are told gravely, in one of the resolutions, that we are to be asked to vote—what? "That in the opinion of this House the selection of the Burrard Inlet terminus was premature." Well, what does premature mean? That it was selected too soon—is that it? Very well, then, Sir, what will be said when it is known that the member for Victoria, the Premier, and his Administration selected a route by Bute Inlet to Esquimalt, five years before that. It was premature; that is, it seems, after we had completed the surveys on all the known possible lines, that only then did we announce our final determination. But the hon. gentlemen opposite, before there was an inch of country surveyed, committed themselves to the selection of the Bute Inlet and Esquimalt route. How could the hon. gentleman opposite word that resolution? How could he dream of accusing us of

selecting the Burrard Inlet route too soon, in the face of that fact? But it is politically necessary, in the meantime, to quiet the apprehensions of the hon. gentlemen from that part of the Province. Then, Sir, we have two members here from the mainland of British Columbia; they are interested in the Burrard Inlet route, I presume, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works to-day tells those gentlemen, for their comfort, that these resolutions do not necessarily imply that the Burrard Inlet route will not be adopted after all. They are told, in fact, practically—and the Minister of Public Works candidly states, and I think he made his statement with great candour to-day—the hon. gentleman candidly states that, as far as he is able to say, Burrard Inlet is at present the most available. He states what is true, that the grades are much more favourable, and that is everything, I may say, upon a great road like the present. In consultation with the Chief Engineer during my term of office, I found he invariably laid the greatest possible stress upon grades, and I entirely concurred with that gentleman, on the necessity of obtaining favourable gradients on a great railway. He endeavoured to obtain, going eastward from the centre of the continent, a grade not exceeding 26ft. to the mile, and not exceeding 40ft. to the mile going westward. Now, on the Burrard Inlet route there is no grade in excess of 52ft. to the mile, a very large proportion of it is less than half of that, and a considerable portion is entirely level. The hon. member for Victoria, who sits in the rear of the Premier (Mr. DeCosmos)—I do not know which of them is the senior as to votes—called out to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, while he was speaking of the favourable gradients on the Burrard Inlet route, as compared with the Bute Inlet, that he had forgotten the question of curves. I think the hon. gentleman was quite right in that. It is a very important matter. Now, I am able to give the hon. gentleman and the House the information he desires. On the Burrard Inlet route, out of a distance altogether of 493 miles, there are 285 miles of straight line; and on the Bute Inlet route, out of a distance of 546 miles, there are 328 miles of straight line. The

percentage of straight line on the Bute Inlet route is 58, and on the Burrard Inlet route, 60, showing that there is a larger amount by 2 per cent. upon the latter than upon the former. Then, the radius of curves on the Burrard Inlet route from 4 to 5 degrees, reached 36 miles, and on the Bute Inlet route it reached 22 miles, showing a difference in these curves, between 4 and 5 degrees, of 14 miles in favour of Bute Inlet. Then, on the Burrard Inlet route there is a quarter of a mile with a radius of from 955ft. to 819ft., and there is one other, occupying very small space—a mere fraction of a mile—from 819ft. to 716ft. of a radius. These are the sharpest curves on the line, and, when I say to the House that nearly all the curves on the Intercolonial Railway, near Halifax, where the trains run 30 miles an hour, are less than 700ft., it will be seen that there is nothing in the curves which will materially interfere with conducting the traffic of the country over it. The entire percentage of curvature on the Bute Inlet route is 39.76, and the entire percentage on the Burrard Inlet is 42.10. Now, the hon. the Minister of Public Works touched upon another matter in reference to the Burrard Inlet route. He said, and said truly, that it passed through a country partially settled, and most available for agricultural purposes. Other advantages may be mentioned besides that, which would materially lessen the cost of construction. One of those magnificent turnpike roads, constructed by the energy and enterprise of the British Columbia people, passes over that part of the country. There is, besides that, in the interior, near Kamloops, a bed of coal known to exist, which would be available both for fuel and traffic. These advantages are not counterbalanced in the least, in my opinion, by the military consideration referred to by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman said it was a serious consideration to go so near to the United States. Why, all our great railways pass within sight of the United States. Even the Intercolonial, at one point, is only 26 miles from the United States border; the Grand Trunk passes, for nearly 100 miles, within gun-shot of the United States territory, and even less, for a great part of this distance is on the shore of the River St. Lawrence, which

is open to both countries. No one, I am sure, dreams of military considerations interfering with the route of a railroad built on Canadian territory. But the hon. gentlemen actually seem apprehensive that a large portion of the traffic from and to the United States, contiguous to British Columbia, would pass over our route. Why, instead of being an argument against the Burrard Inlet route, it is a strong argument in its favour. Besides, the hon. gentleman must recollect that the naval officers, by a very large preponderance of opinion, selected Burrard Inlet when they were requested to report upon it. Our own Lieutenant-General Smyth also considered that there was no objection to taking the Burrard Inlet route, from a military point of view. I would also refer to the opinion of General Moody, a celebrated officer of engineers, who was at one time Governor of British Columbia.

MR. DECOSMOS: I am sure the hon. gentleman has no desire to mislead the House, but allow me to say that General Moody was never Governor of British Columbia, and the best character I can give to that gentleman is that, in his own words, he is simply a mathematical Christian.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am sure no one will accuse my hon. friend from Victoria of that crime. An hon. gentleman near me suggests that, if the hon. gentleman is a Christian at all, he is a curvilinear one. I always understood that General Moody had been Governor of British Columbia. I learn from an hon. gentleman that he was Administrator only; but it is a matter of no importance. He lived in that Province, and made himself acquainted with its topographical features, and with the engineering features necessary for the construction of a railway. I am sorry his views have not been presented by the hon. gentleman opposite. I asked General Moody to place himself in communication with Mr. Fleming, and I understood by Mr. Fleming that they had been in communication. I thought it was important to get the views of a perfectly impartial and independent British officer, who had a practical knowledge of the profession and the locality, which would enable him to give such an opinion fairly.

General Moody informs me—at all events, I am at liberty to say—that he sees no military objection, whatever, to choosing that route. But, even if it were possible that there should be some military objections, I would not, as a Canadian, permit this mere objection to stand in the way of accomplishing a result so desirable as that of obtaining the cheapest and best route for a railroad through our own territory. But there is another great danger. I pointed out last night that, in ascending the Fraser River, it is possible in the meantime to obtain communication by water as far as Yale, and, by the construction of 125 miles of route, we reach again for a short distance the navigable waters in the interior, either by Lake Kamloops or as following the route of the Thompson River. I believe, therefore, that we, as a Government, adopted the proper line. There is no information before the Minister at present—that he admits—which would justify him in taking any other line. The line to the mouth of the Skeena leads, as he says, to an impracticable harbour, and we have some information, the hon. gentleman must recollect, with regard to reaching Fort Simpson; we know that it is only possible, by following that River Skeena to the forks of the Westonquah, and ascending that river towards Fort Fraser, and then diverging southwards through the chain of lakes and the head of the river to Fort George. That route, I think, is really out of the question, and, besides, we must remember that, if that is the object the hon. gentleman aims at, it would take the railway 100 miles northward of the entire population of the Province, both of the island and the main land, and that is a matter we must seriously look to. As to the trade of the Pacific being carried over our railway, it is a matter too remote, I am sure, for present consideration. It is a matter that will not trouble us for twenty years to come. It is a matter that ultimately will be of importance, but it is of little importance now; and, even as regards that matter, we must remember that there are considerations other than those of the character of the land route. We must take the currents of the ocean into consideration, and, although we would have most ready

access to the ocean from Portland, or Dean Inlet, the most ready access to the railroad from the Sound outside, we must remember that the currents change the course of navigation so materially, that, without considering them, it is impossible to say which route would be best by sea. But we do know this, that from Burrard Inlet there is an open sea which can be easily reached. We know, that in the event of war, which is anticipated by the hon. gentleman as a possible contingency, it is just as easy to go from Burrard Inlet to Vancouver Island at Nanaimo, and easier, than it is to go from Waddington Harbour to Otter Cove on the Island opposite to the Inlet. The distances are much less; the distance across from Nanaimo to Burrard Inlet is not over 25 miles—this distance I have had measured by careful parties—while the distance from Waddington Harbour to Otter Cove is 66 miles. From the head of Bute Inlet to Frederic Harbour is 51 miles, from which point to Vancouver Island is 15 miles, over which an expensive ferry would have to be maintained. Now, Mr. Marcus Smith admitted himself in his reports that from Waddington Harbour to Esquimalt would take \$27,000,000, including bridging, and we know it could not take less than from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 to construct the remainder of the route, including bridging. These reasons seemed to me so conclusive against the Bute Inlet route that we could not for a moment hesitate, and I will say this to the House that up to two years ago my mind was wholly biassed in favour of Bute Inlet. My reasons were these: I saw that, other considerations being equal, we struck the centre of the Island instead of striking one end of it. I also saw there were good harbours at the Alberni Canal and Quatsimo, both of which could be reached in a shorter distance than by going to Esquimalt. And, if the route *via* Bute Inlet is selected, one of these harbours must be chosen, unless there is a reckless disregard of the public interests on the part of the Government. But there is no necessity for going to either place. I was convinced of this solely by the experience of my engineers, and by getting opinions which they gathered in the course of their explorations through the

country. It is a most serious matter to undertake to build a railroad with gradients such as there would be encountered in passing through the Homathco Valley from Bute Inlet.

MR. DECOSMOS: What are they?

MR. MACKENZIE: They are as high as 104ft. to the mile. I do not recollect the mileage precisely, but I think there are from 11 to 15 miles of this high gradient. The hon. gentleman will find the exact statement of mileage in some of my former speeches. Now, we have to consider the best course to be adopted with reference to these resolutions. The statement in the first resolution is not literally correct. The first resolution declares that engagements have been entered into with British Columbia as to the conditions of union. Now, that is not literally correct. The engagement with British Columbia was to build the railway within ten years, and, if hon. gentlemen mean to respect their bargain, they should do it in the exact words of the engagement itself. If there is no objection to a modification of the engagement, it has been owing to the efforts of the late Administration, and if there is any difficulty now in accomplishing the result that we thought to be desirable—the construction of the railway—it is because of the unwisdom of the course the hon. gentlemen opposite pursued in entering into an engagement so far beyond the power and resources of this country. I do not see how it is possible that this House can authorise the Government first to select a line, and, at the same time, when that line is not made known to Parliament, that we should authorise the Government to enter into a contract for building 125 miles of the railway. If the Government ask for power to let out contracts on lines that have been already thoroughly surveyed and are located, I would not blame those who approved of the policy of the Government for giving them that power, and, if they ask for the power to build 125 miles on the line that I believe to be the best, I will be prepared to support that proposition, but I am not prepared to support any proposition to place power in the hands of any Government to expend money in building a portion of a rail-

way, without, at least, communicating the place where that money is to be expended. We have no reason to believe, from recent experience of the cost of building the road in a much more favourable country—from Lake Superior to Selkirk,—that it will be possible to build these 125 miles of railroad in British Columbia below \$70,000 per mile. I question very much if even that will do it. So that the Government are really asking us to give them power to commit the country to an expenditure of from \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 without informing the House where the expenditure is to be made. That is contrary to all sound constitutional principles, and cannot be commended to any man's judgment. If the Government want further time to explore other routes, and want money to conduct surveys upon these routes, I am prepared to agree to those propositions, but I am not prepared to agree to such an extraordinary proposition as that embodied in the resolution. I have only to say upon the general proposition that I am quite willing to consider any scheme of colonisation that will settle up the interior of our continent. I am quite prepared to consider the propriety of extending any aid that may be thought desirable in advancing such a proposition. I am convinced, and have always been, that, in order to make our railroad a paying one, we must have a large population thrown into the heart of the continent. We have already opened up a highway through that country, and, by building the Pembina Branch, we have brought the railroad almost to the doors of the settlers in the North-West Territories. I do not understand why the hon. gentleman anticipates a large revenue from the lands to be sold, because it is absolutely indispensable, in order to induce settlers to come into the country, that we should furnish them with land free of charge. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that settlers will go to the North-West, and buy land at \$2 an acre, when there are millions of acres of land offered for nothing in the United States?

MR. PLUMB: Where do they give land for nothing in the United States?

MR. MACKENZIE: There can be no question about that.

MR. PLUMB: I think there is room for question.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, my hon. friend from Niagara is exceedingly wise, but I doubt his possession of information on that point. If the hon. gentleman will examine the condition of the State of Texas, he will find that that State alone will furnish more land free than he has any idea of. The very fact that they are pouring ten or twenty times the number of people into these new territories that Canada is able to do, proves conclusively that it is true. If the hon. gentleman is proceeding on the hypothesis that in Canada alone is there any land available, he will find himself greatly mistaken. We have found it very difficult indeed in Canada to promote settlement, even where the land was given away by the Government. It is still more difficult to send settlers to the far-off western country, where they have the initial difficulties of a new country to contend with, not less in amount, though different in kind, than the settlers of our own wooded districts. They have a long winter, absence of lumber and building materials, and difficulties of transportation. We must, therefore, make up our minds, if we are to settle that country, that it will be done only at the expenditure of a large amount of money to aid settlers in going in and giving them land free after they get in. That is my conviction. If the hon. gentleman's expectation should be realised of getting \$2 per acre for those 100,000,000 acres, I will confess to him that I have been utterly mistaken in my ideas upon this subject. In conclusion, I have simply to say that, while some of the resolutions of the hon. gentleman are of such a character that they can scarcely be approved or opposed, the main features of the scheme are those which are merely suppositions. If such and such things can be done, it will be better to do such and such other things. This resolution that refers to giving power to the Government to do certain things, and that which condemns the decision of the previous Government in selecting the Burrard Inlet route, I cannot give my assent to. If the Government really mean to change the char-

acter of the enterprise to this extent, I think they should have given Parliament more details, and enabled us to discuss this particular point with some regard to that freedom of discussion, and that exhaustive research necessary in a great scheme like the present. The hon. gentleman thinks to revert to the plan that was lauded by hon. gentlemen opposite during the late elections, when they told the country that the Government then in power had spent between \$10,000,000 and \$12,000,000, "while we," said the hon. gentlemen opposite, speaking for themselves, "were prepared to build the road with \$30,000,000, and 50,000,000 acres of land." Well, I can only say, in conclusion, that any scheme whatever, if it has for its object the building of this railroad, or a portion of it, such as will commend itself to the wisdom of this House, or of the people of Canada, I shall be prepared to consider; but any scheme which is on its face a delusion, and any scheme which asks Parliament to commit itself to a policy unheard of in the records of parliamentary history, I never can consent to, however much I desire—and I do desire—to do everything in my power to facilitate the construction of the railroad into our prairie country, and that is now far on towards accomplishment. I desire to say, while I feel that obligation on the one hand, I feel also compelled to pay serious regard to the state of our finances; and to consider, as a Canadian and as a member of this House, how far these additional obligations will lead us in the way of taxation. We deliberately decided in Parliament, in 1871, afterwards in 1872, and again in 1874, that under no circumstances would we, for the purpose of accomplishing this object, increase the rate of taxation throughout the Dominion. The same resolution governed the Carnarvon terms. The rate is now alarmingly increased for other purposes, and the burdens on the people have been seriously aggravated. We occupy a very different position, relatively, to the position we occupied last year, and, in any conclusion we may reach, it is impossible to avoid paying most serious attention to the burdens which will be imposed by any such obligations as those upon the people of this country. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr.

MR. MACKENZIE.

Wallace) believes that the road can be built by the aid of a paper mill and a printing press. If it were possible to carry out that scheme, I should be glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with all the paper and printing presses he desires, and send him off to the wilderness with *carte blanche*, to pay for the building of the road with all the money he could manufacture.

MR. WALLACE: We want a loan as the basis of it.

MR. MILLS: It is an airy scheme.

MR. WALLACE: It is a sensible scheme, whatever may be the opinion of the member for Bothwell with all his philosophy.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is a good deal of philosophy with both hon. gentlemen—one being a practical philosopher, and the other an æreal one; the one a philosopher on subjects which are capable of being demonstrated, the other a philosopher on subjects which have been demonstrated to have no basis whatever. I have no faith in the obtaining of money in any other way than by the taxation of the people of this country. We may have any scheme we please; we may hold out any investments we please to English capitalists, but they will not come to build this railroad on any other basis except to obtain profit; and, whoever may be the contractor, the country will have to pay the money in the long run, directly or indirectly; we may borrow money, but, in order to meet the interest and sinking fund, the people will have to be taxed. Therefore, the scheme is one which, in its inception, was a mistake, and one only to be accomplished by additional taxation on the people of Canada, and at the present moment I am not prepared to submit gracefully to the present taxation, far less to the imposition of a much heavier one.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have listened attentively to the hon. member for Lambton, to hear from him, as leader of the Opposition, his explanations of the last five years' distinct railway policy, and the objections he could possibly take to the resolution of my hon. friend, the resolution proposed by

the Minister of Public Works, with the assistance of the members of the Government. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman still adheres to the idea that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a necessity, that it must be built some time, must be built speedily, as soon as practicable, as soon as it is consistent with the revenues of this country. I listened attentively to discover the number of the objections that he had to this scheme. Both sides of the House, now, as in the past, being agreed that we must have a Canadian Pacific Railway, the only question that remains, is, by what scheme, by what mode, in what way, this great object can be accomplished. The hon. gentleman's remarks, though somewhat discursive, and not for the major part of his speech directed to the resolution, seemed to point out some three or four objections to the present scheme. In the first place, he says, the setting aside of 100,000,000 acres of land was a delusion, and that his scheme was to send in the emigrants and other settlers free—that the land must be given to them free, and that there must be no revenue got from those lands at all. Secondly, he objects, on constitutional principles, to that portion of the resolution which provides that 125 miles of railway shall be built without the line being previously specified, and submitted to Parliament, and approval obtained. Then he objects, also, to the apparent doubt as to whether Burrard Inlet or Bute Inlet should be the terminus of the Pacific Railroad. Then he pooh-poohed, he laughed, he spoke with scorn of the idea of the Government going to the British Government and to English capitalists for aid in the construction of this great enterprise. These, Mr. Speaker, so far as I can gather, are the objections the hon. gentleman takes to this scheme. Now, as to the first objection, that it is a delusion and a snare that 100,000,000 acres can be set aside and profitably sold for the purpose of constructing this railway, that has always been the course taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite. They have always said that we could not make any use of the land.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, that we could not make much use of the land along the line for the purpose of building the railway. We can all remember—those of us who were in the old Parliament, previous to 1873—how the Opposition of that day took the ground that there were not 100,000,000 of acres of arable land in the North-West. They said that it was absurd to suppose it was worth money or fit for cultivation or settlement. It is now found—by the explorations which we have paid for, or have to pay for—that from 180,000,000 to 200,000,000 acres can be found fit for the settlement and occupation of civilised men. I should have thought the hon. gentleman, in view of the condition of the country, would have looked to these lands in the North-West as a means of building this railway. The policy of the Government, of which I was formerly a leader, is the same as the policy of to-day. We believe the Pacific Railway can be built from the head of Lake Superior to the Pacific, without the cost of a farthing to Canada. We believe that the road will pay its own expenses. We believe that the country will eventually be reimbursed for every farthing they devote to building the Canadian Pacific Railway. We believe that the hundred millions of acres which we now desire to appropriate, and which we desired to appropriate in our scheme of 1873, will be amply sufficient for the purpose of recouping the over-taxed people of Canada, for whom the hon. gentleman has so much sympathy, every farthing they may have contributed. The policy of the hon. gentleman opposite has always been to disparage that country. He says the only way of using that land is by giving it away. He says that it is covered with snow, that there is no fuel, that there is no wood, and that there is no water. If the hon. gentleman had been employed by the Texas or Kansas, or by the Northern, Southern, or Central Pacific Railroads of the United States, in order to run down and ruin the country, and destroy the prospects of our railway, he would have used the language he has done.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is very well done.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The hon. gentleman says it is very well done. I am glad to get his approbation, as well as the approbation of a large majority of this House, that he joins his cheers, enthusiastic cheers, with those of the majority of the House, when I declare that I am doing well. In the North-West, I believe, Sir, that we have an advantage over the American Pacific Railway in the countries through which these railways pass. I believe we have got more arable land. I believe we can avoid the depths of snow. I believe we will have a railway passing through a rich fertile country, stretching over regions of national extent, if I may use the term in the European sense of size. We have immense stretches of land fit for pastoral purposes, great regions of country rich with every kind of mineral wealth. Yet the hon. gentleman, in his speech, follows up the course of his speeches ever since the subject was laid before Parliament, by attempting to disparage and underrate our country, as he did in 1873 with the view of destroying the prospects of building the Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman is following up the same practice in 1879, telling the people of England, telling British capitalists, German or Dutch capitalists—what? If the hon. gentleman ceased to be a Canadian statesman, perhaps the country would not suffer much.

Mr. MACKENZIE : Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : What said that hon. gentleman : "If I were a British statesman, I would say to the English capitalist, 'Do not spend one farthing in this scheme?'"

MR. MACKENZIE : I said nothing of the kind.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : "Do not spend one farthing."

MR. MACKENZIE : I did not say anything of the kind.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I appeal to the House to say if he did not. He says "Canada has insulted England, Canada has affronted England, Canada has legislated against England and in favour of the United States, and, there-

MR. MACKENZIE,

fore, on all these grounds, I say, if I were a British statesman, I would tell the English public, I would tell the English and foreign capitalists, not to give one farthing towards the construction of the road."

MR. MACKENZIE : I said nothing of the kind.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : This, Mr. Speaker, is his patriotism—his anxious desire to help the present Government in carrying out this scheme. He said, "When you were in Opposition you opposed our scheme and our policy. We got no fair play from you, and we are going to return good for evil. We are going to heap coals of fire on your head and we will gladly assist you in this great enterprise." At the same time, every word he used, every sentiment he uttered, every insinuation he dared—

Several HON. MEMBERS : Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Was done for the purpose of attempting to destroy and injure the prospects of building this Pacific Railway, for which he had such a paternal regard.

MR. MACKENZIE : You are overdoing it now.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The hon. gentleman says I am overdoing it now. It is better to overdo it than not to do it at all. Doing nothing at a great expense the hon. gentleman arrived at to perfection,—doing as little as possible at the greatest possible cost to the country. That was the policy of the hon. gentleman, and successfully carried out, as the numerous deficits and increased taxation of the country, consequent upon these deficits, has shown. Mr. Speaker, it was laughable to hear the hon. gentleman talk about his respect for the authority of Parliament. Why, I remember when we were placed on the other side of the House, and used to ask the hon. gentleman if he were going to submit his contracts to Parliament, he said : "I never said so, and did not intend to."

MR. RYKERT : Irving pitched into him about it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We remember that even the worm trod upon will turn. Even the member for Hamilton could not stand it. When the hon. the leader of the Government said he never said he meant to do it, then the member for Hamilton said: "Well, those were the principles on which the hon. gentleman was elected, and on which I was elected, and which I expected the Government would carry out." Then, Mr. Speaker, I think I remember something about the hon. gentleman asking for a resolution for an authority to enter into a contract, during the recess, for the Pacific Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE: Define the place.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Somewhere on the route of the Pacific Railway, eastward from the Pacific Ocean. I remember, also, that the hon. gentleman, in 1876, moved for certain works of construction on the road from Fort William westwards toward Lac des Mille Lacs.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, that is clear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, here we are going eastwards towards Lake Manitoba. The resolutions are precisely the same. The principles are precisely the same, but I think the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with the resolutions. He once introduced a Bill providing for the construction of the road from Esquimalt to Nanaimo. At that time the hon. gentleman believed in Bute Inlet.

MR. MACKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman will permit me, he will find that, in that event, it did not require a Bill. The hon. gentleman's decision gave me authority, and I—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We know perfectly well that this was for the purpose of building a portion of the Pacific Railway. The original intention was to make it a portion of the Pacific Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, it was not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have been reminded that in less than two years he was in favour of Bute Inlet as

a terminus. Now, I am speaking about the constitutional question, and the great impropriety of introducing this Bill. In one clause it is provided "That in case it shall be found by the Governor in Council more advantageous to construct the said railway, or any portion thereof, as a public work of the Dominion of Canada, the construction thereof shall be let out by contract, offered to public competition, and the Governor General may—" and so on. My hon. friend the present Minister of Public Works moved a resolution affirming that, before these contracts should be given, the line of location should be laid on the table of Parliament, and should be approved of by Parliament. That was voted down by the majority the hon. gentleman had behind him then. Now, we arouse the indignation of the hon. gentleman by introducing a resolution by which we say that, in order to keep faith with British Columbia, we shall, during the season, commence 125 miles of the road, building from the west to the east.

MR. TUPPER: No more than 125 miles.

MR. MACKENZIE: On the mainland?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: Where?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Echo answers, where. We tried very hard to find out what was the hon. gentleman's policy with regard to this railway. It was a policy of a protean colour, of a chameleon hue. Sometimes it partook of all kinds of changes. Why, we remember the hon. gentleman came down and said it was impossible, in the embarrassed state of the country, to build an all-railway line; that we should take advantage of the magnificent water stretches across the continent—a mingling of land and water, which, Sir, generally produces mud. By mingling land and water, it was held we should have a perfect system of railway communication across this continent. It was a little eccentricity of the hon. gentleman. Another eccentricity of the hon. gentleman was the construction of the Fort Frances Locks, which cost the country some hun-

dreds of thousands of dollars. This was a waste of the public money just by way of eccentricity. There was such a thing as making contracts without the previous approbation of Parliament. There was the contract respecting these rails, which was a very advantageous one, especially as to price. We have seen the hon. gentleman's Esquimalt and Nanaimo policy. He took up water stretches and abandoned them.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, he did not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Then he took up a stretch towards Lake Nipissing and laid down railways where there had been no surveys, and he changed that. He started once from Douglas to Pembroke. That was carried and then he gave up that. His policy was as varying as a summer cloud, and it would be amusing, only for the great loss of time it entailed, together with the great loss of money to the over-taxed ratepayers of Canada. Now the hon. gentleman objects to Bute Inlet. Now, suppose the Government had taken up Bute Inlet, it would have been rather a venial fault, because the hon. gentleman avowed that was his policy.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said nothing of the sort. I said up to two years ago I had a strong bias as to that being the best route, meaning simply that up to that time the information I had led me in that direction.

MR. DECOSMOS: Whether or not, did the hon. gentleman make an Order in Council to bring the road that way?

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, the report will tell who is correct.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would like to know whether there was not an Order in Council making Bute Inlet—

MR. MACKENZIE: There was not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman says there was not. At all events, the hon. gentleman spent millions for the purpose of surveying, with the object of making the terminus Bute Inlet.

MR. MACKENZIE: It was not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I say it was. I will say this: On no occasion yet did the Government which expired in 1873 decide on Bute Inlet.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say they never passed an Order in Council making Esquimalt the terminus?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There was such an Order, and the hon. gentleman, when he introduced his Bill to build the railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, did not, thereby, bind himself over to Bute or to Burrard Inlet.

MR. MACKENZIE: Certainly he did.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He did not. It will be better to look back to the record, that there may be no mistake. On the 28th May, 1872, we find that Mr. Langevin, who was then the Minister of Public Works, was pressing upon Parliament the construction of the Pacific Railway, laying down our policy, and Mr. DeCosmos said: "The explanation was quite satisfactory in one respect, but he wanted to know whether, in case the railway should be constructed to Burrard Inlet, the Government was prepared to construct a branch line from Victoria to Nanaimo, and, in case they reached the straits, whether they would cause a line to be constructed along the east coast." Mr. Langevin, in reply, said that the intention of the Government was to go to Esquimalt, and, if that was impracticable, and the road went to Burrard Inlet, a ferry would be established to connect it with Esquimalt. There was no uncertain sound on our part as to the choice of Esquimalt, but, when we were asked: Will you have the terminus at Bute Inlet or Burrard Inlet?, we said, Whether we choose Burrard or any other terminus, we will still have the ferry to Esquimalt as the Pacific harbour of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman objects to our going to England at all. He says: "There is no use in your going there; you have tried it already. You boast of your plan, but you sent Sir Hugh Allan there, and he failed." Yes, and we failed through the same line of policy of the Opposition of

that day, by which they are attempting to make this scheme fail in 1879. We had the members of the Opposition denouncing the scheme, disparaging our own country, patriotically decrying our resources, using every opportunity they could in order to prevent our carrying out this great, grand, glorious consummation of the Confederation of the Dominion, of the consolidation of British authority, power, and interest on this continent. And the hon. gentleman said that he advertised in England, and that for nine months there was not a single offer made. Was the hon. gentleman sincere in advertising in England? Could he have hoped, for a moment, that he would succeed? Why, he had gone and called out "stinking fish," to use a celebrated expression of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cartwright), and no man in his senses would have taken a contract from the hon. member for Lambton, as he had stated in Parliament that the security was not worth one farthing, that the railway would be a tax and a burden which the people would be unable to stand; while the Hon. Mr. Blake, from his place in this House, told the people of British Columbia that they could not expect to get that railway, and that if they did not like it they might go in peace. Every effort was made to destroy the chances of the Canadian Pacific Railway in England. No stone was left unturned to ruin the chances of building this great trans-continental work. But what did the hon. gentleman care? It was fair game to him. He did not care if Canada was ruined, and he shows no signs of repentance. At this moment, in 1879, he is committing the crime again, and we know what ought to be the punishment of men twice convicted of the same offence. What did he care, so that he could displace the Government of that day, and get possession of power? Canada's credit has not only withstood the failure of the scheme in 1873, but has risen superior to five years of the Government of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and, after having stood, it will be capable to build the Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman has admitted, however, that, with all the efforts that can be made, there is no possibility of building the railway by means

of capitalists or a company; that it must be a Government work. We tried it with every prospect of success, but that was killed by the hon. gentleman; he tried with no hope or prospect of success, and failed; therefore, we agree on this point, that the road, if it is to be built at all, must be built by the Government. The hon. gentleman charged us, in these resolutions, with committing a great political and constitutional crime in asking for liberty to build 125 miles of railway without coming to Parliament with specifications and the Engineer's report.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said nothing of the kind.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Then he said, without pointing out whereabouts it was. Well, the whereabouts of the railway is to be found by the Engineer's survey; that is the only way. I remember when the hon. gentleman, without asking the sanction of Parliament, in any way whatever, made a solemn contract with the British Government, to which the Canadian Government was pledged by him, the British Government was pledged, and the Government of British Columbia was pledged, to build 2,000 miles of railway across the continent by 1890, and the hon. gentleman will not allow us to build our miserable little 125 miles without giving him all the details of the matter. He says, after the failure of these two schemes, it is quite impossible this can succeed. The scheme is going to succeed. Although Canada is overtaxed; although she is running a ruinous course of expenditure; although she has adopted a faulty, a disloyal, and I do not remember what other phrases are used—commercial policy, I believe—Canada can go into the English market and borrow, at a fair rate, at this moment, all the money required to build the railway. With the plenty of money there is in England; with the great Imperial objects, as shown in these resolutions, which are involved, Canada can get the money on fair terms now. What does she offer? The proposition of the Minister of Public Works is this: We are going into the English market; we will tell England: Here, we are going to build a great railway across this continent. It is going to

pass through one of the finest countries the sun shines on, and will be the happy home of millions of descendants of Englishmen. Every emigrant that settles there will be an additional strength to England. We offer you a great road, the shortest to be found in the world for your trade, across the continent to China and Japan and all the North Pacific, and, besides that, we offer you the credit of Canada, the consols of Canada. It will be a special and favoured stock, and when put into the English market, the capitalists of England will find in all a profitable investment. Canada says: We pledge you our faith for all the money, besides 100,000,000 acres of land, worth \$2 an acre, and we pledge you, besides, the road itself. Never was stronger security given. The consols of England are not stronger, or based on a stronger condition than will be the amount that will be required to build that road. We will allow the British Government to choose one Commissioner, we will choose another Commissioner, and those two men shall hold a *quasi*-judicial position, somewhat like the Auditor-General in England, and the Auditor-General here, free from all political exigencies, from the chance of all political change. They shall be charged to faithfully and honestly administer that enormous estate of 100,000,000 acres, to invest it in Dominion securities, not to sell any land under \$2 an acre, except with the joint consent of the two Governments, the Government guaranteeing and the Government borrowing, and, besides all that, to administer the operation of the railway itself. I have faith in the future of the railway. On the extreme east and the extreme west we have a difficult and rugged country, but the main body of that railway passes through a magnificent country, which will be the happy abode of millions. Just consider what a hand, if I may use a simile from the gaming table, a Minister would hold, who should go to England and say, not only is the credit of Canada pledged for this road, but 100,000,000 acres of land are set aside for it, not to speak of this great railway itself and all its future earnings, which is to be built by Canada, and kept free of incumbrances. It will be good sub-

stantial security for all it can earn over its working expenses. It is a scheme that must succeed, and not all the puny well-directed shafts by which it is attempted to disparage this great work will have the desired effect. This railway is going to be built by this country, which has wasted the last five precious years in regard to it. I hope the prospect will be greeted by hon. gentlemen opposite with great favour, and have no doubt that, eight or ten years hence, we shall be told that they were the originators of the successful policy. It is said that the minimum price of \$2 an acre is too high for those lands. I believe that we ought to open up that 'great North-West as fast as we can for settlement, and that the homestead system is a good one. But we are bound not only to give a man a free prairie farm, into which he can run a plough the day he arrives on it, but to furnish a railway to every man's door; so, if he has a railway near his door, or within 20, 30 or 40 miles of it, he can afford to pay for his land. Look at the difference between the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite and ours. They have admitted that the plan of building the railway by private enterprise or capital is a failure; that, if built at all, it must be by the Government, and they pledged themselves to build it by 1890. But it never occurred to them that there was any means by which this railroad should be made self-paying, or that the people to be benefitted by it should give a single farthing for it. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) honestly said that was not his policy—he does not believe in it, but that the old Provinces of Canada should build this railway across the continent, without the slightest chance of the taxes imposed for the purpose of its construction ever being repaid in any way. It ought to have occurred to them, as men of business, and men of sense, that that was not the proposition to make those lands valuable for building the railroad. Yet, they took no steps to make them valuable. We can judge of the value of those lands by the average value of the lands in the United States. More good land will be pledged to build the Canadian Pacific Railway than was given to build the Northern, or the Union Pacific,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

by far. On the one, the average value was \$6.50, and, on the other, \$4.50, an acre, and those United States lands are selling now at \$20, \$30, and \$40 in favourite places. We are very moderate in our calculations, then, in estimating \$2 as the average for the 100,000,000 acres we propose to give, and which will yield \$200,000,000 at least. We will thus have that magnificent work completed in our time, and the satisfaction of knowing that, if the scheme be carried out, it will not entail a debt upon the old Provinces of Canada, upon us or our children, but the regions and the people that gain the benefit of this work will pay its cost, only too glad and grateful for the opportunity. This is upon the supposition that we get no guarantee that Canada assumes all the debt on the credit of those lands. But I believe that, when the scheme is presented to Her Majesty's Government, and they have seen the Imperial importance of this work—when they see the enormous advantage it will be to relieve the over-crowded portions of the Mother Country, by removing the surplus population into the new Britain in the far West, they will grant a guarantee where they have granted it before, with this additional security which, without obliging England to pay a single sixpence, will enable us to push on the work and obtain all the money required for this great work on as advantageous terms as if it were a direct liability of her own. I contend, however, that, if England should not think a guarantee should be given—and we have only the right to ask her and point out the advantages that would result from it—we have no right to complain if she declines. With the security connected with the scheme we offer, it would be a favourable stock in the English market, where it would be readily, greedily sought for. I believe that money would flow into Canada, as also immigration, and that the country now roamed over by the savage red man and the buffalo, would be the home of a prosperous body of Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, living under British institutions, and enjoying all the free laws and advantages of our system, with all the benefits, besides, that a good soil and salubrious climate may afford.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Believing, as I have always done, that, no matter what mistakes may have been committed, no matter what errors, no matter what crimes may have disgraced the inception of the Pacific Railway project—believing it to be a matter of the greatest possible moment and importance to the future well-being of Canada that our great North-Western inheritance should be developed by all possible means, I am not disposed to reject rashly the propositions which come from the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. On the contrary, I desire to examine them as calmly and dispassionately as I can; but, at the same time, we are not to be deterred by any fear of the displeasure of those hon. gentlemen, much less by any such outburst of affected indignation as the right hon. the First Minister has just levelled at the head of my hon. friend the member for Lambton. In discussing this question, I think, for once, the right hon. gentleman might well have taken a lesson from the calm and deliberate manner in which the Minister of Public Works has dealt with the subject. To that hon. gentleman, although I may not agree with his opinions, I can give the credit of having presented this matter in a style and tone which was not unworthy of the great theme he had to handle. Those hon. gentlemen who, like myself, have held seats in this House the last ten years, can, I doubt not, remember well how the original propositions of the present Government were introduced and received. On that occasion, eight years ago, my hon. friend the member for Lambton and Mr. Blake, the hon. member for Chateauguay, and half-a-dozen hon. gentlemen whom I see around me, all pointed out to the then Commons the precise difficulties, dangers, and probable blunders which, by the confession of the Minister of Public Works to-day, have resulted from the most unwise and unstatesmanlike manner in which that project was conceived and placed on our Statute-book. I regretted very much to hear the hon. the First Minister—I suppose in the attempt, in some way or other, to lessen the damaging effect of the admirable speech of the hon. member for Lambton—dare to accuse that hon. gentleman—a man whose patriotism

is as unblemished as that of any man in Canada—of having, on a former occasion, meanly, maliciously, dishonestly, and unpatriotically, done his best to destroy the scheme brought forward to enable the people of Canada to construct a railroad to the Pacific. Why, for very shame, the First Minister might have recollected that the conduct which, more than anything else, caused the failure of that project and the downfall of his party, was a charge which, at first, I did not believe—that the greed of place and power had induced that right hon. gentleman, to the lasting disgrace of himself, his party and the country, to commit a crime that stands recorded as among the most shameful of our annals, and which led to his and his colleagues' ignominious expulsion from power. How could he have expected English capitalists, or honourable men, of any country or clime, to have anything to do with a Government which lay under the imputation of having sold the charter of the greatest public work they ever had to handle for the sake of a paltry bribe to keep themselves in power? And, when those hon. gentlemen opposite talk to us, now, as the Minister of Public Works did, of the inevitable difficulties which attend the inception of this enterprise, they must remember that, when I, myself, moved that we should insert words in the treaty with British Columbia which would limit our exertions in regard to the railway to all that could reasonably, considering her circumstances, be expected of Canada, they promptly voted it down. When we proposed to appeal to the people, and ascertain whether they would ratify the contract their representatives were entering into, those hon. gentlemen voted it down also. When we proposed to insert a declaration that we would not go on with that project unless it could be done in such a fashion that undue and unnecessary burdens might not be imposed upon the people, those hon. gentlemen, led by the First Minister, voted down the proposition. The right hon. gentleman talks of people disgracing our country. I wish it was in our power to have removed from Canada the ignominy and disgrace which the conduct of those hon. gentlemen has inflicted upon it, and which, say what they will, must, I fear, prove a formidable obstacle in relation to any of

those projects they may now undertake. The First Minister desires to see signs of repentance in my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie). The right hon. gentleman had better pluck the beam out of his own eye before attempting to remove the mote from my hon. friend's. They talk of our having made a solemn compact to build 2,000 miles of railroad in twenty years. What we did was this: We knew it was our duty to modify their own most absurd and impossible contract, to build 3,000 miles of unsurveyed railroad in ten years; we reduced the work to two-thirds, doubled the amount of time for the construction, and got rid of a section of 1,000 miles, or thereabouts, which would have probably cost as much as the difficult section in British Columbia. He tells us that we have lost five years. Well, as his own colleague, the Minister of Public Works, has just shown in the clearest and most emphatic manner to the House, he, the responsible head of that great Department, knowing the magnitude of the task, having come at last to understand something of the difficulties that must attend the construction of this road, has formally, and in terms, acquitted my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) of any negligence or unnecessary delay, and, so far as his words can do it, has lent, substantially, the whole weight of his authority to the policy my hon. friend has been carrying out. When the right hon. gentleman tells us that we never proposed to make use of the lands along the route of the Pacific Railroad to lessen the burden of its cost, has he forgotten not one but twenty sections of the Act of 1874, brought in by the hon. member for Lambton, containing a series of provisions, setting forth how those lands were to be used for the purpose of aiding in the construction of that railroad?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I will call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that his leader said, in his speech, that the lands could not be sold, but would be given free.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that it was impossible to send settlers into that country unless they got land free.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: My hon. friend is perfectly right in saying that, for

the purpose of developing that country, it is, in the very initial stages, of great moment to give away some land to encourage settlement. But he never pretended it would be part of his policy or that of any Government to give the great mass of the lands along the line of the Pacific Railway in free grants. We recognised distinctly and clearly the fact that, for the purpose of promoting the settlement of that country, some sacrifice might be undergone, more especially because we knew there was great competition to be borne with from the United States in the settlement of the North-West, and that they offered great tracts of land to settlers on very favourable terms, and that so long as that rivalry continued, it would be practically impossible for us to attract to the North-West any but the most inferior class of settlers, unless prepared to give corresponding advantages to those offered by the United States. But that statement in no way detracts from the well-settled policy, set out in the Act to which I have alluded, of using a large portion of those lands to aid in the construction of this railroad. The right hon. gentleman tells us that it is the same thing to start a railroad from the Pacific Ocean eastwards, 500 miles, beginning from a base of 500 miles broad, to a point which he does not know, which neither the Minister of Public Works nor any of the engineers knows, as asking the consent of Parliament to start from a well-defined point like Fort William, on the shores of Lake Superior, to another point, equally well defined, 100 or 150 miles distant. To compare that to the proposition brought down by the Minister of Public Works, shows the First Minister must feel how poor is the cause he is advocating. Then he calls attention to the fact that the member for Lambton proposed to build sixty-five miles from Esquimalt to Nanaimo. He knows that that was expressly provided as compensation to British Columbia for the delay in the prosecution of the principal work, and that it was not intended or accepted as any part of the Canadian Pacific line. He tells us my hon. friend from Lambton proposed a thing of shreds and patches—a scheme of half water-stretches and half railroad. The right hon. gentleman forgets that the railroad under his management, as well

as ours, comes to a dead stop at the west end of Lake Superior, and that Lakes Superior and Huron interpose a tolerably good water-stretch between the two sections. When does the Minister of Public Works, or the Premier, hope we shall be able to bridge the long stretch of 700 or 800 miles extending from end to end of those magnificent inland seas? Do what he will, it must be his scheme, as well as ours, to continue to use those great water-stretches. What my hon. friend did say was that he proposed to use those great inland seas at one end of the line, and save the construction of 500 to 600 miles of railway through an uninhabitable country, and that he designed, at the earliest moment, to connect Lake Superior and Red River by the railway, and that, when so far west, he thought he would use those other magnificent inland seas which drain the interior of Manitoba, and which, together with the navigation of the Saskatchewan, gave ship-way or water-stretches of between 700 and 800 miles, or very nearly to the base of the Rocky Mountains. That was a great and well-conceived policy; but I never heard or understood my hon. friend to say that other water routes than these would be used except as a mere temporary expedient, as he designed to make use of the portage system for the present between Lake Superior and Red River.

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

After Recess.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I shall detain the House but a few moments longer, but I feel it would be unwise, on our part, to allow these resolutions to pass this stage without calling attention to certain points in connection more particularly with the natural aspect of the country, which I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works has hardly sufficiently considered, that is to say, if I understood correctly the proposals he has introduced to the House. Sir, we have lately engaged in a two-fold experiment. In the first place, we are attempting, by means of an enormously increased taxation, to relieve the depressed condition of certain portions of the people of

this country. Now, whatever may be said as to the correctness of the views of the hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not think that anyone, even among themselves, will be found bold enough to deny that we are engaged in an experiment, the result of which nobody can accurately foresee. Just at the time, therefore, when it is, to say the least of it, a matter of great uncertainty what will be the exact revenue upon which the people can count for the next three or four years, at any rate, we find the hon. the Minister of Public Works bringing down a scheme which may, if I understand it aright, result in an enormous addition to the annual fixed charges of this country. Now, I think it will be necessary to consider a little the two series of the resolutions which the Minister has brought down. At the time the Budget was introduced, I called the attention of the House to the fact that it was very probable that, over and above the expenditure to which the Minister of Finance had made reference, we would be called upon, before we rose, to provide for the purchase and working of the Rivière du Loup Branch, as I see he actually proposes to us to do by the second set of resolutions on this very paper. It is a matter of very great importance that we should understand exactly what are the facts, as the expenditure is one which we may be called upon to provide for within the next year or two, wholly apart from any expenditures that may be incurred under the resolutions of the Minister of Public Works. By the first estimate brought down by the Minister of Finance, a sum of \$23,425,000 was required for the service of the year 1879-80; to that, by the recent Supplementary Estimates are added about \$186,000, together with certain minor charges by Statute for Manitoba and Prince Edward Island, and one or two other matters. We may, therefore, put the total annual expenditure, as estimated by the hon. gentleman, at \$23,650,000 in round numbers. Now, the second set of resolutions on these papers contemplates the purchasing for about \$2,000,000 (including the sum requisite to put the road in order) of the Rivière du Loup Branch of the Grand Trunk Railroad, whereby an annual expenditure of \$100,000 a year will be

added to our fixed charges. Over and above that, I think the Minister of Public Works will admit that I am within the mark, in saying that \$100,000 a year will have to be provided for the running expenses of the 114 miles of road he proposes to assume. It is not possible for us, nor will it be possible for the hon. Minister himself, to give the House any exact information, I fear, as to the extent of the deficit that will be involved by taking this branch over, and that for two reasons: first of all, there is only too much ground to believe that it is now run by the Grand Trunk at a heavy loss, and, in the next place, he knows—we all know—that it will be a matter of extreme difficulty to ascertain how far a great portion of the traffic, which now goes over the Intercolonial Railroad, may then be diverted to Portland. That he will endeavour to avoid this as far as he can, I have no doubt, but we all know it will be a matter of extreme difficulty. I do not know, but I may say it will be impossible, to prevent shippers at the western extremity of the line from deciding what Atlantic port their goods shall go to.

MR. TUPPER: Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to say that the surplus over working expenses last year, a very unfavourable year, was \$28,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: But I also know the condition the company had allowed the road to get into, and I am afraid that, if the hon. the Minister of Public Works keeps the road up in fair condition, that will not be a sum on which he can depend, wholly apart from the other contingency to which I alluded—the risk of a diversion of the traffic. I have no right, I admit, to insist upon that, but I call attention to the fact that there is great risk that a very considerable additional annual charge will be made, not only for the purchase money, but particularly by reason of the diversion of traffic which will arise. Now, the hon. the Minister of Finance brought down a demand for about \$11,000,000 for public works, and the least we can count on will be a further additional charge of about \$550,000 a year, although not all falling within next year, for the interest and sinking fund on the \$11,000,000 which he proposes to

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

expend ; and that, as I perceive from the statement of the Minister of Public Works, is a thing wholly and entirely apart from any expenditure which may be incurred in the prosecution of the Pacific Railroad westward of Red River. Supposing it is possible for the Minister of Finance, and for the Government, to keep within the limit of their own estimate of \$23,650,000, and, supposing that only \$800,000 require to be added for the other services I have alluded to, he will find our annual expenditure raised to the sum of \$24,500,000 in round numbers. Now, it is, as I have said, a matter of very grave doubt in the mind of those who are best qualified to judge what will be the real effect of the tariff we have just introduced. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Burpee), to whose information on such subjects I would be disposed to bow, is inclined to think that, at first, though at first only, the Estimates of the Finance Minister may be somewhat exceeded, but it is, to say the least, extremely likely that the other result may occur, and that our importations may, as they actually did, in the case of the United States, fall off to a considerable extent, and that, so far from obtaining \$2,000,000 or \$2,250,000, on which the hon. the Minister of Finance relies, we may find ourselves scarcely in possession of more than one half, and, perhaps, even less of the amount he expects to obtain. The matter, as I say, is one of opinion, and I do not express any decided view on the subject, but I say it is an experiment. I say that it is a danger, and I say that, until that experiment is decided one way or the other, and until we know with some degree of accuracy on what we have to depend, I think it is a matter involving the extremest risk to commit ourselves to other expenditures, which may add largely to the annual outlay of \$24,500,000, which, according to the statements submitted by those hon. gentlemen, we are almost certain to incur, if not within the next twelve months, certainly within the next eighteen months. I may further state that I fear other expenditures will arise, which will swell our annual expenditure to something like \$25,000,000 ; at any rate, I should be extremely relieved if the hon. gentlemen are able to keep the expenditure within the sum they have

named themselves, in the Estimates recently brought down. Now, whether the amount be more or less, there is no doubt whatever that the immediate effect of a Protective tariff is to take a good deal more out of the pockets of the people than it puts into the Treasury. We must, therefore, recollect that we are now about to undertake large additional expenses, so large that the hon. gentleman is not able to give us any accurate estimate of what they may be, with a certain fixed expenditure of about \$24,500,000, and with the probability that the burdens of the people for some time to come will be largely increased by the necessary results of the operation of the tariff we have lately introduced. Under these circumstances, I would earnestly advise—as far as it is possible for me to hope my advice will be listened to—I would advise the hon. gentlemen opposite, more especially the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works, not to commit themselves on any account to a large expenditure in this direction, unless they are able to rely with perfect certainty on being able to obtain large sums of money on very favourable terms. Whether they can do it or not by the sale of these lands, time alone can show. I do not say it is not fair to expect to make a considerable amount of the cost of these railroads out of these lands, but I must point out that it will require a very large sale indeed to give any perceptible relief to the public finances ; and, although I entertain, as I have said at the outset, myself, high hopes of what may be the future of this North-West country, yet I feel that, at present, and until we know more accurately than it is possible for us now to know, what the true financial position is, the hon. gentleman will do a very mischievous thing indeed if he commits the people of this country, on the faith of such resolutions as these, to any considerable expenditure in any direction whatever. My own objection to the resolutions before you are chiefly these : I object, as does my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) to the statement with respect to the Burrard Inlet route, as no doubt the hon. gentleman knew we must object. I object also, and for the same grounds, which he (Mr. Mackenzie) has ably stated, to the proposition that the Gov-

ernment should be allowed to locate 125 miles of the road when they are not acquainted with the country, which their engineers are not able to define in the contracts, and which may not improbably involve an additional expenditure of \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000. Moreover, I doubt extremely the wisdom of the precedent of establishing a Commission, without stating to the members of this House exactly what the powers of this Commission may be, and who are to be the gentlemen appointed thereto. This whole business, however, is at present in a tentative shape. From what I can gather from the hon. the Minister of Public Works, he does not appear to have, or to be able to communicate to the House, any single fact whereon he can base an assurance that this project will be taken up by persons in England in a position to afford him material aid. If he gives, or if he proposes to give, as I think the First Minister more than intimated, the guarantee of Canada in addition to the lands, and in addition to the railway itself—if he proposes to give that for a large amount, I do not doubt that he might obtain or secure some company to start with the operation. Nor do I think that there will be any great difficulty, probably, in bridging the 1,200 or 1,400 miles, which intervene between Red River on the one side, and British Columbia on the other, but he will find that he will run very great risks; that, inasmuch as his conditions are extremely stringent, and, moreover, unless the parties with whom he makes a bargain are possessed, in their own right, of a large amount of capital, he will run great risk of getting this country committed to an enterprise, for which we will be called upon to furnish further funds from time to time. Do what he pleases, he will find it almost impossible to induce or compel contractors to execute the really difficult parts of the road at once. Moreover, as I understood his scheme, he proposes to make this largely subsidiary to a great colonising movement, and, if he does that, it will be necessary for him, in the first instance, at any rate, to allow them to construct the road, and to receive advances while engaged in the easy part of the task, leaving over the more difficult portions to a later period. I think, therefore, that the hon. gentleman ought

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

to be content with a general discussion of these matters; he ought to be content with knowing that, if he brings anything like a matured and well-considered scheme, no unreasonable opposition will be given to it on either side of the House. The resolutions he has presented, and the discussions he has had, will serve his purpose nearly, if not altogether, as well as the passage of these resolutions through the House; as I take it for granted, from certain remarks of his, that his intention is simply to pass the resolutions, and not to put an Act on the Statute-book.

MR. TUPPER: I may say the Act is already upon the Statute-book. We do not propose to ask any legislation except with reference to the Pembina Branch, which alone, of all the portions embraced in these resolutions, is unprovided for.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am not aware there is anything on the Statute-book which would authorise the location of these 125 miles by the mode proposed, nor that there is anything which would authorise the creation of the Commission; and I think the quantity of land, which is proposed to be given, is very much larger under these resolutions than under the existing Statute—all three points of the gravest moment. Moreover, the hon. gentleman has given us, indeed, very little information as to the mode in which he proposes to float his bonds. We have got a little more in an indirect fashion from the First Minister, but no such full statement as I think the House ought to be presented with before being asked to plunge headforemost in an undertaking which may easily enough end in requiring us to provide \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 more within the next four or five years, over and above the large liabilities which we have already. As I stated in my place last year, the policy which I then thought the wisest policy, and which I still think the wisest, would be to complete, in the first instance, that portion of the line from Lake Superior to Selkirk, and, after that, not to commit ourselves rashly to any further expenditure until we have ascertained distinctly and clearly what the resources of the country will permit, in conformity with the opinion expressed by all the legislators that, up to this time, have dealt with this subject. That, I think, is the course which commends itself to

the prudence and common sense of every hon. gentleman here, and, although we are powerless to prevent, we are not without power to warn, and we are not without power to call the attention of the country in future to the evil results which may follow, which, I fear, all follow from any hasty action in the premises, just as they followed with such serious consequences to the hon. gentlemen themselves in the case of their hasty and ill-considered action in 1871. Of the proposition that we shall apply to the Imperial Government for aid to construct this road, I have only to say that it was the duty of the then Government of Canada, before they came to terms with British Columbia, to have made application to the English Government. I hold it showed a great want of statesmanship on their part that they allowed themselves to become charged with the care of that Pacific coast, and with the still more onerous burden of constructing a railroad across the continent without having first applied to the British Government for assistance. I think that they had a right to ask for it, and, if they had done so then, they would probably have got it. I shall support, with all my heart, any reasonable proposition in that direction now; but I am bound to say that I fear the course pursued by hon. gentlemen themselves is one which is calculated to throw many unnecessary difficulties in their way. Anyone who has watched the tone of public opinion in England of late, must be aware that they felt annoyed that large classes of their goods are being shut by the high tariff of this country. Although, I hope, with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), that they will return good for evil, still I must say it is a very extraordinary way to propitiate, and to induce them to come to our assistance at a time when we can advance no legal claim upon them for aid, that we should commit ourselves to a policy which is utterly opposed to the whole policy of the Empire, and which, at a time of very considerable need in England—a time, according to the hon. gentleman's own admission, of extreme need—has, beyond all doubt, contributed in no small degree to aggravate the difficulties with which they were now struggling. Nevertheless, with the exception

of the point to which I have referred, I shall be glad to do anything in my power to assist hon. gentlemen in that particular direction, and, although I am not able, at present, to say that I think they have any very considerable chance of success, although I fear their own conduct has seriously interfered with the prospect of that success, still I am not disposed to complain of their attempt, even at this twelfth hour, to obtain that assistance whereby alone, I fear, they will have a chance to float this scheme.

Mr. DAWSON said that the resolutions were statesmanlike and comprehensive, as was also the very able speech which the Minister of Public Works had delivered in bringing them forward. The true policy was certainly to set aside lands, from the sale of which, in course of time, funds more than equal to the cost of the railway, which was to render them valuable, would be realised, and the plan of vesting these lands in Commissioners, for sale and administration, seemed to be a wise one. Every practical man who had given attention to the subject must approve of the policy of combining colonisation with railway construction west of the Red River, and he was very much pleased with the eleventh resolution, which referred to further exploration in the Peace and Pine River districts. It was not going too far, as stated in the second resolution, to say that our railway would be a highway to the dependencies of Great Britain in the Pacific, as well as to China and Japan. The route would certainly be the shortest and the best for passenger traffic, but, in considering this great undertaking, it would be well to keep in view the change which had taken place in the direction of a carrying trade which it was at one time supposed would go far to support it. They should not now be led away with the idea that the line would be the main highway of traffic between Asia and Western Europe. The Suez Canal had been opened about the time at which the Canadian Pacific Railway was projected, and it would for ever divert the bulk of the carrying trade between Asia and Western Europe from the railways of this continent. Its success had been such as to throw out of employment the great fleets of sailing vessels that used to pass

by the Cape of Good Hope, and it had disappointed the projectors of the United States Pacific Railroad in the anticipation that their line would command a large share of Asiatic traffic. California and Oregon had, however, grown to be great States, and the trade from these and the mineral regions of the Pacific slope supported the transcontinental line of our neighbours. They carried teas and other merchandise of China and Japan for the populous Eastern States of the Union, but they had been, in a great measure, disappointed in the stream of traffic which they had anticipated from beyond the broad waters of the Pacific Ocean. Canada should, therefore, to a large extent, eliminate from its calculations the carrying trade of China, Japan and the East Indies; and could not, moreover, reckon on any great trade from the Pacific coast, for an indefinite period. No doubt, British Columbia was destined to become a populous and thriving Province, but, at present, its traffic would not go far towards the support of a transcontinental railroad. In view, therefore, of a limited carrying trade from the Pacific, it became less a matter of importance to have the very shortest route, than to have the line which should best open up and lead to the settlement of the vast unpeopled districts of the North-West. Their policy should be to place the railway where it would pass through the greatest extent of fertile land, if they did not thereby greatly divert it from the straightest obtainable course, and still more should this be their policy if they could run it through the most fertile belts, and, at the same time, have easier gradients, which were, within certain limits, quite as important to a railway as a diminution of distance. He (Mr. Dawson) was glad to see that this was the policy indicated by the resolutions, and it was well known that to the east of the Rocky Mountains there was a better route than the present projected line to the Yellow Head Pass. Before reaching that Pass a long extent of indifferent country had to be passed through. The plains east of the mountains, on the route projected, were at a great elevation, cold, and, to a considerable extent, barren. The great desert of the Missouri extended in a strip, always narrowing, even to the North

MR. DAWSON.

Saskatchewan, and the line ran through a portion of the desert. Even after passing the Pembina River, which was west of the desert, on reference to Mr. Marcus Smith's published report of 29th March, 1878, it would be seen that there would be between four and five hundred miles of very inferior, if not absolutely barren country, almost in a continuous stretch. There was, undoubtedly, a better route, as regarded the development of the country, by the Passes of the Peace River, better also as regarded gradients and alignments. North of the Saskatchewan, both the Rocky Mountains, and the plains to the east of them rapidly decreased in altitude, and there was a marked change for the better in soil and climate. They had some valuable information in regard to the region through which a line to the Peace River country would pass, both from reports of officers of the Pacific Survey, and the writings of explorers of a former day. Mr. Marcus Smith, whose high character for integrity and truth gave weight to every word he uttered, in his official report just referred to, had remarked as follows:—

“The south slope of the Moose Hills, where the trail runs, is covered with a dense growth of aspen, but, in crossing to the west end of these hills, a magnificent prospect opened out. Stretching away to the east, north and west, as far as the eye could reach, there appears a vast undulating plain, rising in places into lofty rounded hills, dotted and intersected with groves of aspen mixed with spruce and tamarac and clumps of willows. During these days, wherever the trail was left, great difficulty was found in forcing a way through thick masses of grass and peavine, three to four feet in height, and sometimes reaching nearly to the horses' backs. As Lac la Biche was neared, the country became more wooded, and the track lay through long glades, between belts of poplar and willows.”

After passing the Lesser Slave Lake, he said:

“The line enters on a vast region of great fertility, extending far northward on both sides of the Peace River, and westward to Pine River. By this route, what is termed the fertile belt, or wheat-producing country, extends nearly three hundred miles further to the west, before the Rocky Mountains are reached, than by the route over the Yellow Head Pass, a corresponding reduction being made in the breadth of sterile country to be crossed in the Rocky Mountain district.”

Surely such a country as this was not to be left out of calculation, but he would

read another extract regarding it, and from an earlier writer. Sir Alex. McKenzie, after whom the Great McKenzie River was called, in his journal under date of 10th May, 1793, wrote of the Peace River country as follows:—

“From the place which we quitted this morning, the west side of the river displayed a succession of the most beautiful scenery I had ever beheld. The ground rises at intervals to a considerable height, and stretching inwards to a considerable distance. At every interval or pause in the rise, there is a very gently ascending space or lawn, which is alternate with abrupt precipices to the summit of the whole or, at least, as far as the eye could distinguish. This magnificent theatre of nature has all the decorations which the trees and animals of the country can afford it. Groves of poplar in every shape vary the scene, and their intervals are enlivened with vast herds of elks and buffaloes—the former choosing the steeps and uplands, and the latter preferring the plains. At this time the buffaloes were attended with their young ones, who were frisking about them, and it appeared that the elks would soon exhibit the same enlivening circumstance. The whole country displayed an exuberant verdure, and the trees that bear a blossom were fast advancing to that delightful appearance.”

Professor Selwyn was equally struck with the country; and Professor Macoun, a distinguished naturalist and botanist, said of it:

“Clumps of willows and poplars of various ages were interspersed with the most astonishing growth of herbaceous plants I ever saw. In many places the peas and vetches were in such abundance as to completely cover up all other plants, causing the country to look like a field of mixed peas and vetches. It would be folly to attempt to depict the appearance of the country, as it was so much beyond what I ever saw before that I dare hardly make use of truthful words to pourtray it.”

The same writer remarked further on (page 33, reports of 1877):

“I was on Peace River the whole month of October, 1872, and the constant record was warm sunshine, west wind, balmy atmosphere, and skies of the brightest blue. Even as late as the 15th of October, the thermometer was 48° at daylight, and 61° in the shade at noon.

“Within the foot hills of the Rocky Mountains, I picked up three species of plants in flower as late as the 26th of the same month. These facts, and the testimony of all the residents in the country, show conclusively that there is an open fall all along Peace River from the Mountains to Lake Athabaska.”

It would be needless to multiply descriptions, but he (Mr. Dawson) might say that the testimony of all the writers and *voyageurs*, who had been in the

Peace River country, was to the same effect. The river opened about the 20th of April, and sowing commenced about the 1st of May, and that was more than could be said of the beautiful and populous Ottawa region where they now were.

In proceeding westward by the Pine River Pass, the Rocky Mountains were crossed at an elevation of 2,400ft. above sea level, and west of the mountains, the country was said not to be so barren as that in the latitude of the Yellow Head Pass. Now the point at which he wished to arrive was this: If, by keeping to the valley of the Peace River, we developed such a country as was described, population would flow in, and our railway would, in course of time, have traffic arising within the country itself to sustain it. If, on the other hand, it should run through 600 miles of barren country, which the reports showed to be on the Yellow Head Pass route, it never could have local traffic, and we could not get capital wherewith to build it. The true policy was to run the railroad where it must ultimately yield the best return for the capital invested. As to the line projected by the Yellow Head Pass being cheaper to build, he (Mr. Dawson) much doubted it. The reports of the engineers differed widely, and he feared that the estimate had been made in this, as had been seen in other cases, without sufficient data whereon to found it. Over the projected line no location had been effected, and the figures given in the report were the merest guesswork. It was well known that the engineers differed in their views, and did not pull together, and it was said that reports of very great value had been suppressed, for what reason it was difficult to conceive, seeing that the public had a right to all the information which it had cost such enormous sums to obtain. In the published report of Mr. Marcus Smith, a map was referred to, without which the information conveyed could not be readily understood, and it was said that a map prepared by the Department of the Interior had also been suppressed. Rumour had it that these maps were suppressed at the time Mr. Fleming was about to proceed to England, last year, because they showed that the line which he was to advocate—that by the Yellow Head

Pass—ran through a great extent of barren country, and that there was a much finer country not far off and nearly parallel to it; but he (Mr. Dawson) would have great difficulty in believing that maps could be suppressed with such an object. It would have been unfair to those who were invited to join in such a great national undertaking to withhold from them any information which could enable them to form an independent opinion of the work to be done and the road to be opened up by that work. In the meantime, he must say that the report just issued by the Chief Engineer was a most extraordinary document. On reference to it, it would be seen that its pages bristled with the words "nothing reliable known," in reference to the sections regarding which it was most important to know something, and that, too, after eight years of exploration and an expenditure of \$4,000,000 on surveys alone. The late Premier had just said that he had not limited the Chief Engineer as to the surveys, and that he had been at liberty to employ as many men as he chose, and the result was, according to this report, "nothing reliable known." The report was inconsistent with itself, inasmuch as on the map—and a most unique map it was—sections were set down as fertile which a careful study of the extracts actually given would prove to be barren, or comparatively so; but other extracts might have been made from some of the works quoted, which would have conveyed a better idea of the opinions of their authors. And in this view some of the extracts could only be regarded as garbled. The map showed large areas on and near the projected line, well known to be inferior, as being fertile, while, as regarded the Peace River region, except a small strip along the river, it was set down as unknown, with notes to the effect that no reliable information had been obtained regarding it, although it had been pretty well known for a long period, and recently explored by some of the officers of the survey, Macoun, Horetzky, and others. Both map and report were *ex parte*, showing one section in too favourable a light, and another as unknown to an extent which existing information did not warrant. It would be questionable policy to send such documents to England, because, in the first place, apart from any higher consideration, English engineers would soon analyse them and see what they were worth; and, in the next, if capitalists were led to invest on information which the circumstances did not justify, if they were led to believe that the great elevated plain east of the mountains and south of the North Saskatchewan, was a grass-covered flowery region, instead of a comparatively arid waste, with good soil and grass only in the bottom lands, they might come afterwards on the country for damages. The true policy, in his (Mr. Dawson's) opinion, was to publish all the information that had been obtained, especially the official information, obtained by the Department of the Interior, or the officers of the Railway Survey. Surely the Deputy Minister of the Interior—himself a surveyor, and a highly scientific man—was quite as able to describe the country so long under his supervision as Mr. Sandford Fleming. A map had been prepared under his supervision, showing a very different condition of the country as to fertile and barren areas from that exhibited on Mr. Fleming's map. The latter was evidently a map got up for a purpose. It gave an incorrect view and misleading information in reference to the character of the country east of the Rocky Mountains, both on the Saskatchewan and on Peace River, showing the one district to be better than it really was, and the other worse or unknown. In regard to the country between Lake Superior and Manitoba, the report just issued—showing that it would cost \$83,000 per mile to complete Section 15, and over \$80,000 per mile to complete the adjoining Section B—would take this House and the country by surprise, more especially when the enormous sum of \$18,000,000 was set down as being necessary to complete the entire line from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, making an average of \$44,000 per mile, where the first estimate had been \$24,000 per mile, or less than \$10,000,000 for the entire line, fully equipped. These figures had fully vindicated him (Mr. Dawson) in his long and persistent advocacy of the Southern Route, by Sturgeon Falls, which, had his advice been taken, would have been by this

time in operation, with no greater outlay than had already occurred. It was shorter by 30 miles than the present line, and it would have ended at Fort Garry, which was the best starting point for railway extension westward through the prairies. True, there would, for the present, have been a navigable stretch in the middle of this route, extending from Sturgeon Falls to the Narrows of the Lake of the Woods, but this navigable stretch led past the rough sections. Nature had placed it where it was most wanted, and, by making use of it, as a temporary expedient, the line would not thereby have been in the least deflected from the straightest obtainable course, when an all-through line of railway became necessary. In the meantime, there would have been a saving of \$10,000,000, and it should be remembered that, until a railway was in operation from the point in Ontario to which existing railways had reached, through the wild regions to the north of Lakes Huron and Superior, we could only have communication with Manitoba through our own territory during the season of navigation, so that a navigable stretch was, as regarded speedy transportation, a matter of less consequence than it would otherwise have been. He was sorry that, after the Premier of the late Government had got on the right track, he had suffered himself to be driven out of it by a ridiculous cry about "magnificent water-stretches." The water-stretches were really magnificent, and nature had placed this one in the very position where it was most needed, but, instead of taking advantage of the beneficence of nature, millions upon millions were being wasted on the stern and unyielding rocks of Keewatin. It was always claimed by the late Government that they had acted on the advice of the engineers, but this was by no means the case. The opinions of the field engineers could not reach the Government. They had to make their views conform to preconceived notions. If they did otherwise, they were discharged. All the Government had to go by was the view of the Chief Engineer, who had never been over the ground, and who had shown himself to be anything but a safe guide. Reports had been held back and informa-

tion which would have been of great value to the country had been suppressed. There had, in the first instance, been a great deal of unnecessary expenditure on all the surveys, and there had existed a foregone conclusion to take the northern route, cost what it might. The southern route would have developed mines, opened up a fine forest country, where timber, much needed in the prairies of the west, was abundant, and it would have brought settlement into the country between Lakes Superior and Manitoba; whereas the line adopted passed far to the north, through a region where there was little or nothing to develop. The difference in cost, even taking the figures in the report as a basis of calculation, could not be set at less than \$10,000,000, and that was a sum which would press heavily on the present as well as on future generations. It was much to be regretted that a scheme which had had so much to recommend it in the way of economy, facility of construction, and ultimate advantage, should have been abandoned without due consideration. Years had been frittered away in looking for a route in the rocky regions to the north of the Lake of the Woods, and during all that time we had been building up and fostering settlement in a foreign country, instead of our own. Our people had been caught on their way through the United States, and led to settle in Minnesota, and we had encouraged a trade with that State which it would be difficult to regain. The policy adopted in respect to the line from Thunder Bay to Manitoba had, indeed, been suicidal, and the evidence being taken before another branch of the Legislature, showed a most deplorable state of things still existing in the management. There seemed to have been very strange proceedings in respect to Section 15; he meant the section immediately west of Rat Portage; and, in regard to Section 14, of 77 miles, leading from Selkirk to Cross Lake, for the most part over a level country, it was let at \$402,750, but its cost was now set at \$723,134, or something less than double, and so on with other works. Was this in the interest of the country, or would any man tolerate such management on the part of agents in his own affairs? The same mismanagement and extravagance which

had characterised the surveys had been continued on the works. The only true remedy to apply, was to effect an entire change in a system of management which had proved so disastrous. Means should be taken to ascertain the real opinions of the field engineers, and they should be in a position to feel that they were at liberty to express them, without, as at present, the risk of losing their places. The best way of effecting this would be to have a Board of Engineers, each one of whom should be independent of the others, and, above all, independent of the contractors. The sums being spent were enormous. This vast expenditure would affect the country for a long time to come, and a little present outlay, in employing the best talent that could be commanded to decide on the reports of engineers and the direction of route, would be the truest economy. In regard to the Georgian Bay Branch, in his (Mr. Dawson's) opinion, it should, if made, be continued all the way to Sault St. Marie, and be designated the "Sault St. Marie Branch," instead of the "Georgian Bay Branch." A very good line, with easy gradients, had already been found and surveyed, from Cantin's Bay and French River westward to Sault St. Marie. It passed not far from the coast of Lake Huron, through a district fast rising into importance, a district rich in minerals, with considerable areas of good land, and in which there would always be a considerable trade in lumber. But this branch line, if adopted, would have something more than mere local traffic to support it. Once completed to Sault St. Marie, the people of the States bordering on Lake Superior, would see its importance as a winter outlet for their products, and a means of rapid conveyance to the seaboard in summer, and would soon form a railway connection with it. In winter it would, without doubt, command a fair share of the trade of the Western States, and, if carried a little beyond Sault St. Marie, to the open waters of Lake Superior, it would be of very great advantage to that portion of the Pacific line which we were now building between Thunder Bay and Manitoba. Lake Superior was an open sea which did not freeze, even in the bays, until winter was far advanced, and navigation would be not only practicable, but

MR. DAWSON.

easy, over the 300 miles of open water between the Sault Ste. Marie Branch and the terminus of the Pacific Railroad at Thunder Bay, all through the months of November and December. This would be of vast importance to the trade of the North-West, for it would enable the harvests of Manitoba to be carried out in the fall. The Sault St. Marie Branch would thus have a traffic from our own territories, and a traffic from the western territories of the United States. It would render unnecessary, for a long time to come, the construction of the main Pacific line through the wilderness to the north of Lakes Huron and Superior. The country could not at present afford to build 700 miles of railway through that unbroken wilderness, and the true plan was, in the meantime, to run a branch to Sault St. Marie, and he might add that, in his belief, a considerable part of this branch would, eventually, form a portion of the main Pacific line—perhaps half-way up Lake Huron, or even to the Mississauga River; it would, for the ground was better for railway construction near the coast than it was further inland. They should not be deterred from this scheme by the silly cry that, in building a branch to Sault Ste. Marie they were favouring United States lines. People who raised such cries should know that a railroad could not live without traffic, and that if we could secure any considerable share of the trade of our neighbours, it would be highly desirable to do so. Let the Sault Ste. Marie branch be opened, and a stream of traffic would pour over it during the winter months, flooding the Canada Central and the Occidental to their utmost capacity of carriage, giving winter freights also to the railroads of Ontario, as soon as she shall have extended some of her lines to the Nipissing region. But what could be gained by making a branch merely to the Georgian Bay, or by converting the French River into a canal? These would only be summer routes, at best, and large vessels, once loaded, would not leave the high waterway to go up hill and unload at Lake Nipissing, or even at the mouth of French River, were the Georgian Bay branch to stop there. These schemes were delusive, and the best policy would

be the bold one of running the branch all the way to Sault Ste. Marie. He (Mr. Dawson) was not opposed to the opening up of the French River and constructing a canal, by way of Lake Nipissing and the Ottawa, but it was too vast a scheme to enter into while we had the Pacific Railroad with its branches on our hands. There was really a fine country to develop on Lake Huron. Among the hills of the north coast there were valleys of unsurpassed fertility, fast filling up with an industrious population, and that too of our own people from the older settlements. The Island of Manitoulin was nearly as large as the Island of Prince Edward, and quite as fertile. There were other large islands along the north shore, and both islands and mainland were alike cut off in winter. A branch to Sault Ste. Marie would remedy this. It would lead to the development of mines, forests, fisheries and agricultural lands in a region which, with all its vast and varied natural resources, its fine climate, its rapidly increasing population and growing trade, was, as yet, inaccessible in winter. By running a branch to Sault Ste. Marie, we would not only open up a most important section of country, not only lengthen the period during which communication could be kept up with the North-West Territories, over Canadian waters and Canadian railways, but secure a large share of a foreign traffic while we created a very important local traffic. He observed that the Chief Engineer had suggested that the grant of \$800,000 for the Georgian Bay Branch should be expended in making what he called a "territorial road" from the east end of Lake Nipissing westward along the line of the Pacific Railway. The Chief Engineer had a hobby about territorial roads, and he (Mr. Dawson) feared rather an expensive and impracticable hobby. In this case, if the line of the Pacific Railway were to be adopted, it would have, in the first place, to be located, and at the rate which the location surveys have hitherto cost, the \$800,000 would not go very far in that work. Not to speak of the territorial road, it certainly would not suffice to locate 600 miles in such a manner as to make the line available for a railway track in the future. But, admitting that the terri-

torial road were made, it certainly would not, of itself, draw settlement from its natural course along the lakes and lines of water communication, and, unless large sums were annually spent in keeping it open, it would, in a few years, be covered with a dense forest. Experience had shown that a road made through the woods, and so left, was immediately taken possession of by young trees, and so densely did they grow that the roadway soon became the most impenetrable part of the forest. The fact was that territorial roads through a wild region could not be made in such a way as to be of use. The idea was chimerical, although not quite original, and it would be much better to expend the amount on the line for which it was intended, extending it, as circumstances would permit, to Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. McLENNAN said they all remembered the proposition that was made by the Government soon after Confederation, to construct a railway across the continent to the Pacific Ocean, upon the basis of a subsidy of money, and of public lands for settlement. They remembered that when that project was framed, which would probably have met with the requirements of capitalists and provided for the construction of the road, the hostility of a faction in this country prevented that consummation. He had been amazed to hear from the hon. the leader of the Opposition and his friends, all the old ground-out arguments about the utilisation of water-stretches, and that this system was enlarged by the colleagues of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, to include the great lakes. When that project was presented, it was not a project for connecting the great lakes; it was a project for connecting lakes in the interior, that had a beginning and an end, but led to nowhere. After some years' trial of that system, the late Government came back to the necessity of providing for the construction of the road by the use of the public lands and by such money grants as would cover their cost. What he wished to impress upon the Government was that they should try to get back to that principle in the future, because he maintained that there was, and would be, perpetual difficulty in the Government constructing

and working the railway, and that, if it was possible, the Government should rid themselves, by a very liberal contribution of public money, of an incubus of anxiety, trouble and difficulty, of which, they could, perhaps, have no comprehension at the outset. The questions which had come up already in connection with the Intercolonial, were a very small epitome of the difficulties to which they would be subjected in undertaking to build this railway and run it. Another feature that he should like to impress upon the Government was, the question of the line to be adopted. He had heard it stated with great confidence from the other side that the true policy for this country was to find the most direct line across the continent. He hoped the time would come when we should have a great trade developed across the continent, that would make it important for us to cross the continent; but, in the meantime, the most important matter and the true policy of the Government was to assist the construction of the railway in that fertile land, where it would find some sustenance. It would be impossible to carry on satisfactorily the next stage of the railway without considering the whole question in relation to the settlement of the country. In this connection the question of population came up very cogently, and he did not think it had been sufficiently considered. In discussing this question, he feared they were too largely influenced by the circumstances of the people that were more immediately under their notice. They had been told that there were a great many labourers out of employment, and, for that reason, it would be unwise to encourage immigration. Did any gentleman consider for a moment the value of people to a country? How were we going to get on in this country without a vast number of people out of all computation beyond the present population, or how were 4,000,000 people even going to turn to account the great stretch of country upon our hands? There were, indeed, some idle people in the country, but they did not help us. What we wanted was a people who would be of some use to us, who would settle this great fertile country towards the North-West, who would build the railways as they went, and be a peren-

Mr. McLENNAN.

nial source of wealth to the country. The value of these 100,000,000 acres of land had formed the subject of very exhaustive discussion; these lands might have a value of \$1, or \$5, or \$10 an acre, but had no value at all until they were settled. What had been done in similar cases in the United States? The Illinois Central Railway was built by a system of that kind, of very large grants of land. That land was sold, at first, at a very small price, \$1 an acre; it gradually rose to \$10 an acre, and to-day the lands of that company were worth \$20 an acre. There was no reason why a similar result should not happen in the North-West, but these lands would never be worth anything unless people settled on them. At present, the state of affairs in Europe was favourable to immigration, and, by giving the necessary information, in a concise form, of the position, the resources, and the possibilities of this country, and by using intelligent agents to scatter that information in Europe, the same class of people who had settled on the waste lands in the United States, these people from the Northern countries of Europe that were of such great advantage to the country, that furnished the population from which we had sprung ourselves, would be induced to settle in this country. Our ancestors in the fens of Northern Europe, those Angles and Saxons from whom the British original stock was developed, was considered of very little account, just as little as that great North-West now was, but the possibilities of a vast and powerful people were there. The possibilities were here if we would but use them. What he meant to suggest was that, in carrying on this railway project, it was a matter of so much less consequence that we should get directly across the country than that we should follow those lands of the country that were capable of settlement, and that the extension of our railway line by two or three hundred miles, in order to follow the direction of those lands, would be a wise thing; and, if, at some future day, the development of trade across the continent reached and connected with the Eastern hemisphere by the Pacific Ocean, it would be a much wiser thing than to construct the

shorter and more direct line ; but, in the meantime, the true policy of this Government would be to follow the fertile belt, and carry on the construction of the railway in the section of country where it would sustain itself. In connection with these resolutions, they had the report of the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was a very instructive report. Some allusion was made in it to the development of the means of transportation from the country. In connection with this, he might refer to the report from the Canal Commission, issued in 1870 by the Government of this country ; and the changes that took place in the methods of transportation, from that time to this, were very instructive. The report of the Commission stated that the route of the St. Lawrence, with the improved navigation, was the one that must necessarily be adopted as the great carrying route of this continent, and figures were quoted to show that, whereas wheat would be carried from the western side of Lake Michigan for about 10c. a bushel less by the St. Lawrence than it could be by New York, to-day, wheat was carried to New York for about 10c. per bushel. That was supposed, only seven or eight years ago, to be the difference we had in favour of the St. Lawrence. That was the effect which resulted from the development of a carrying system completed and made cheaper by the construction of railways. The figures that were stated at that time, were altogether lost to-day. They were left far behind, and the mixed route by water-stretches, which had been taken up and abandoned, was out of the question. He was rather surprised to hear repeated, after it had been hammered out so much to the merest chaff, the statement that they had been legislating against Great Britain, and in the interest of the United States. He thought that every man in this country must have come to the conclusion that they must adopt a system for themselves, with regard to the carrying trade with the Western States, when they had in Canada the very best facilities, and a large margin in favour of this route. There never was a season when he could not count upon his fingers the cargoes of

grain or packages of goods sent by the Americans through this Canadian route. The fact was, that the Canadian route had to depend upon the Canadian people, and that the measure of traffic by it was the power and resources of Canada in capital and enterprise to buy and move it. Before they would be able to accomplish any material result in carrying out the enterprise under consideration, they must receive a vast accession of people from across the Atlantic. No country was better able to assist them in that respect than Great Britain. He thought he saw in these resolutions the germ of a system that he imagined must ultimately become the system of the British Empire, in which the parent country would be the partner of Canada in the carrying of it out for the financial and industrial development of the whole Empire. Thus, England would take her part with Canada in extending trade and settlement across this continent, through the fertile region about which they knew so little, but of which they knew enough to believe that it was a country of vast resources and possibilities. If it were true that they were one with British Columbia—that they were all citizens of one country—he believed that the Provinces on this side of the Rocky Mountains would consider that the interests of all, on both sides, were identical. He hoped, then, that British Columbia would not ask them to undertake the impossible, or make engagements of an impractical or absurd nature in obedience to sectional interests. It would be as unwise for one section as for the others to rush prematurely upon an expenditure of money on any portion of that road that would not produce satisfactory results. He thought more highly of the patriotism of British Columbia than to suppose that they had made a bargain by which the older Provinces were bound hand and foot to spend a certain sum on the other side of the continent on something that might produce no result. He hoped that the people generally would develop a patriotic interest in the whole country, and that all sections would work together for the interest of the country, and that all their interests would be one. He regretted very much that

these resolutions had been brought down at so late a period. He thought the whole matter was of so much importance that it required the earnest consideration of the House. The resolutions were suggestive, and necessarily a little indefinite in terms; but he saw no serious objection to the scheme proposed, if they had confidence in the Government. He believed, however, the Government was assuming a very great responsibility in undertaking to deal with 100,000,000 acres, and, possibly, constructing 125 miles of railway on the other side of the continent. He was not afraid, however, to leave that responsibility in their hands. But, in placing 100,000,000 acres in the hands of any Commission, the conditions and relations of that Commission in any connection that might be formed with Great Britain, were matters that should be very carefully considered; and the whole question of the settlement and development of the country should be carefully guarded, no separate feature of the undertaking being considered simply by itself, but the policy of the country considered as a whole, and well considered.

Mr. MILLS said he protested against the introduction of so important a subject in the closing days of the Session. The Government might, by the introduction of this subject at the last moment, prevent discussion in the House, and the proper consideration of one of the most important subjects ever submitted to it; but they would not be able to prevent its discussion in the country; and hon. gentlemen supporting the Ministry, who undertook to throw off discussion, would find some difficulty in defending, before the country, the propositions the Minister of Public Works had submitted. He (Mr. Mills) dissented from them. He did not believe, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman had much chance of success; but, if he were to succeed, the injury to the country would be infinitely greater than if he should fail. If he could secure the co-operation of the British Government in the obtaining of a loan by the Canadian Government, he (Mr. Mills) had no doubt that they would spend an amount of money in unprofitable undertakings that the resources of

this country would render it impossible to meet. The present scheme was not likely to succeed any better than the previous scheme of the hon. gentlemen opposite. This country was not able to construct a railway across the continent, and the sooner they honestly admitted their inability in the matter, the better for all classes. It was not fair, then, to hold out hopes of the very early completion of this undertaking. How was the country committed to those propositions? The hon. gentleman opposite agreed, on the union with British Columbia, to conditions utterly incapable of fulfilment, including the construction of the railway in ten years. The hon. gentleman knew well that he agreed that this road should be constructed in ten years, and he had no doubt the hon. gentleman introduced these resolutions at the close of the Session, in order to avoid a full consideration of the question. He believed the intention was to choke off discussion and to prevent that full consideration which the importance of the question demanded. The hon. gentleman had submitted series of a resolutions ill-considered, ill-digested, contradictory, and incompatible with the policy submitted to this House, and he now asked the House to lend its sanction to them. The hon. gentleman spoke about this being a great Imperial highway. Did the hon. gentleman believe that any railway ever constructed across this continent would ever be a line by which Asiatic commerce could pass? If he compared the Asiatic traffic on American railways, with that through the Suez Canal, he would see it was the merest bagatelle. There was no Asiatic traffic; there were no articles of commerce from Asia that were likely to find their way over this railway. The only traffic we could ever make for a railway was that which arose from its immediate vicinity along both sides. The hon. gentleman expected to get aid from the British Government. Had he any pledge that he would get it? He had admitted that he had not. The hon. gentleman had introduced this scheme in order to place at the disposal of the Government some gigantic piece of patronage rather than with the object of promoting the welfare of the country. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture told this House, a few evenings

Mr. McLENNAN.

ago, that the Government did not intend to encourage the immigration of the manufacturing classes of Great Britain, but their object was to bring out agriculturists. And now the hon. gentleman told them that the people of England were in distress; but who were those that were suffering? It was the manufacturing classes that were thrown out of employment, and not the agriculturists. But it was not the manufacturing classes the hon. gentleman wanted, but the agriculturists. Did the hon. gentleman expect to get a population here for whom, he admitted, he could find no employment, and who, from their previous habit, would be ill qualified, indeed, to perform the work required of them if they were to undertake to rough it in the North-West Territories? The hon. gentleman alluded to the views of Lord Derby, but Lord Derby was at this time connected with neither party. Why did the hon. gentleman not allude to the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? He knew well that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had recently announced that it would not be wise for the English Government to encourage immigration from the country. He did not desire to denude the country of its population and increase wages. The Minister of Finance in England had announced, in the most explicit manner, his entire opposition to the policy of the hon. gentlemen here, for which, they were told, to-night, it was possible to get the support of the Imperial Government. The hon. gentlemen proposed to lock up 100,000,000 acres of land. According to their scheme, the First Minister would be in the position of Othello—his occupation would be gone. He proposed that a Commissioner should do the most important portion of his work. The hon. gentleman proposed in these resolutions nothing less than a vote of want of confidence in his leader. He had also intimated that the English capitalists would have no confidence in the administration of the public lands by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. Was not the hon. gentleman as competent to manage lands as the Commissioners would be? What was the necessity of Commissioners for this purpose? He (Mr. Mills) admitted that the public lands could be made an important auxiliary in the construction of

railways, but it ought to be laid down, as a fundamental principle, that no land should be applied to aid in a construction of a road that would not be improved in value, and rendered accessible to the people, by the construction of that road. Last winter, he had a discussion with many parties when the late Government introduced a Colonisation Bill, offering to deposit money as a guarantee that roads would be built in various directions. He thought it important to the public that these roads should be built, but he always said to everyone who asked if they would give them lands elsewhere than along the lines, that he would never give his assent to a proposition of that sort. The building of a Pacific Railway would render lands valuable for a few miles on each side, but not those a considerable distance away. A year or two ago the Government told the people going into the North-West country that they might settle on lands, devoted to railway purposes, for one dollar per acre, and that they would be asked to pay nothing more until an arrangement was made with the railway company for the construction of this line. In that way, the settlement was not impeded. Persons could go in any part of the country they liked; they could go where the railway was projected, with the understanding that, when the land came to be sold for railway purposes, they would be called upon to pay an amount that might be fixed upon between the Government and the company. But to devote lands to railway purposes, where they were not made valuable by the railway, was simply to misapply public lands. If lands were fit for settlement, they would require railways to go to them. If the Pacific Railway did not go there, other railways would. A more unwise course could not be adopted than to devote lands to the construction of a Pacific Railway, which would not be benefitted by it. They might be necessary to assist in building other railways which would render these lands accessible for settlement. He would say further, that Mr. Fleming some years ago estimated that the interest on the money required for the construction of the railway, for many years to come, and the cost of working the road, would amount to \$14,000,000 a year. Looking at the progress

of settlement, looking at the time within which a reasonable portion of the North-West country could be settled if the road was completed within twenty years, it must be admitted that a large portion of the cost of construction and of working must fall on the Public Treasury. Bearing that in mind, he held the resources of this country were wholly inadequate to undertake so gigantic an enterprise as the hon. gentleman had submitted to the House. This country was committed to the construction of a road as fast as the existing rate of taxation would place moneys at the disposal of the Government for that purpose. All the terms of agreement made with Lord Carnarvon were contingent on the ability of the country to furnish the necessary funds at the existing rate of taxation. He affirmed that these resolutions proposed hopelessly to involve this country, and would render it incapable of meeting its engagements, putting it, in fact, in the position of a bankrupt. There could be no doubt that the only solution of the difficulties in which it was proposed to plunge the country would be a change in our existing political relations. He was anxious that this country should remain master of its own destiny, and he said that the Government had now submitted to the House a scheme that took away her freedom. The hon. gentleman proposed, here, that they should give him permission to construct 125 miles of railway in British Columbia, nobody knew where; the hon. gentleman did not know himself. He said the selection of the route by Burrard Inlet was premature; he proposed further surveys, and admitted that they could not be completed this year. While the work was still pending, he asked a vote to allow him to go on with the construction of 125 miles of railway before Parliament met again. If his representation was correct, why should he ask for a vote at all? The hon. gentleman did not know where this road was to be located; he did not know whether it was to run north or south, east or west, where it was to begin or where it was to end; and, until the hon. gentleman knew what he wanted at all, and knew where he was going to place what he wanted, he was not in a position to ask this House for a dollar. All the reports of the engineers, and all the in-

formation that had been collected, pointed in the one direction, and he was not prepared to support a series of resolutions censuring the late Administration, and putting an indefinite power at the disposal of the present Government. He therefore entered his protest against the production of resolutions involving a question of such magnitude to the country at this period of the Session. He entered his protest against the submission of a series of propositions which tended to deprive this House of its own conscience, and convert it into a simple registering body of the intentions of the Administration, when those intentions were not even known to the House, and if they were to believe what the hon. gentleman had stated, they were not known to the members of the Administration themselves. He was anxious that the House should not rush forward in this way, and he was not disposed to incur obligations, the mischievous nature of which no member now in this House would live to see the end of. He opposed the scheme submitted by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works as one detrimental to the public interests, as crippling the resources of this country and as seriously interfering with its future prosperity and welfare.

Mr. BUNSTER said these resolutions proposed to place at the disposal of the Government all the mineral lands in British Columbia. There was no doubt that there was mineral wealth enough in that Province to build ten Pacific Railways. It was well known that British Columbia was the only Province in the Dominion where gold could be obtained in any quantity, and hence the terms upon which that Province went into the Union could not be changed unless a royalty was paid. Notwithstanding the fact that the people of British Columbia were willing to aid the Dominion in every way to carry out this great national enterprise, they had not, heretofore, been treated at all justly. He supposed many hon. members expected that British Columbia would swallow these resolutions as a whole. Well, from the good faith expressed by the Government, and the manly and straightforward manner in which the Premier and the Minister of

Public Works had dealt with the question, he had no doubt that they would fulfil their pledges to the House, and that British Columbia would accept these resolutions. It was well known that the present was the only Government possessing the ability to frame such resolutions as had been laid before the House to-day, and the carrying out of which would not cost one dollar to the people. What would it cost the people of Canada to put into operation the proposition of the Government? Why, merely 100,000,000 acres of land, by the sale of which it was proposed to throw into the Public Treasury \$200,000,000 to be utilised for the purpose of building this railway? The land was now valued at the low figure of \$2 an acre, but, when the railroad was commenced, it would be worth at least \$10 an acre. Take the Union Pacific Railway for instance—the land along that road which was not one-twelfth as good land as that in the vicinity of the Canadian road, sold for \$12 an acre. The people of the Dominion were convinced that the present Government would build the railroad to their satisfaction. He was surprised that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was so little acquainted with the circumstances of the case, and had such a limited knowledge of the Statutes bearing upon the admission of British Columbia into the Confederation, as to say that there was nothing in the Carnarvon Award to guarantee assistance from Great Britain. He read for his information—and he regretted that, owing to the hon. gentleman's want of information on the subject, he should have taken so much of the time of the House in doing so—the resolutions which were agreed to at the time of the Union. Yet, notwithstanding that, the hon. member for Bothwell stated that Great Britain had not given them any assistance. Why had the Mother Country given Canada the voice of one of her ablest statesmen, who offered, if the Government of the day would accept his proposition, to obtain that money from England? So much for the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell in reference to British statesmen not being willing to assist in the construction of the

Pacific Railroad. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) said that the only traffic on that road which would pay would be the local traffic. He (Mr. Bunster) thought that was completely refuted to-day, to the satisfaction of every candid-minded member in the House, by the fact that the distance by this road to the Pacific Ocean would be so much shorter than by other roads that it would command the carrying trade of the world across the continent. The distance in favour of the Canadian road was 1,169 miles. This was well-known to the right hon. gentleman the present leader of the Government for years, and he was working out the problem successfully, when the late Government tried to grapple with the question, and, by their misrepresentations and bungling, the work was thrown back so much that it would take twenty years to regain what had been lost by their maladministration. Hence, the widespread dissatisfaction in the Province of British Columbia against the late Government. This he stated fearlessly of anyone being able, successfully, to controvert his statement. That Province abounded in mineral wealth, which had been locked up for years for this Dominion. And that fact alone kept a great many settlers from going into the Province, for they were told, when asking for the land, that it had been reserved for the Dominion Government as a recompense, or in lieu of building the Pacific Railroad. That land would have been opened out for settlement long ago, but that the people of British Columbia felt that the present Government would return to power and build the railway. Therefore, the land was still reserved in good faith for Canada. But had Canada kept good faith with British Columbia? Not by any means. One gentleman had made use of this language: "Until these surveys are thoroughly completed, and until we find a less impracticable route through that inhospitable country—that sea of mountains—it is folly to talk of commencing the work of construction." The name of this gentleman was Blake, and he was called Aurora, a gentleman in whom the people, in his own constituency, had so little confidence, that they thought the interests of the country would not suffer by his absence from this House. And

in this way the people of Canada would roar at any representative who worked against such a national enterprise just the same as they roared against the late Government for their treatment of the Province of British Columbia. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was pleased to say it would not be a matter of great regret even if that Province were to be let go. It was for making such expressions as these that the people of this country had lost confidence in him, and that the British Government had, to a certain extent, lost confidence in the great national enterprise, and it was in that way that Canada had lost the great interest which Great Britain would have taken if the scheme had been proceeded with in the manner first proposed by the Government of which the right hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald) was the head. The hon. member for Lambton had asked upon what consideration the hon. the Premier was elected for Victoria. He (Mr. Bunster) could give him the information. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) sent him a telegram as his friend in Victoria, which arrived at one o'clock p.m., and at seven o'clock one of the largest gatherings that ever convened together in the Province of British Columbia unanimously decided that the right hon. gentleman should be one of their agents in this Parliament. Could the hon. member for Lambton be elected to represent any constituency in British Columbia? No. Many persons were now going from Ontario to British Columbia, and he had not the least doubt that soon the hon. gentleman would have no constituents left even in Lambton, and that he would not be able to get into this House. He (Mr. Bunster) thought it would not be much to regret. These resolutions had been a long time in being brought down to the House, and the only reason he could see for the delay was to be found in the fact that they had been carefully prepared in the interest of the country. He believed that they would commend themselves to British statesmen when they were placed upon the British market to obtain the money required, notwithstanding the efforts of the Grand Trunk Railway company. What had the late Government, who were under the influence of

that company, done for the country? They ran the country into debt, though when they assumed office there was a surplus in the Treasury. When the late Administration succeeded to the reins of Government the people were confident that, with the surplus in the Treasury at the time, they would be well able to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, but, through the enlargement of canals, building locks and other useless works in Ontario, that surplus had been squandered. The surveys made in British Columbia had, to a great extent, been unsatisfactory, except those made under the immediate supervision of Mr. Marcus Smith. He was sorry to see that reports in connection with that work had not come before this House as frequently as they should have done. It had been well said that some reports had been suppressed in order to keep capitalists from going into the Province. The policy of the late Government had created a good deal of disappointment and discontent in the Province of British Columbia, and neither the British Government nor the people of this country could have blamed the people of that Province if they had seceded, as they had a right to do, under the Carnarvon terms. It was only through the confidence they had in the present Government that the Province was still in the Union. What would Canada be to-day without British Columbia? The instructions sent to British Columbia by Mr. Mackenzie's agent, looked to him a great deal like driving the people of British Columbia into annexation with the United States. Notwithstanding the abuse that British Columbia had received, she still lived, but the hon. gentleman still went on to abuse British Columbia. He thought he might have left off abusing that colony after the chastisement he received at the polls. The members for British Columbia were supporting a Government that he believed would carry out its pledges. He thought the attack of the hon. member was very uncalled for. He himself had never intruded himself upon the House any further than the interest of his Province demanded. It was a well-known fact that, had it not been for the late Government, this scheme would have been carried out. The manner in

which British Columbia had been treated had caused her to lose a good deal of confidence in the words of British statesmen. He trusted, however, that the manner in which the present Government would carry out their pledges would tend to restore that confidence.

MR. HUNTINGTON said, in reference to this subject, that, from the manner in which the hon. gentleman representing that Province spoke of this undertaking, one feared that the English language used in that Province was not precisely understood as they used it in the eastern portion of Canada. The Province of British Columbia was a small Province. Did the hon. gentleman claim it was equal to Ontario?

MR. BUNSTER: Yes.

MR. HUNTINGTON said there were other Provinces besides British Columbia whose interests had to be consulted, and there were other interests to be considered besides the Pacific Railroad. In consequence of this, they could not tamely take the advice he had just given them. The hon. gentleman sneered at their railways, sneered at their public improvements, and said that, in spending money upon these, they were wasting money which ought to be devoted to the construction of the Pacific Railroad. He (Mr. Huntington) maintained that there was no bargain to construct the road—they were not compelled to increase their burdens for the construction of the road. He would ask every man in the House, and every man of common sense in the country, if the Pacific Railway were built to-day, and were in the same running order as the Intercolonial, what would be their means of keeping it running? They must have something outside of buncombe speeches and glowing sophisms. It was about time the House and the country told the people of British Columbia the terms upon which they entered the Confederation. He could conceive of nothing more childish or absurd—nothing showing how little their friends from British Columbia had studied the affairs of the Dominion, than the speech of the hon. gentleman who had just told them that the hon. member for Lambton was defeated because he did not meet

the views of the British Columbia people in regard to the railroad. The hon. leader of the Government was not defeated on account of his Pacific Railway policy, but because the accidents of political life placed him where he was. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bunster), let them all understand where they were. Let them begin to deal with this question as a serious question which affected the finances of the country, and which they would have to discuss in years to come. Let them remember that the people of Canada were not going to submit to build the Pacific Railway to the ruin of all other interests. The hon. gentleman told them that, if the hon. member for Lambton had remained in power, British Columbia would have gone out of the Union. British Columbia could not have gone out of her own accord. She was a part of the Dominion, and a part of the Empire. The hon. gentleman had stated that they had wasted five years in regard to this work, when he knew they had been doing everything to acquire information for the building of the road. Then British Columbia questions had given occasion for more careful, painstaking thought and discussion than almost any other questions in this House. Let not the hon. gentlemen lay the flattering unction to their souls that this House or this country, whether led by the hon. member for Lambton or the right hon. gentleman opposite, was going to push them into the perils of bankruptcy for the purpose of securing the object of hon. gentlemen coming from that Province. Several hon. gentlemen had spoken of the Union Pacific Railway and the Central Pacific Railway as evidences of what might be done. Now, in relation to this, it was well known that a certain number of men, when the United States were in the throes of civil war, and when it was of national importance that they should have communication across the Rocky Mountains, took hold of the work. The hon. gentleman said that they would have carried out their scheme had it not been for the partisanship, or the desire to get on the Treasury benches, displayed by the hon. member for Lambton and his friends. He remembered when the hon. gentleman was not so thoroughly a party man as he was now. He believed

the gentleman, and his friends from British Columbia had done, perhaps, some discredit and harm to the cause they represented by being so inclined to look with jealous eyes on everything that was done by those whom they came here to oppose. Had the hon. gentleman considered this question in a judicial character, rather than made it an opportunity of parading his glorification of one party, and his denunciation of the other, he might have addressed himself more keenly and with greater prospects of success to the hearts of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman told them that the party of which the hon. member for Lambton was leader had caused the arrangements, which might otherwise have carried, to break down, and the Prime Minister had said that the Liberal party, in 1873, had exercised every means possible to destroy British confidence. He did not think the hon. gentleman could mention a single particular in which an attempt was made to prevent British capitalists investing in that scheme if they proposed to do so. He did not believe that there was the remotest chance of their doing so. He believed that the circumstances which attended the initiation of that scheme were an embarrassment to it, as he believed that, if the hon. gentleman went to England to-day with his present scheme, the history of the Pacific Railway transaction would prove ruinous to it. Did the hon. gentleman expect the English capitalists to jump on their desks and cry "hurrah" when they saw his emissaries. They would ask, Are these the gentlemen who signed the charter in 1873 for funds to be used in the elections? The hon. gentleman would not find himself a gainer by the memory or reminiscences of days gone by. When the right hon. gentleman came into power, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster) stated he came in on the Pacific Railway question, whereas the fact was he came into power on the desire of the people to have a change in the fiscal condition of the affairs of the country. There was no lack of this Pacific Railway matter in any of the constituencies in which discussion took place with regard to public affairs, but the first thing the right hon. gentleman did when he

MR. HUNTINGTON.

got elected was to spring upon a platform in Quebec and declare that the people had condoned the offence. He (Mr. Huntington) did not think the British Government and people would condone the offence. The people of this country had condemned and never approved of it, and his restoration to power had no connection with that matter. He had assumed power, and, in surrounding himself with his old colleagues, he had shown the disposition which was alluded to by the hon. member for Bothwell: "The king has come to his own again, let us take up the bones of Cromwell and dishonour them." These men had given them no earnest that these vast interests which they were now about to take, would be put into sound hands. There was no evidence that there would be a fair and just administration, no reason to suppose that corruption would not again run rampant in the hands of men who had done wrong for many years, and he warned the hon. gentleman that he had taken up a scheme which would not benefit himself, and might bring ruin on the country in the future.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) said the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat had evidently been waiting for a good while for an opportunity of recounting to this House some of the exploits on which he prided himself in the past. His speech, in the first instance addressed to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster) rather than to this House, was evidently intended to lead back to the revival of the old story of the Pacific scandal. Those who remembered the circumstances which existed at the time that the hon. gentleman had ventured to move his resolution in this House—those who remembered what there was behind that resolution, and the reason for placing it in the hands of a member in the back benches instead of one on the front benches, would probably appreciate the title the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had to lecture hon. gentlemen on the Government side of House every time he rose. He talked of the First Minister going to England and being met by the recollections of the Pacific scandal, being asked whether he was Prime Minister at the time of that Paci-

fic Scandal He (Mr. White) could tell the hon. gentleman that the First Minister could go to England, and that he (Mr. Huntington) dared not. If the Prime Minister went to England, he would go there as a man villified at the instance of that hon. gentleman, on the motion of that hon. gentleman, who, when the Commission was appointed to try, was too cowardly to present himself for examination. He would further tell the hon. gentleman that, if he would go to England, he would find there persons most anxious to meet him, to settle accounts with him, and ascertain what had become of the money of which he had robbed them. It ill became the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) to lecture hon. gentlemen in this House as he had done on every occasion on which he had risen to address the House, and he (Mr. White) could tell him that, until he cleaned his own hands, until he had succeeded in wiping out the infamy which attached to his own name, he had better not deal in invectives, as he had been so fond throughout this Session. With these remarks he would dismiss the hon. gentleman from his further consideration. As to the serious question with which they were dealing to-night, what was the position in which it stood? As the First Minister pointed out, both sides of the House admitted that we must have this railway, that this country was practically pledged to the building of it, that it was in the interest of this country that the Pacific Railway should be built at the earliest possible moment, that the future of the country depended on its completion, and that without it we had, in the North-West, instead of an advantage, a great burden to the country. Both sides of the House having admitted this, they would imagine that, when the Government came down and asked the authority of Parliament to adopt a scheme by which the road could be built out of the lands of the country, by which, in fact, the country itself which was to be principally benefitted would be charged with the expense of building it, this scheme would have met with the hearty concurrence and support of both sides of the House. It had not done so, because those hon. gentlemen now, as in the past, must be bribed by office to say

a kindly word of their country. When the scheme was brought down in 1872, they decried this country in order that they might have a temporary political triumph; they warned the financial men of England against investing a single dollar in an enterprise of this kind; and here to-day they had the same story repeated over again, the same warning to the people of England, who were to be invited to assist in this great Imperial enterprise. What was the position in which we at present stood in relation to these North-West Territories? Judging by the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, one would imagine that this building of the Pacific Railway was to be a burden for all time upon the 4,000,000 of people who now inhabited the Dominion, upon the resources of this country as they now existed. If we looked at our friends on the other side of the line, at the enormous development of settlement that had taken place, then we would realise how important it was for us, if we would have any part whatever in the race of progress on this continent, that we should follow their course. In 1830, thirteen States, which were now known as the Western States, had only a population of about three-quarters of a million; at the last census, nearly ten years ago, these thirteen States had a population of very nearly thirteen millions, while, during that time, in which that enormous development and progress had taken place, over 30,000 miles of railway had been constructed within those States. We might well look forward to a great future if we could only be true to ourselves. The Government had submitted a policy which did not seek to burden Canada, but sought to develop that North-West country by means of lands there. The Government asked the power to permit that North-West country to develop itself, and to bear not only the cost of the building of the railway, but to return it to Canada by its great resources, and the enormous contributions, through Customs dues, of the millions of people who would settle there, a people whom they could not over estimate. That was the policy submitted, and he believed that the attacks which had been made upon it by the Opposition were due solely to the fact that they realised the truth that this

policy was certain to be popular and successful.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he desired to say—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order; spoke.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved the adjournment of the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman could not move the adjournment, as he had already spoken.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved the adjournment of the House.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was glad to see that he had evidently made a little impression on the right hon. gentleman, since he had caused his henchman to attack him (Mr. Huntington) in this House in the same manner in which he had slandered him through the columns of his newspaper since 1873. The hon. gentleman's newspaper, in connection with the *Mail*—he (Mr. Huntington) would not say whether they were respectable newspapers or not—had, so far as he was concerned, indulged in baseless falsehoods for the last few years. It never gave him any uneasiness, or affected his position in this country, and, except in the breast of some benighted Tory, they never created the impression they were telling the truth. The hon. gentleman from Cardwell (Mr. White) commenced those falsehoods in 1874, and filled his paper with them, though he admitted the hon. gentleman could not have known them himself. He said that a suit was brought against him (Mr. Huntington), and it was taken, only long after, and he filled his newspaper with gross, wicked, and monstrous falsehoods against him, in regard to transactions in Lower Canada, in respect of the Pyrites Mining Company. He then sued the hon. gentleman for damages, when his (Mr. White's) advocate came to him (Mr. Huntington) and asked delay, as he wanted to go to England for six weeks; the matter went on for a time, and, finally, he was foreclosed from pleading. He did not plead to this action, his lawyers constantly making the excuse, "What is the use of pleading; the case is not going on?" Two or three years afterwards, on some

dispute with the right hon. gentleman, who insulted him (Mr. Huntington) grossly in this House, as he would not, perhaps, under ordinary circumstances, some altercation occurred, and the next day but one, two and a-half years after the action was instituted, Mr. White made an affidavit in Court that the reason why he had not pleaded was that the hon. gentleman's (Mr. White's) lawyer had been in England; and, upon that statement of the reason for not having pleaded, he hurled against him (Mr. Huntington) all the accusations hurled against him before, which the *Mail* also published. He was all right, and all the lies of all the Tory newspapers could not bring him down till he had done wrong. He was stating the circumstances under which the action was brought. Before that time the people in the Old Country, at whose instance it was brought against him (Mr. Huntington), had sent a representative to Canada, who examined the facts, after which a deed of settlement was passed withdrawing the actions, and saying they had been brought on false information and every action against him was withdrawn. He (Mr. Huntington) did not think, after that, that there was any particular hurry about pressing on this suit that the hon. gentleman from Cardwell became, two and a-half years afterwards, so eager to push on, though not having pleaded all this time. So much as regarded the first accusation, which was a miserable falsehood, as the hon. gentleman must have known when he published it, as he had all the facts, which proved it false in his (Mr. White's) possession. He could do and say more were the seal of secrecy removed from his lips.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell): The hon. gentleman's lips are unsealed—let him tell everything.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was sure the hon. gentleman must have known that nothing could be more despicable, more dishonest, or better calculated to show the demoralisation of his newspaper than that an attack on him should have been published without any circumstance of justification except the declaration of a suit drawn by a lawyer. The majority, however, believed the hon. gentleman read falsehoods every time he

MR. WHITE.

read those stories. The right hon. gentleman opposite was the man to start those charges in this House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is not the case; it is a fib.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The right hon. gentleman did, and threatened me.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is not the case.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The right hon. gentleman did threaten me in the celebrated three-hour speech, when he held up his hands.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is not the case.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that the hon. gentleman held up his hands—at any rate, he could not deny that. When the settlement was made in Montreal with the representatives of this company, they were anxious that the action against the *Gazette* should be withdrawn, because they did not want more litigation. His own attorney and the lawyer of the company were authorised to consult with the counsel on the other side, when they reported they had not seen Mr. White, but only his attorney, who said he would not care about humiliating him by asking him to publish an apology, but that they would be very glad to reach an understanding and settlement, and allow the matter to rest. He (Mr. Huntington) always regarded the thing in that way. He did not know how long it was afterwards that the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) plucked up courage to file an affidavit. The quarrel with the right hon. gentleman had led to the re-statement of the old falsehoods, and that though two and a-half years had supervened. He had read in the *Mail* and in hostile papers published in Glasgow, accounts of an action there with regard to the Huntington Copper Mining Company. But he never had any demand from them or heard of correspondence with them—he meant the company to which it was said he sold the property. He never was served with a writ by them, nor had the least reason to suppose they were going to sue him. Did the hon. gentleman think he dared not go to Eng-

land, having committed some crime against widows and orphans?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is all.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he dared go to England any time. The worst that could happen to him would be the service upon him of a writ in the second suit that the hon. member for Cardwell was so much interested in. But what difference did it make whether it was served there or here? He had been represented by those slanderous newspapers, the *Gazette* and *Mail*, whose reporter in the gallery slandered him (Mr. Huntington) daily, as having been sued by this company, when all he knew about it was what appeared in the newspapers. He had something more to say with regard to the second suit. The hon. member for Cardwell said he (Mr. Huntington) had bought up the stock to influence them. That was false; he had never bought up a dollar's worth of it; he never voted or had any influence in that stock. He had never sold the Huntington Copper Mine to the company or people in Glasgow. He had submitted the whole case to lawyers in this country, since the newspapers had attacked him, and he had received their opinion that, in the course he had pursued, he was in no way responsible for the formation of the company in Glasgow. He was not in the country, and the hon. gentleman's story was not correct. He had sold the property six months before, his only relations with the company being those of a director, which they had made him. When about organising the company, in the spring of 1872, they wrote to him to know if he could persuade Sir Hugh Allan to act as one of the directors. He then showed Sir Hugh this request, and told him that the parties in Scotland wanted him to act as a director. He then told him (Mr. Huntington) that there was this difficulty, that the company, as a copper mining company, would command his confidence at once, as he had seen the mines, but he did not know the chemical process to be applied, and till he did, would not act; and he authorised him to telegraph that, so far as he (Sir Hugh) knew anything of the mine, he would be happy to act as a director, but would first require to know

more about the chemical process. Without his (Mr. Huntington's) knowledge, they had made him a director. He had sat twice as a director in Glasgow, but never had anything further to do with the company, and resigned shortly after. He had dared the hon. Premier to put him out of the House if he thought him unworthy of a seat in it. He had the opinion of able lawyers that he was in no way responsible for those transactions of the company, as also the opinion of that distinguished juriconsult, Judge Day, that he (Mr. Huntington) had had nothing to do with the formation of the company and no responsibility for it; and he would lay those opinions beside the baseless slanders of the hon. member for Cardwell. The Eastern Townships mines had long engaged attention, and all the slanders upon him could be judged of from the fact that, as to the first transaction, he had given his lands for the prices he paid himself, and that for all his trouble he was only to have some stock, which he never got. The hon. gentleman knew this undertaking was not a swindle; that, so far as he (Mr. Huntington) was concerned, there was a clause in the contract by which he made himself not responsible for titles of any description, except such as he was able to prove. And, as to the second property, when he sold it, it was examined by experts from the other side of the water. He believed then, as now, that it was a good property, and that the present holders had made a vast mistake in allowing themselves to be used by the Tories, with the view to making party capital out of it. He believed that the mine itself was a good one. He had never blamed Sir Hugh for buying the hon. gentlemen opposite, as he would buy any other commodity for sale; and he (Mr. Huntington) supposed the hon. member for Cardwell also had his value. He had no doubt he knew it, and to-morrow his paper would say it was all a lie.

AN HON. MEMBER: And so it is.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman says he has no doubt it is all a lie.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The hon. gentleman is Prime Minister of this country,

MR. HUNTINGTON.

and some of his friends call him a statesman, but, if he were out of this House, he would be a blackguard.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I ask you to rule whether the language of the hon. gentleman is in order or not. I think it is disgraceful to this House.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it is time this thing should be put a stop to.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the member for Cardwell, in my hearing, was good enough to describe my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Huntington) as a robber, and, unless my ears deceived me, the First Minister stated audibly to us here that what my hon. friend said was not true. Now, I regret very much my hon. friend, even under that provocation, should have gone as far as he did, but, if ever a man had an excuse for his language, my hon. friend had it.

MR. COCKBURN: There can be no excuse for the use of such language; the term is the worst that can be used.

MR. SPEAKER: I admit that, since a certain time, the language of some hon. members has not been parliamentary.

MR. HUNTINGTON: As far as I am concerned, if I have transgressed any parliamentary rule, I am willing to apologise, but I regret the hon. gentleman who called me to order had not noticed cases still worse that occurred.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Northumberland says the word "blackguard," that was used by my hon. friend, is the worst term that could be used. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman whether that is worse than telling an hon. gentleman that he is a robber and a swindler? It seems to me even worse than the other term.

MR. COCKBURN: The hon. member replied to another hon. gentleman, altogether without reference to the member for Cardwell. His remarks were applied to another hon. gentleman, and I say that so applied they were unjustifiable by all the parliamentary rules and laws that obtain in this House.

MR. MILLS: That is beside the question.

MR. COCKBURN: It is exactly the question.

MR. MACKENZIE: No; it is not the question.

MR. HUNTINGTON said it was in answer to the right hon. gentleman charging him with falsehood that he made the remark he did. He was sorry to be the occasion of this trouble, but he had committed a sin in the eyes of certain hon. gentlemen opposite, for which, it appeared, he was to be punished every day of his life, and he was compelled to protect himself against the slanders and unfair treatment which he received from the other side of the House. At the same time he thanked God that he could make his voice heard in justification in this House, and in this country, where he was born, where he had never done an act of which he was ashamed, and where the men with whom he had daily and weekly intercourse, knew these foul slanders were without foundation. He was glad his character was sufficient to stand the assaults of such mere politicians as the member for Cardwell. That hon. gentleman had thought it suited his political convenience to make him this challenge, but the right hon. leader of the Government had only to shake his finger and he would talk in an entirely different strain. The country would understand that these newspapers and public hacks were only dealing exactly as they were told to do by the leader whom they came here to serve. He (Mr. Huntington) presented himself before this House and before this country, as a man against whom—God knew he had faults enough—there were no faults of dishonesty. He stood here as a victim of hatred, but he could not be deterred from doing his duty by all the slanders and assaults made upon him ever since the hon. gentleman from Cardwell changed his mind as to the fact that there had been a *prima facie* case made out against his leader.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said the members of the House who had had the privilege of listening to the member for Shefford last year, and

of contrasting the speech he had then delivered on this subject with the speech he had delivered to-night, would realise that there was a marvellous change in tone since that time. He could remember, last year, when the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) brought this matter up, the magnificent, the indignant tones in which the hon. member for Shefford repudiated all guilt—in fact, all intention of guilt in the premises, and charged those who ventured to make any insinuations against him with cowardice and with every baseness. To-night those who listened to the halting, doubting speech of the hon. gentleman, and who contrasted the tones with which he addressed the House, with the tones in which he usually addressed it, must have come to the conclusion that he knew there were facts in waiting for him, the exposure of which he had better not have provoked. The hon. gentleman said that he had sued a newspaper in Montreal for libel, that that paper took two years before it pleaded, and since that time he seemed to be under the impression that for some reason or other that suit was withdrawn. He (Mr. White) could only say that, speaking for that newspaper and for its proprietor, who was to-day responsible for it, if the hon. gentleman would gratify him by bringing this matter before twelve of his peers anywhere in this Dominion, he would undertake to prove every allegation made against him in the *Gazette*. The hon. member told them to-night that his only fault consisted in the fact that he had sold some mines in the Eastern Townships. He (Mr. White) proposed to state some of the facts connected with those transactions. There were two great mining companies involved—there was the Copper Pyrites Company and the Huntington Mining Company, the company which was honoured by having the name of the hon. gentleman attached to it. In the case of the Copper Pyrites Company, the charge which was made against the hon. gentleman—the charge which stood on record in the Courts against him to-day—the charge which he might, if he had the courage to proceed with the suit, disprove, if he was innocent—that charge was: That, whereas he told the people who put their money in this

scheme in Scotland that he was simply acting as agent, for which they paid him, buying mining properties and giving them to them at the price which he paid for them, he was in fact getting money from the vendors as well, acting as a commission merchant for both sides, and taking wrongfully about \$250,000, which came into the pockets of himself and his associates who were engaged with him in the transaction, a proceeding of which the people who bought the mines in Scotland knew nothing whatever, but, on the contrary, supposed that the money had been paid to the original Canadian proprietors.

MR. HUNTINGTON: At the time these commissions were taken, there were two or three of the directors in this country who knew all about it.

MR. WHITE said that certainly was no mitigation. The hon. gentleman had stated that this company had passed resolutions exonerating him from all blame in connection with the matter. He (Mr. White) could remember, last year, when the hon. gentleman stood near where the hon. the Finance Minister now sat, the indignant tones with which he flourished these resolutions, but he did not tell the House then how much these resolutions had cost him. He and his friends, finding themselves in the position in which they were, obtained control of the company by buying shares at the reduced price to which they had gone down, elected friendly directors, and then withdrew the suits against themselves.

MR. HUNTINGTON called attention to the fact that a person who had a seat on the floor of the House was making remarks on the subject under discussion.

MR. SPEAKER ordered strangers to leave the floor.

MR. WHITE said, if anyone wanted to know why that plea of justification on the part of the publishers of the *Gazette* stood on record to-day unanswered by the hon. gentleman, why a public man in this country deemed it consistent with his honour and his character to permit that plea to remain there, he (Mr. White) would tell them that, when that suit was brought against the Montreal

MR. WHITE.

Gazette, the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to fight off the suits in England, and, being desirous of stopping the discussion in Canada, he believed the best way to do it was by bringing an action for libel. He did succeed in stopping discussion for two years. But, when, by the process just described, the hon. gentleman did succeed in buying off the suits and getting them withdrawn, he had the strongest interest in preventing this matter coming into Court, where the exposure of his proceedings must be made, and the record stood there a damning evidence of the hon. gentleman's conduct in connection with the formation of this mining company. Then there was another company, the Huntington Mining Company. In the case of the Copper Pyrites Company, he bought mineral lands and sold them, taking commissions from both sides. In this Huntington mining case, he had lands of his own which he put into the company, about 5,000 acres of Bolton lands. The hon. gentleman knew how he became possessed of those Bolton lands—that was another story that it was not worth while now referring to. But he put those lands in at \$47 an acre, or about £50,000 sterling.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Not a word of it is true.

MR. WHITE: Not true, did the hon. gentleman say? Well, he would see how true the statement was. The description of these lands in the prospectus, which bore the signature of the member for Shefford, was as follows:—

"The purchase money to be paid for the mines is £125,000. This includes the whole working plant, steam-engines, water-wheels, crushing-mills, and dressing machinery, offices, dwelling houses, and about 5,000 acres of freehold land in the same township, a great part of which is heavily timbered—all of which will be valuable for the purposes of the mine and for fuel. These lands, though little explored, are known to contain minerals, and may therefore become a valuable asset of the company."

Recently a gentleman had been sent out from Scotland, to investigate the affairs of the company, and to report to the shareholders, and the following was an extract from the report of the proceedings at a general meeting of the shareholders, as published in the Glasgow papers:—

"Mr. Andrew B. Gray reported that at the request of the directors he had visited the mine in Canada. He had only returned three days ago, and had not had time to prepare a formal report for the meeting. He had acquired very valuable information regarding their property and its history, but it had not yet been submitted to his co-directors, and it therefore seemed to him to be somewhat premature, in the present circumstances, to lay the information before the meeting. He would, however, be glad to answer any question, if he could do so, without injuring themselves, as a company. He had visited all their property that was accessible to ordinary persons like himself (laughter), and it would, no doubt, surprise many of them to know that what was designated as valuable, heavy-timbered land, for which they paid \$47 per acre, consisted of swamps and high rocks, and was truly described in the Government records as waste lands. (Laughter.) He had gone through all the workings of the mine, and it was only too evident that but a small portion of the 2,000 tons per month which were promised in their prospectus, could be obtained, notwithstanding all the expense they had been at in opening it up."

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. I ask you, Sir, to decide whether it is competent for this House to hear a personal quarrel of this kind, not in the public interest, a matter that cannot be determined by this House in one way or the other, and during the debate on a great question affecting the interests of the Dominion at large. Is it proper that a question of this kind should be intervened to draw away the attention of the House from the resolutions that are now before the Chair? I ask you, Sir, to decide whether this discussion is pertinent to the question before the House? I can quite understand that a member may rise to make explanations, but this far exceeds the limits of the rule. It is really dragging on to this floor a question which we have no right to be troubled with at all, and which I decline myself, as a member of this House, to be troubled with.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I do not object at all to this question of order being decided. If I am on my trial here, I am willing to be tried; but I cannot allow the slander of the hon. gentleman has uttered to go without my having permission to state why they are false.

MR. COCKBURN: I think that is not the question. The question is not

whether any member should be tried here at all. A member has the right to rise and justify himself if he will, but to go beyond that is not the vocation of this House. We are dealing with public measures and public questions, and not private issues between the member who has just spoken and the member for Cardwell, and I object to it.

MR. MACKENZIE said they must remember that the member for Cardwell first made a personal charge in a matter that this House had no cognisance of whatever. He denounced the member for Shefford in the most unmeasured terms in connection with some private transaction that had no kind of relation with the business before the House. He (Mr. Mackenzie) would have called attention to that matter at the time, but, from the fact that the hon. member for Shefford was one of his colleagues, and that he knew personally he was entirely innocent of any wrong-doing in the matter, he felt that, as this had been attempted once or twice before, it would be better that he should deal with it. Were they to ask the House to undertake the task of trying every member who had been deemed guilty in the estimation of some hon. members of a moral offence? This was an unprovoked attack on a matter touching the hon. gentleman's private affairs altogether, and which had not the slightest connection with the question under debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The main motion that the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, has disappeared altogether, and the question now is the adjournment of the House. There was ample latitude allowed the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) to make the charge against the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), and then, to allow the hon. member for Shefford to make a reply, the motion was made to adjourn the House. It is true that these personal recriminations are far from being right, but, as the matter has been commenced, and the charge made, it is as well to allow the matter to go on.

MR. WHITE said the hon. gentleman would recollect that, almost in the first speech made by the hon. member for

Shefford during this Session, he referred to the attacks made upon him, and challenged controversy concerning them. Every time he had risen in the House since he had made reference to those attacks, he had never ceased to charge those who ventured to doubt his great disinterestedness and morality with being slanderers and villifiers, and it was simply now that the Session was nearly over, and when again the hon. gentleman assumed a lecturing tone, and ventured to say to the hon. the First Minister that he dared not show himself in England, and when that hon. gentleman's character was impugned, that he (Mr. White) referred to the hon. member as he did. He entered into the details he was now giving, because the hon. member for Shefford had declared these charges to be utterly false, and, in view of that denial, he (Mr. White) thought it was a matter of interest to the House and to the country to know the grounds upon which those charges were based. As he had already stated, the hon. gentleman had had an opportunity of bringing the gentlemen who made the charges before a proper tribunal, where they could be investigated, but, after challenging the investigation, he refused to go on. When he (Mr. White) was interrupted, he was going on to say that these 5,000 acres of land in Bolton, which were put in by the hon. gentleman as so valuable that they were worth \$47 an acre, had been recently valued by an old surveyor, well known and greatly respected in the townships, at eighty cents an acre. The report of this surveyor was referred to two gentlemen of undoubted character—both of them being prominent political friends of the hon. member for Shefford himself. They made an examination of the land, and confirmed the report of the surveyor. So the House had—on evidence which was indubitable, and which he ventured to say neither the hon. gentleman nor anyone else would undertake to impugn—the fact that the member for Shefford had put into this company land which he described in glowing terms, and as worth \$250,000, but which, in reality, was at the time of record in the Crown Lands Department as waste lands of the Crown, and was now proved to be only worth eighty cents an acre. Recently,

MR. WHITE.

the company held a special general meeting, and the same game was attempted to be played as had been so successfully played in connection with the Copper Pyrites scheme. A motion was made to withdraw the suit against the hon. gentleman and his co-directors, and that motion was carried; but the scrutineers decided that the people who were interested as defendants in the suit, or their proxies, had no right to be counted, and as a result the suit had to be proceeded with. The Courts were appealed to and sustained this decision of the scrutineers. Since that time, the co-directors of the hon. gentlemen had arranged with the shareholders, on the ground that they too were victims of the deception practised by the hon. gentleman, and now, by common consent, the suit was going on against the hon. gentleman alone, as he (Mr. White) was informed. And yet the hon. gentleman got up here on every possible occasion, and undertook to lecture this House, to lecture the public men of this country, and to set himself forward as the purifier of the public life of the Dominion, while, in reality, if he (Mr. White) were to repeat the language of the original statement complained of in the libel suit, he was himself steeped to the very lips in the most wicked frauds. But the hon. gentleman had a somewhat original plea—which would be amusing if it had not so serious a side to it—which he was constantly putting forward. They were told that those charges were the result of a conspiracy between people in Glasgow and the Tory leaders in Canada to crush the hon. gentleman for the part he played in the Pacific scandal. They were actually asked to believe that these gentlemen in Glasgow, most of whom he (Mr. White) ventured to believe were Radicals of the first water, had conspired with the Conservative leader in this country to ruin the hon. gentlemen opposite. Unfortunately for the plea, they had evidence of the intensity of the feeling against the hon. gentleman, on the part even of his own co-directors in Scotland, before any charge was made against him in Canada. Here was an extract from a letter written by one of the gentlemen, dated on the 26th of December, 1873:

"A very remarkable and suspicious affair, which, I think, has been now mentioned to you for the first time, and which, to me, probably more than to the other directors, except McEwen, shows me the mind of Huntington all through this affair. Each of the directors put their names down for 1,000 shares, signed their applications, paid their deposits and calls—all except Huntington. He never applied for shares. McEwen did for him, but Huntington never signed the letter of application; he is not legally even a shareholder, and much less a director. To all the secretary's applications for calls, he has never answered a word nor acknowledged himself a shareholder. We refused to give up the £50,000 fully paid shares to McEwen, unless these calls were paid, and the end of it all was that, to save the Company, I had to purchase 1,000 shares from McEwen, £6 paid for £4 a share, and now hold nearly 5,000 shares, mostly bought up from people—friends in distress. I am quite clear that Huntington all along knew that it was a gross swindle, and kept clear of the shares. He has legally never been a shareholder, and has cruelly fleeced us. And this is the man who sets up for the Simon Pure of Canada! Some people say the John Bright of Canada. You and I, and everyone who has any honesty of purpose, should bend all our energies to expose such a man."

MR. HUNTINGTON: Who was the writer of that?

MR. WHITE: Mr. Henderson wrote it. That was in brief the record of this transaction. And yet the hon. gentleman got up in this House and hurled his epithets of falsifier, slanderer, and liar, against everyone who ventured, in the face of these patent facts, to accuse him. He (Mr. White) had only been provoked into this statement by the frequent references of the hon. gentleman to this matter since the commencement of the Session, and by his bold denial to-night; and, in closing, he challenged the hon. gentleman to answer the plea of justification which had been filed in this case, and thus leave the decision of the question to twelve of his countrymen in an arena where every one of these facts would be brought to light, and their truth or falsity would be fully established.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he would mention one circumstance that would throw a little light on the affair. He had never heard the letter which the hon. gentleman read. He had nothing to do with the organisation of the company, and he was not in the company. If he had 5,000 acres of land to sell in

times of mining excitement, it might be worth some money. The hon. gentleman made out that it cost \$47 an acre, but the fact was that almost all of it sold for \$9 an acre. That was all he (Mr. Huntington) had received for it, and there never was a blacker falsehood than that which was told at this meeting by this man, who, however, he (Mr. Huntington) believed was misled by false information. The mining property in that country, for which he had been offered as much almost as he got for it, was included in these lands. That was, they purchased from a well known man in the county of Brome, and the exact price that person got he (Mr. Huntington) got. He (Mr. Huntington) simply drew the man's money. The price, altogether, would not yield \$2.25 an acre. It was true that two friends of his certified it was not valuable for timber. He had nothing to do with the representations in this prospectus.

MR. WHITE: The hon. gentleman's name is affixed to the prospectus.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the hon. gentleman knew how it occurred. He had nothing to do with the money given to Mr. Henderson, or with any arrangements made in the organisation. What he had to say was that the whole story was as baseless and false as the hon. gentleman's story about these 5,000 acres of wild land.

MR. TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 12th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. MACKENZIE said he desired to call the attention of the House to what

took place in it on Saturday night last. During the discussion, a stranger, who named himself John A. Macdonell, sitting on a seat here, used the most vile language towards a member of the House. The attention of the Speaker was called to it, and he directed, not merely his withdrawal, but the withdrawal of all beside him, including a Senator. A moment afterwards the same party appeared in the House again, and the third time appeared, and still another time attempted to force his way to this entrance, in defiance of all propriety and against Mr Speaker's express directions. He (Mr. Mackenzie) never knew of any occurrence of the kind previously. It was the first time he ever heard of any party coming into the House and speaking at all, but especially addressing himself to a member of the House, and using such grossly insulting language. But, even if Mr. Speaker had directed the Sergeant-at-Arms, ultimately, to remove him from the House, as he (Mr. Mackenzie) understood, he went outside and sent this letter to Mr. Huntington:—

"SIR,—I desire to state, out of the House, you are a cheat and swindler.

"JOHN A. MACDONELL."

It, therefore, became the duty of the leader of the House to deal with this matter, and to take such steps as were necessary to vindicate the proprieties and independence of this House, and secure its members from insult while sitting in it. What action did the leader of the House propose to take in this matter?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I ask the hon. member to lay that letter on the table. This is the first notice I have had of this matter. I shall consider it, and state to the House what course I think is due to the dignity of the House and the protection of its proprieties.

MR. MACKENZIE: I understand from the leader of the House that he will deal with this matter to-day?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hope I shall.

MR. MACKENZIE.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order of the House to resume the adjourned debate on Mr. Tupper's proposed motion for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, *read*.

MR. DESJARDINS said that he begged the attention of the House for a few minutes, in order to correct certain statements made by the hon. member for Shefford, upon the important question contained in the resolutions now submitted. Upon this question, as upon almost all others, the member for Shefford did not represent the views of the Province of Quebec, and was in no way authorised to speak in her name. In giving an honest support to the work of Confederation, the people of the Province of Quebec recognised and accepted all the consequences thereof. That was why they had always been found ready to support the Government in any measure that might be thought necessary for the carrying out of the plan of Confederation. That was why they had accepted with so much earnestness the gigantic scheme of building the Pacific Railway. They had looked upon the acquisition of British Columbia as an important one, not only on account of the advantages and the wealth she possessed, but also because she opened to Canada the highway to the Pacific, and completed the act of Confederation. They had also looked upon this scheme as a political act, that raised Canada several degrees higher among the nations of the earth. They had not changed their opinion since then, and, in 1874, when the hon. member for Lambton thought fit to come before the House and offer a new policy, they had opposed it with all their might. Those who had been present during the debates of the last Parliament would remember the remarkable speeches delivered by the hon. the Minister of Militia, who, he regretted to say, was unable at this moment to support with his eloquence the question that had been discussed since 1874. The broad views of the hon. the Minister of Militia, which were the views entertained by the population of the

Province of Quebec, were calculated not only to meet the interests of the Province of Quebec, but the general interests of the Dominion as well. The people of Quebec would see that the hon. the Minister of Public Works had gone back to this truly national and equitable policy, which was based upon the agreement they were always desirous of carrying out. The Act of 1872 was not a mere Statute, it was a compromise between the Provinces, and not only had the Province of Quebec wished to carry out the letter of the agreement, but she had anticipated the realisation of the scheme it contained by taking upon herself an expenditure of nearly \$14,000,000 in order to build a railway that would connect the Intercolonial with the proposed Pacific Railway. But, if the people of the Province of Quebec had contracted these obligations, if they had loaded their Province with a debt of several millions in order to build this road and to carry out the policy of the Dominion, they had always thought that, when the Conservative party would regain power, justice would be rendered them, and that their share in this great enterprise would be restored to them. It was in vain that the ex-Premier had thought that he could lead public opinion astray on this question by offering the Georgian Bay Branch as a compensation for the abandoning of the terminus fixed upon by the Act of 1872. The more this Georgian Bay Branch was examined, the more it became apparent that it would not realise the hopes that had been held out, nor could it make good to the Province of Quebec the losses she would sustain by the carrying out of the policy inaugurated in 1874, which placed the terminus at Thunder Bay instead of placing it at some point east of Lake Nipissing. If something was to be done in that part of the country before the completion of that part of the road starting from the east side of Lake Nipissing, and going westward as far as Thunder Bay, it would be by going to French River, rather than to build the Georgian Bay Branch, because the opening up of French River would open up immediately the navigation of the Lakes as far as the extremity of Lake Nipissing, towards which would converge the rail-

ways of Ontario and Quebec. That would be a compensation, not for the abandoning of the remainder of the line, but for the time that would necessarily elapse before the road would connect by an uninterrupted line with the terminus at Lake Nipissing and with the Provincial lines. He was convinced that he was giving utterance to the views of the vast majority of the people of Quebec, when he stated that they approved of the policy contained in the resolutions brought down by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, because he was sure that their vested rights would be respected, and that the Government would go back to the policy of 1872, not only with regard to the financial part of the undertaking, but also with regard to the particular conditions that were to ensure equal advantages to the Province of Ontario and to the Province of Quebec. They could not refrain from approving also, in spite of the contrary opinion expressed by the hon. member for Lambton, the inauguration of a policy the aim whereof was to make the territories through which the road was to pass pay their share of the expenses. He entertained entirely, in this respect, the hope that the Government had expressed, to wit, that, when they would go to the money markets of Europe with a hundred million acres of land to offer as security for the loan required to build the road, they would be just as well received as any other that was obliged to borrow on the English markets. He would ask whether there was any country, even in Europe, that could offer to capitalists such advantageous and safe conditions as Canada could offer them. The people of Quebec had other reasons for looking favourably upon any policy calculated to ensure the possession and the enjoyment of the vast regions of the North-West. They could not but recal with respect the ancient traditions of their history. The North-West Territories that the present Government invited them to acquire for the advancement of industry and colonisation, their predecessors had formerly travelled over, and taken possession of, in order to introduce true civilisation. For this reason, as well as on account of the political necessity, the Province of Quebec could not but eagerly accept any occasion calculated to write

her history over again, as it were, and to unite to the ancient French possessions the ancient territory that both her missionaries and explorers had acquired. If this question was one of sentiment for them, it was also a question of political interest. Not only did they look upon the construction of the Pacific Railway as the necessary link that was to unite the different parts of the Dominion, but they would insist upon the carrying out of the agreement made in 1872, which guaranteed to them a legitimate share of the advantages that were to flow from this undertaking. Thus he hoped that the debate upon these resolutions would not be closed before the Government made known their views with regard to the eastern part of the road, that was to say, the part between the east side of Lake Nipissing and the western extremity of Lake Superior. He had no reason to doubt a favourable answer, from what he knew of the views and opinions of the hon. Ministers from the Province of Quebec, as well as those entertained by the hon. the Minister of Public Works—views and opinions that they had so openly and frequently expressed during the last Parliament. He could strongly express the conviction that the road would really be for the advantage, not only of a section of the country, as was to be the one proposed by the late Government, but for the advantage of Quebec and the Lower Provinces, as well as for the great Province of Ontario. He would conclude by expressing the hope that the absence of the hon. the Minister of Militia would be temporary, and that he would soon be able to resume the position that he occupied in the councils of Her Majesty, in order to continue, with his worthy colleagues, to represent in the Cabinet the views of the Province of Quebec, and to cause her interest to be recognised, as he had so well succeeded, with his colleagues, in making them prevail with regard to other matters of equal importance.

MR. ANGLIN said that, though he had examined these resolutions with a great deal of care, and had listened with attention to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, he had, as yet, failed to understand them. They seemed to him to be the strangest series of reso-

lutions ever submitted to this House. The hon. the Minister of Public Works in introducing these resolutions departed widely from all the positions he had ever taken upon the Pacific Railway. During the time he was in Opposition, he made repeated, and sometimes violent, attacks upon the policy pursued by his predecessor, charging him with a want of skill, a want of ability, a want of earnestness, in relation to this Pacific Railway. A more thorough and satisfactory vindication of the policy of his predecessors, a more complete reply to the charges made by that hon. gentleman himself, could not possibly be furnished, than was furnished by the speech he made on Saturday last. He had admitted that the continued surveys were useful and necessary, and that his predecessor was actuated by an earnest desire to carry out, as far as possible, the bargain made by the previous Government with British Columbia, and that, if he had constructed a portion of the road between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg, he had done more than ought to satisfy the people of British Columbia, and more than could have satisfied reasonable people, had he commenced the construction of the work on the Pacific shore itself. The hon. gentleman only objected to one thing, namely, that the late Minister of Public Works did not, last year, cause a survey of the Peace River country to be made. He (Mr. Anglin) thought he could remember within the last year sufficient reasons were given why that survey was not ordered, and why the late Minister of Public Works had declined to consider even the possibility of building the line through the Peace River country, and the reasons then given were good reasons still. The hon. the Minister of Public Works must admit that the Bute Inlet route was now in question, and it was out of the question that this line should be continued up to Fort Simpson. They all knew that in approaching Bute Inlet the road would have to run some 200 miles through a country, where the difficulties in the way of construction and working the road were of the most formidable character. The route through the Peace River country must find its way to the Pacific coast at one or other of these termini, all objectionable in the opinion of the late Minister of Public Works, and

two of them, he thought, objectionable in the judgment of the present Minister of Public Works. After six or seven months of consideration of the whole question, and of consultation with the engineers, the hon. the Minister of Public Works on Saturday last did, in fact, endorse in every particular the policy and conduct of his predecessor. There was another consideration also, which stood directly in the way of the adoption of a line running through the Peace River country. He believed it was stated, last year, and the statement had not been contradicted, that, were the main line built through the Peace River country, it would be lengthened fifty or sixty miles, which would involve not only the cost of building the additional fifty or sixty miles, but the cost of working them, of transporting every passenger, and every ton of goods over them. As far as he was acquainted with the subject, there seemed to him to be insuperable objections to the extension of the main line of the Pacific Railway through the Peace River country. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, in comparing the Burrard Inlet route with the Bute Inlet route, admitted that, in every point of view but two, the Burrard Inlet route was the best. It was somewhat shorter, the grades were incomparably easier than by the other route, and it ran through a comparatively fertile country. The only objections were these: In the first place, it approached so near to the American frontier that they might possibly build a branch line, tapping it at its terminus, and so divert a great portion of the trade to one of the harbours of Oregon. In this part of the Dominion, he encouraged connection of American railroads with our own system of railroads. We believed that it was a great advantage to us that a large portion of the American trade should pass over our roads. We were expending many millions in enlarging canals, not so much for the convenience of our trade and our own farmers, as for the purpose of securing a large portion of the carrying trade of the United States; but, while we were doing everything in our power on this side of the continent to secure, as much as possible, that carrying trade, the hon. the Minister of Public Works seemed to

think it was a fatal objection to the Fraser River route, that it approached somewhat near to the American frontier, and that an American line should be there connected with it. It seemed to him (Mr. Anglin) that, if we could do the carrying trade for Oregon over our railroad, we would be the gainers; but, at all events, if we did not choose to allow the Americans to connect with our road, we need not permit them to do so. They could not do so without the permission of this Parliament, which permission we were free to withhold. The other objection which the hon. the Minister of Public Works seemed to consider a very serious one, was an objection taken from a military point of view. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) stated correctly that, in the present condition of our railroads running close to the American frontier, connecting at so many points with the American system, we must have made great blunders in the past in our railroad policy. But this objection was a feeble one. If, unfortunately, the United States and Great Britain should go to war at any time, the fate of this country must be determined all along the frontier. Every one must be satisfied that a war between these two countries could never be settled within this century, at all events, by anything that might happen on the Pacific coast, whether the Americans chose to erect a fortress in San Juan, or to occupy Vancouver Island, or whether we had the strength to occupy the island which now belonged to the United States. It would be almost folly for this Parliament to provide rather for one year of war than for ninety-nine years of peace. They would prepare this country best for war by cultivating the arts of peace, by strengthening our people commercially, agriculturally, and otherwise. He (Mr. Anglin) considered the objection in a military point of view as so feeble that it could hardly be urged, except as a pretext for the selection of a longer and more expensive, and comparatively impracticable route by Bute Inlet. The hon. the leader of the Government had made on Saturday a remarkable speech. They had heard him occasionally make remarkable speeches in the House, but his speech on Saturday was, on the whole, a most remarkable one, and a very fair

sample of those he had made during the last elections on the hustings; for he dealt not with facts but with fancies altogether. He chose to fancy that the hon. member for Lambton had attacked and belittled this country, and he replied to those imaginary attacks. One of his fancies was that the hon. member for Lambton had stated that the North-West was unfit for settlement, and on that he dwelt feelingly and emphatically for some time—the only lack in his whole argument being that it was entirely without foundation, as the hon. member for Lambton had never made such a statement. Having dwelt on that, the right hon. gentleman proceeded to speak of the probability of our obtaining some assistance from Great Britain. On that he dwelt at great length, but he (Mr. Anglin) confessed not very convincingly. That Great Britain ought to help us, he (Mr. Anglin) was perfectly willing to admit, but we should have sought that help when we first obtained possession of the North-West, when we relieved the Imperial Government of the responsibility, then becoming a heavy responsibility, of governing that country. He (Mr. Anglin) remembered that in those days the Hon. Joseph Howe, then sitting on his side of the House, urged very strongly that it was the duty of Canada not to assume that responsibility, unless the Imperial Government would render that assistance which, under the circumstances, it was reasonable on our part to demand. His protests were, however, unavailing. Another opportunity occurred when the hon. gentlemen opposite might fairly have called on the Imperial Government, in some way, by guaranteeing interest or otherwise, in the working of and constructing the great Imperial highway, as it was called in the resolutions. That opportunity occurred when British Columbia became part of the Confederacy. There could be no doubt, at that time, that the British Government were very much in favour of that Union; that they did very much to remove the difficulties that stood in the way of adding British Columbia to Canada. That was the time when we could have pointed out to the British Government the enormous work which we had to undertake, and ask their assistance in carrying

MR. ANGLIN.

out the bargain which, at their instance, we were making with British Columbia. To-day he could hardly imagine that the Government of Great Britain seriously entertained the belief that it would be possible for them to induce the Government and Parliament of Canada to guarantee any amount of money or to give any aid towards the construction of this railway. The people of Great Britain were now suffering from want of employment. The only thing that he could see in these resolutions was a determination to appoint Commissioners. He had no doubt that that would be carried out, that these lands, now sufficiently managed by the Department of the Interior, would, in the future, be managed by highly paid Commissioners. But he had no idea of gift, guarantee or aid from England, and could, therefore, have no idea that the British Government would appoint Commissioners.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is proposed there will be a Commission, whether there is a guarantee or not.

MR. ANGLIN said it was his impression, and this statement made it a conviction, that a Commission would be appointed, at all events; that they should have highly paid Commissioners.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That does not follow.

MR. ANGLIN: But that the Imperial Government would not appoint a Commissioner, because they would not consent to give either guarantee or aid to this great work. One of those things he could not understand was that the Government began by misstating the terms of agreement between Canada and British Columbia. These terms were distinctly and absolutely, without qualification of any kind, that this work should have been commenced within two years of the time of the Union, and built within ten years. It was true that they had passed an Address to Her Majesty, asking her to incorporate those terms into the British North America Act; that other resolutions were moved declaring that the work should be so carried on as not to increase the burden of the people of Canada. But it was also true that the House deliberately refused to adopt a motion

made by Mr. Dorion for an Address to the Queen asking Her to incorporate their conditions with the other conditions in Her Proclamation, so that an Address to the Queen contained only those specific absolute conditions, and these only were embraced in Her Majesty's Proclamation, and thus formed part of the Constitution of Canada. The qualifying resolutions had no part in the Proclamation, and ought to have no effect whatever. It was stated then, and had been stated again since, that the gentlemen who then represented British Columbia were satisfied that these terms so solemnly promised by this House, and solemnly promulgated by Royal Proclamation, could not be completely carried out, and were willing that the object should be reached as best we could, if they could only be satisfied of our sincerity. Hon. gentlemen were not authorised to make any such terms. They did not assent to any such terms, and speeches made could not be held to modify the terms of an actual bargain. British Columbia had a right to insist that Canada deliberately pledged herself to commence that road within two years and to complete it within ten years. Yet the Minister of Public Works spoke as if the Act of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) in accepting the Carnarvon terms did increase the liabilities and responsibilities imposed on this country. The Carnarvon treaty gave Canada some nine years more in which to complete two-thirds of the original road. That surely was making the terms much easier for Canada, and yet both the Minister of Customs and the Premier spoke as if, in accepting these terms, the hon. member for Lambton had imposed new liabilities and responsibilities on this country, and that then, for the first time, was Canada bound to a specific period within which the work was to be done. It was hard to believe that these gentlemen made this statement unintentionally. When this proposal to build the road first came before Parliament, he (Mr. Anglin) took the ground that this country was absolutely unable to complete it within ten years. He believed, now, that this country was absolutely unable to build that road in the additional time estimated by the hon. member. He was rather pleased to learn, from the tone in which

both hon. gentlemen opposite had spoken on this side of the case, that they were of opinion that the road could not be built in this time, and that it would be unjust to the people of this country to build this road from Lake Superior to the Pacific in the time mentioned in the Carnarvon terms. It would be well that the representatives of British Columbia, here and elsewhere, should quite understand, to-day, what was the deliberate opinion of members on both sides of the House on this part of the question. They had, at all events, the right to complain, hitherto, that the bargain had not been carried out, and the only acceptable defence that they could make, was the fact that it was, as some of them stated some eight years ago, absolutely beyond the means of the people to carry it out. About seven or eight years ago, it would have been easy for us to induce English capitalists to invest their money in works of this kind. It was found impossible, and hon. members blamed the Opposition of the day, particularly the hon. member for Lambton, for the failure of the project entrusted to Sir Hugh Allan. He (Mr. Anglin) believed they should rather blame the sound sense of the capitalists of England, who did not believe that investments in wild railroad schemes were likely to prove profitable. They had to-day the same scheme modified. Instead of having a company, and allowing them 50,000,000 acres of land, these lands were to be manipulated under a new form. He (Mr. Anglin) said, then, that he was satisfied that, if a company could raise capital enough to succeed in partially commencing the work, not only would the \$30,000,000 be used up, but additional assistance would be required, and by the time the road would be built the people would be responsible for an amount of money equal to the total cost of the road. The gentleman who was at the head of the company had a very large number of men in this House bound to sanction it, and had the work gone on they would have supported his demands for additional assistance and the country would have been involved in debt. They would have paid the full cost of the railroad, the lands would have passed out of their control, and the company would have owned the road. They were told these lands would

furnish money enough to build the road. Could that be the case, the only question would be how so to manage that land as to promote the settlement of the country. The Government were resolved to pursue the policy of their predecessors. They held to this land question. The mere transferring of those lands to the care of Commissioners would not add to the area of these lands a single acre or to their value a single dollar. When they came to a calculation as to how much money was to be raised by the sale of these lands, it would be found that hon. gentlemen opposite were indulging in delusions when they fancied they could, by the proceeds of these lands, pay the cost of the construction of the railway. One of the attacks made by the leader of the Government on the hon. member for Lambton, was on the ground that the latter had denied there were 150,000,000 acres of valuable land in the North-West, although, in fact, the hon. member for Lambton had not spoken of the value of the lands at all. He said it would be necessary, were the scheme of colonisation, faintly shadowed forth in the resolutions, carried out, to give away a very great portion of the lands to the first settlers. How were these lands to pay? The Minister of Public Works informed them on Saturday that the obligations at present on account of that railroad amounted to about \$25,000,000. The interest upon the sums of money they were now expending on account of that railroad for some years back had never been charged against the road. The interest and Sinking Fund had hitherto both been met and paid by the people of the various Provinces. Assuming that these \$25,000,000 had all been spent within a year or two, they had at once, at five per cent., an interest of one and a quarter million dollars for each year. Supposing that the land could be sold at \$2.00 an acre, and leaving out of question the cost of surveying and laying out the lands for settlers, they would have to sell 500,000 acres this year to meet the interest of \$1,000,000 on the \$25,000,000 already expended. No doubt there was an extraordinary emigration this year, but he questioned whether there would be sufficient settlers to occupy that large quantity of land. Giving 100 acres to

each family, it would take 5,000 families to occupy that portion. If they were to meet the wishes of the population, ten or twelve millions a year would scarcely be sufficient to meet the expenditure on that road. The entire cost would at least be \$100,000,000. They now began to see how fallacious the original estimates were, that, even after careful explorations, the expenditure was increasing from 50 to 70 per cent. First, 500,000 acres, next, 625,000, then 750,000 must be settled merely to pay the interest. Did anyone imagine that the settlement of that country would progress more rapidly than at that rate? There would not be more than sufficient to pay the interest on the money, and by the time the road would be built a very great portion of those lands would be disposed of. They could not imagine that, by any manipulation of those lands, money could be got to pay one-quarter the cost of the railway. They talked of bringing distressed English operatives into this country. It was rather strange to find that on all these resolutions there was not a word about exporting our own distressed population from our cities where they vainly sought employment, out to the North-West. Perhaps the insertion of anything of that kind would be admitting that the National Policy would prove to be a lamentable failure. What class of people in the Old Country was out of employment? What class would it be desirable for us to induce to come and settle here? There were agricultural labourers in the old country who might be induced to come out here, but he did not believe that many would come, nor did he deem it desirable that a large number of them should come; for, on the whole, the agricultural labourers of Great Britain were an ignorant class, and not those who would be calculated to direct their energies in a proper way. When they came to the operatives, the people employed in manufactures, not many of them could be induced to come out to settle in the North-West. Supposing a large number of those could be got, they still would not have money enough, after paying their passage, to buy agricultural implements and pay \$2 per acre besides. Some settlers could be induced to come, but not the very large numbers that hon. gentleman opposite chose to

assume. If large numbers were to come out, very many of them would prove to be very undesirable settlers. He had endeavoured to run briefly through some of the objections to the scheme. They were asked to condemn the selection of Burrard Inlet as premature. The hon. the Minister of Public Works took great care to warn them that there were great objections to the selection of other routes, and that, after all, it might be found necessary to choose the Burrard Inlet Route. These resolutions, in the first place, asked the House to condemn the selection of the Burrard Inlet as premature, and then asked for absolute power to select what route they pleased for the construction of 125 miles of railway from the Pacific coast inland, without having previously to consult Parliament. No matter how undesirable the selected route might be believed to be, Parliament would be absolutely powerless to prevent it. That, he took it, was the most important part of the whole series of resolutions. He attached very little importance to what was said regarding public lands. But he presumed the result would be the appointment of a Commission for the management of those lands. He thought that, in a matter of such enormous importance as the selection of this road, the House ought to insist that it should be left to their approval before any work was undertaken upon it. He thought it should not be left in the hands of the Government to choose what route they pleased. He was glad to know that the Government was satisfied that this road could not be completed within the prescribed time, and that they were not disposed to rush madly into debt. The sober second thought of the Minister of Public Works, went much further in the direction of common sense, and afforded a much better security to the people of this country against additional taxation, than was afforded by his rather wild and reckless speeches of the past five years. He was delighted at the change of tone and sentiment of the hon. the Minister of Public Works and that he was inclined to do justice to his predecessor. He could only express the hope that the law would be wisely and patriotically put in force.

MR. MCINNIS said he always felt that the selection of the western terminus

of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the route through British Columbia, was not a question for the people of British Columbia, or their representatives in this House, or even for the people of the Dominion of Canada, as a whole, to decide. He looked upon it as a purely scientific question—one that appertained solely to the engineering profession. Such being the case, he proposed to make a few remarks with respect to the twelfth resolution, which asked the House to condemn the course pursued by the late Government, in selecting Burrard Inlet as the terminus of the British Columbia section of the Canadian Pacific Railway—or, rather, to say that it was premature. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, a couple of evenings ago, very properly stated that the Burrard Inlet route possessed some advantages over the Bute Inlet. Among other things he said that the Bute Inlet was fifty-seven miles longer. That was quite true; but the hon. gentleman did not go far enough. He did not tell the House that the most sanguine advocate of the Bute Inlet route never for a moment considered that the road would terminate there, for the very good reason that there was no harbour nor anchorage, consequently it never could become the terminus of a great trans-continental railway. Instead of it remaining there, it would require to be carried down to Frederick Arm, across the Valdez Islands—thence by a ferry of fifteen miles to Vancouver Island, and from there down the eastern side of Vancouver Island to Esquimalt, which was on the southern extremity of the Island. The distance, instead of being fifty-seven miles, would be 304 miles of additional railway to be built, not to speak of the delay and inconvenience incident to the fifteen miles of ferry required in getting to Vancouver Island. Then they had to take into consideration, also, that the gradients in the Bute Inlet route for fifteen continuous miles averaged 110ft. to the mile, whilst on the Burrard route the greatest was only 52ft. to the mile, and that only for six miles. There was another fact in connection with the Bute Inlet, not mentioned before, and that was that no less than eighty miles of tunnelling would be required on it, as compared with one mile a few

feet of tunnelling on the Burrard Inlet route. Again, when they looked at the enormous cost to build the road by Bute Inlet, with Esquimalt as its terminus, in excess of the Burrard Inlet route, he thought that every hon. gentleman in the House and the country would have just reason to pause before deciding on the adoption of that route. He wished to impress on the House that he was not giving his own opinions on this important question of routes, involving the necessary expenditure of so many millions of dollars of the public money, or statements founded upon vague rumours, but the result of the engineer's surveys, not merely for one year, but for eight, according to a carefully prepared report, submitted to this House about a year ago—the last report brought down. That report showed that the Bute Inlet route would cost no less than \$21,000,000 more than the Burrard Inlet route, and that, too, without conferring the slightest benefit on British Columbia or the Dominion, besides the inconvenience and delay of those fifteen miles of ferry. They were told, on the same authority, on page 60, that the running expenses, the cost of the maintenance of that section of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, would cost, in excess of the Burrard Inlet route, no less than \$693,000 per annum. Then, when they took the interest at five per cent. on the value of the money invested—and that, he thought, was a fair estimate—five per cent. on the \$21,000,000, besides the \$693,000 he had just mentioned, it would amount to something nearly \$2,000,000 interest per annum, for all time to come, to be drawn from the Dominion exchequer—saying nothing of the 304 miles extra distance, which would be sufficient to condemn the Bute Inlet route once and for all. With regard to the objection raised by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the adoption of the Burrard Inlet route, that it was in too close proximity to the United States, and that vessels would have to go within range of the San Juan Island guns, he (Mr. McInnes) would read an extract or two from the Engineer's report of last year:

"In the event of war with the United States a very fair succession of channels from Active

Pass, across Swanson Channel through Morsby passages, Sydney and Baynes Channels to the Strait of Fuca, can be had by the erection of a few beacons, and buoying out the channel where intricate and narrow; a vessel then using those channels need not, at any time, approach within five miles of foreign territory, as will be seen in statements by Admiral Cochrane, Captain Graham, and Commander Pender."

He thought the military objection was scarcely worth noticing, for the reason that, so long as Great Britain held the supremacy of the high seas, and could command the Straits of DeFuca, she would, in that way, be able to afford all the protection necessary to the commerce of the country in that region. Besides using the channels he had just mentioned, in the event of such a calamity as war between the United States and Canada, they could go around by the north end of Vancouver Island. In these days of treaties and arbitrations, he could not conceive war with the United States possible—or, if possible, it was certainly very improbable; hence this objection, like all the others, against making Burrard Inlet the terminus, must fall to the ground—fall before undeniable evidence. The hon. the Minister of Public Works also appeared to attach considerable importance to the fact that there was a harbour known by the name of Holmes Harbour, where it was possible and practicable for the United States to tap the Canadian line, and thereby draw our commerce to that harbour, and build up a second San Francisco in the United States instead of British territory. Well, he (Mr. McInnes) apprehended no danger from that. In fact, instead of it being an objection, it ought to be an inducement; because, he thought it ought to be policy of the Government to attract in every possible way the commerce from the neighbouring States, and induce it to pass over Canadian railways. But, assuming the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Tupper's) supposition to be correct, that a second San Francisco would be built on American territory, to the detriment of the Burrard Inlet route if it were adopted, was it not within the sphere and the jurisdiction of this House to say whether they should grant a charter to any foreign company to tap the Canadian line or not? Therefore, that did not

present any serious objection when the Government could say, "Thus far you can go, but no further"; therefore, the argument of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, in this respect, must fall to the ground. Besides all he stated about the Burrard Inlet route, he considered the present Government was committed to this route quite as much as the late Government, inasmuch as when the question was brought before the House last spring, not one hon. gentleman on the Treasury Benches to-day, with the exception of the President of the Council, raised his voice against the adoption of Burrard Inlet as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia. It was true it was not finally settled in this House last year, but the late Premier indicated, in every possible way, that that was the terminus to be adopted. The people of British Columbia had been very unfairly charged with being unreasonable in their demands, with asking for impossibilities. Well, he did not deny the fact that they had in British Columbia some as unreasonable people as were to be found elsewhere in the Dominion or other countries. Yet, he claimed that, when the House took into consideration that one of the principal clauses of the terms of Union with British Columbia was that the railway should be begun simultaneously at both ends of the road, it could not be denied that they had some just grounds for complaint. They had been waiting—anxiously waiting for the last eight years for railway construction, but not one dollar had been expended in actual construction, not one foot of railway constructed. Now, let them see what had been done on the Atlantic end of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They found, according to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, a few days ago, that the very large sum of \$25,000,000 had been expended, or, to be strictly accurate, the credit of the country was pledged to that amount. Now, he asked every hon. gentleman in the House if British Columbia had not great reason to complain? They had heard a great deal within the last few weeks about British Columbia going to secede from Canada. He was happy to say that was not the prevailing sentiment in the Pacific Province. It was quite true

there were a number of people in British Columbia who favoured the secession movement unless the railway was begun this year; they were land speculators and merchants, who had invested largely in land at Esquimalt, Victoria, and Bute Inlet, and expected that the choice of that route would raise their lands to a fabulous price, and give them fortunes in a few years at the expense of the Dominion. He denied that the people of British Columbia, as a whole, desired secession. They were true and loyal, not only to Canada but to the Mother Country. A great majority of the people of that Province did not wish, but would rather object to the building of that road in four or five years, as some desired. He believed they would prefer its completion in the inside of the next twenty years. What they wanted, however, was an assurance that it would be built, and meantime placed under actual construction. If it was only a million that was spent yearly, they would be perfectly satisfied, so long as they knew that the Government and people of Canada intended to build the road. But the putting of the work off from year to year, he and the people of British Columbia must and did object to. Were it not the intention of the Government to build the road, it would be their bounden duty to say so, which avowal would give more satisfaction than the keeping of the people in suspense, as during the last four or five years. The hon. member for Lambton had remarked that the surveys were never completed. That was true. He believed that they would not have been completed, and that Burrard Inlet would not have been selected last year as the western terminus had it not been for the influence of Lord Dufferin, who visited that Province in 1876, and went to Bute Inlet, and up the Fraser Valley some 250 miles. He also saw that Burrard Inlet had everything claimed for it as a harbour; that there was no harbour at Bute Inlet, and that it was quite possible to carry a railroad through the canyons of the Fraser; and he (Mr. McInnes) was a member of the deputation that requested of His Lordship a survey of Burrard Inlet before Bute Inlet was selected. They had complained that the Burrard Inlet route had not been equally well surveyed with the

Bute Inlet, and observed that, if it was not in the interest of British Columbia to adopt the Burrard Inlet route, they would have nothing further to say, but would adopt the decision of the engineers. The noble Earl stated that it was a very reasonable request, and he would bring it before the notice of his Ministers at the earliest possible moment. He was only forty-eight hours at the most returned to Ottawa when the engineers, then on their way from the Interior to Victoria, were telegraphed to, to make a preliminary survey of the canyons of the Fraser. It was made, and it met the most sanguine expectations of every one in favour of that route. The consequence was that all the surveying parties were placed on the Burrard Inlet route in 1877, with the result as brought down by the report of last year, showing that the route was perfectly practicable, despite the prejudiced reports of Marcus Smith to the contrary. He had used all his influence to get the Bute Inlet route selected, upon which \$2,500,000 was spent in surveys which showed it impracticable. He (Mr. McInnes) was told on good authority, that Mr. Marcus Smith said he would rather take the road to—well, to a hotter country than any to be found in the Torrid Zone. The Burrard Inlet route was found to have grades much easier; it was 304 miles shorter, and would cost twenty-one millions less, besides \$693,000 per annum less for working expenses, while terminating at a harbour which was second to none on the Pacific coast. A Custom-house officer at Burrard Inlet had made up a statement showing that in the last three years 163 foreign ships had entered that port, with an aggregate tonnage of 102,269 tons. Over one-sixth of them entered and cast anchor without the assistance of tug or pilot, the only two that sustained any damage receiving it, not in the inland waters of British Columbia, not in the Gulf of Georgia, but at the mouth of Esquimalt Harbour and the Pacific Ocean. Another reason why Burrard Inlet would be much more suitable for a terminus than Esquimalt was that it had over 25 times the amount of anchorage that Esquimalt possessed. Before a Special Committee of the Senate, three weeks ago, one of the ablest engineers who had

MR. McINNES.

served in British Columbia during the last five or six years stated on oath that he thought Burrard Inlet should be selected for the terminus of the Canada Pacific Railway, and considered it equivalent to Liverpool, New York, or San Francisco. In view of all the facts, therefore, he (Mr. McInnes) refused to believe that the present, or any Government, entrusted with the welfare of this country, would be guilty of such an irreparable blunder, such an injustice to the already too heavily taxed citizens of the Dominion, as to adopt the Bute Inlet route in preference to the Burrard Inlet. It would not only be an injustice but a gross outrage on the people of this country—an outrage on the rising generation and posterity. He was fully prepared to give all the resolutions but the 11th and 12th, his unqualified support. He believed they would give general satisfaction to the country, being of a practical nature.

MR. TUPPER said that, as no one appeared desirous of saying anything more on the resolutions, he would briefly reply to some of the criticisms and remarks which they had elicited. He had endeavoured, in introducing the resolutions, to avoid opening up any debateable ground between the two parties that did not necessarily come under the consideration of the very important questions involved. He regretted very much that hon. gentlemen opposite should not have felt it their duty to confine themselves to the discussion of the questions naturally and necessarily raised by the resolutions themselves. He would not follow their bad example on the present occasion. He did intend to discuss what was familiarly known as the Canadian Pacific Railway Scandal, and he did not think that hon. gentlemen opposite had any reason to suppose its revival would benefit either themselves or the country. It was quite true that hon. gentlemen opposite had snatched a hasty verdict from the country, by using that question as a means of exciting the public mind. But, they ought not to forget that, after five years' of continuous discussion of the question in and out of Parliament, after the whole matter had been deliberately submitted to the people, its verdict had been of the

most unmistakable character, against the views and conduct of the hon. gentlemen opposite. That verdict ought, forever, to set the question at rest. He would think that the hon. gentlemen opposite would hardly be prepared to utter so great a slander against the people of this country, as to assume or declare that any gentleman with the slightest taint upon his personal honour could receive the deliberate support as Premier of the vast majority of the people of Canada. It was obvious that they had utterly failed in convincing the public mind of the soundness of their views on this question, and they saw the party charged with one of the greatest political crimes, the sale of a great public charter for personal or party interest, considered by the people more worthy of their trust than the men to whom they had recently given five years of trial. He did not intend to say more on this subject, which he regretted had been introduced. He had made what he hoped would be a successful appeal to the patriotism of the hon. gentlemen opposite. He believed they had party issues enough on which they could legitimately divide, without dragging down into the arena of party strife a great question that the public interest demanded should be raised above it; and he did hope that, in the further consideration of the question here and elsewhere, hon. gentlemen opposite would feel that they owed it to their country, even at the sacrifice of party interest, to give all the aid and co-operation that he (Mr. Tupper) solicited at their hands to the Government engaged in dealing with this great question. He intended briefly to examine some of the objections of hon. gentleman opposite to the resolutions. The language of the leader of the Opposition, and of the late Ministers of Finance and of the Interior, would lead to the supposition that in those resolutions the House and country was asked to commit itself to some new and onerous obligation. He (Mr. Tupper) denied it. On the points raised by those hon. gentleman, Parliament had already committed itself to everything asked in the resolutions. Those hon. gentlemen stood as fully committed as gentlemen on his side to everything asked in the resolutions. Exception had been taken to the demand to

appropriate 160,000,000 acres for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. On the Journals of Parliament of seven years ago would, however, be found a declaration that they would give to a company that would construct that work 50,000,000 acres, and, in alternate blocks, an equal quantity, or 100,000,000 acres in all, should be reserved for the purpose of covering the expenditure in connection with the construction of this work. Therefore, as far as the amount of land claimed, as far as the authority asked for in relation to this appropriation of lands, it was put, seven years ago, upon the Journals of Parliament, and had never been withdrawn. The hon. leader of the Opposition objected to the sale of these lands at \$2 an acre, for the purpose of covering the cost of the construction of this work. Why, the hon. gentleman would find, in the law which he himself placed on the Statute-book, a declaration that, of the 20,000 acres of land per mile to be appropriated, one-third was to be given to the contractors, and the other two-thirds were to be reserved in the hands of the Government, for the purpose of paying the contractors for the work. There was no change of policy in relation to it; it was a change in terms, apparently, but only such a change as, while not involving any additional expenditure, would provide the means for the liquidation of the amount necessary for the construction of this great work. The hon. member for Bothwell reminded the House the other night that all these engagements had been subjected to the proviso that no increase of taxation should be involved, that all these expenditures in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway should be limited by the declaration put forward in the outset, and always maintained, that it should not add to the taxation of the country. He wished to deal especially with the remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who were committed by everything that could commit public men, to give a united support to every line of these resolutions. The late Minister of the Interior should remember that, while it was declared in the first instance that the whole scheme should be limited by our ability to obtain a company who, for

thirty millions of money and fifty million acres of land, would, at their own risk, supply all the capital that was required to complete this work and operate it afterwards, the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite entirely changed and extended that responsibility. They admitted that they had made a binding contract with the Imperial Government and with the Government of British Columbia, not limited by any such clause or consideration.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. TUPPER said that, on the floor of this Parliament, he had so thoroughly established the point that the late Government made no such limit, but had imposed a binding obligation on the Government of Canada to complete, by 1890, two thousand miles of railway as a Government work; he had made that so clear and palpable that a member of that Administration drew up a new resolution, and placed it in the hands of a gentleman opposite, renewing the former declaration, that it must not involve additional taxation. He was not blaming hon. gentlemen, but he was showing that they were much mistaken if they supposed that, after the light that had been thrown on this question, they could to-day relieve themselves of the responsibility that they incurred when they bound the Government to complete this work in eleven years from to-day, *comme que cotee*, from the waters of Lake Superior to British Columbia, and without any reservation or qualification whatever. They stood committed to having adopted and imposed on Canada an obligation vastly greater in extent than anything that had been attempted or contemplated by their predecessors. But he did not blame the hon. gentlemen; he believed they did this under a sense of the responsibility imposed on them when they came into power, and, that looking upon this question from a statesmanlike point of view, they felt that they could not turn back, and that, good faith having been pledged to British Columbia to complete this road as rapidly as possible, they believed they were consulting the best interests of the country when they assumed that binding and onerous obligation. Having done so, it was not possible for these hon. gentlemen to escape

MR. TUPPER.

from their liability, or to raise a question to-day as to their own obligation, nor could they refuse their co-operation to any Government in redeeming the promises to which they bound themselves both to the Imperial Government and the Government of British Columbia. But that was not all. He wanted the leader of the Opposition, who seemed to be hesitating about allowing this Government to put 125 miles of this route under contract without previous submission to Parliament—

MR. MACKENZIE: I never said so; I said I would be prepared to consider any resolution giving authority to place 125 miles under contract if I knew where the place was.

MR. TUPPER said he understood the hon. gentleman to go a great deal further, and to be committed to the same principle as the hon. member for Bothwell; he understood the hon. gentleman to take exception to the principle of the adoption of the policy that these resolutions propounded, that of beginning the construction of this work within the Province of British Columbia, and committing the people of this country to prosecuting it steadily. One of the great objections to this proposal on the part of the hon. gentleman was that it would commit Parliament to the expenditure of \$10,000,000 for the construction of these 125 miles. The hon. gentleman said that he had sent Mr. Fleming to England, and obtained the able assistance of Sir John Rose, and those gentlemen united exhausted their efforts in endeavouring to influence British capitalists to come forward and construct this road. He gave the hon. gentleman credit for it; he believed he (Mr. Mackenzie) was doing his duty to Canada, and that he never did it in a more satisfactory, a more laudable manner, than when he was endeavouring, through the best agencies he could command, to secure the accomplishment of that work. But, when those hon. gentlemen told him that they could not obtain any encouragement from British capitalists—he (Mr. Tupper) would not now discuss the reasons that led to that position—what did the hon. gentleman do? Did he abandon the line? Did he shrink from the responsibility? No;

but he put in the newspapers all over this country advertisements, asking for tenders for 125 miles of road from Yale to Kamloops, to be closed on the 31st of December last, so that, at this moment, if there had not been a change of Government, the hon. gentleman would either be in the position of having trifled with the people of Canada and of British Columbia, or he was bound in honour to have let 125 miles of road before Parliament met, and that it was not let at this moment he (Mr. Tupper) believed was due to a change of Government. How, then, could those hon. gentlemen raise the question of responsibility attaching to them, to say they were not prepared to endorse the onerous obligations proposed in the resolutions? They were proposing no onerous obligations, but a means by which the obligations first assumed by themselves, and subsequently adopted with a much greater degree of force by the hon. gentleman opposite, should be rendered lighter, and the means provided at the same time to keep faith with British Columbia and with the Imperial Government, who also were made parties to this compact by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and at the same time do it without imposing any such financial disasters on the country as must ensue, unless means something like these were provided for utilising the magnificent territory that was to be opened up, and making it bear the expenditure that would otherwise be borne by the people of the older Provinces. He trusted he had shown the hon. gentlemen opposite that they were mistaken in supposing that any new obligation was proposed; he trusted he had satisfied them that the Government were limiting the obligation and lightening the burden instead of increasing it, and that the policy proposed ought to commend itself to the confidence, to the support of every member of this House. The hon. gentlemen opposite were bound by every principle of statesmanlike conduct, and every principle of honour, to give it a hearty support. But the hon. gentleman said it was a very serious thing to adopt the location of a line without the consent of Parliament, or without asking the consent of Parliament.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never said so; I said it was a serious thing to ask Par-

liament to give a large amount of money for the purpose of building a line not stated to Parliament.

MR. TUPPER said the burden of the hon. member for Gloucester's (Mr. Anglin's) speech was that they were going to adopt a line without the consent of Parliament. He (Mr. Tupper) held in his hand a description of a line adopted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, on the recommendation of the hon. member for Lambton, and without the consent of Parliament ever being dreamed of. Last Session this subject was discussed in Parliament, and he then asked the hon. gentleman if he proposed to submit his adoption of a route to Parliament, and he (Mr. Mackenzie) not only answered no, but, after Parliament had risen, he recommended to Council, on the 11th July, 1878, the adoption of the 500 miles not already located, from Tête Jaune Cache to the Pacific. Previously, he had located the line from Thunder Bay to the Rocky Mountains, without the consent of Parliament or without consulting Parliament. In that Order in Council locating some 1,500 miles of Canadian Pacific Railway, the hon. gentleman declared over his own signature that there were but two points to choose between, one Bute Inlet, and the other Dean Channel. What produced this change in favour of Burrard Inlet,—that line which the hon. gentleman had previously condemned?

MR. MACKENZIE: I condemned nothing.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman, after locating the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph by the Burrard Inlet route, cancelled the contract, and ordered the contractor to stop the work, and subsequently recommended that either Bute Inlet or Dean Channel should be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and adopted, in fact, the location of the line to Fort George, which was far beyond any point that would go to Burrard Inlet. He did not blame the hon. gentleman for having reconsidered that question, but he was showing that it was not so easy of solution as the hon. gentleman from New Westminster (Mr. McInnes) would lead them to suppose, since, after the

most careful consideration that his hon. predecessor could give this subject for three years, he had decided that the Fraser River route to Burrard Inlet was not practicable. Therefore, he believed the hon. gentleman did what he believed to be right, when in his judgment he supposed he had been mistaken, and was prepared to retrace his steps, and to reconsider that question. He would draw the attention of the hon. member for Gloucester to the fact that here was a Government receiving his hearty support, who had been guilty of the great enormity of locating a line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, without reference to Parliament. The hon. the leader of the Opposition limited his objection to letting the contract on a line that was not specified. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be surprised to be told that there was no law on the Statute-book of Canada that required any contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway, made by the Government as a Government work, to be submitted to Parliament at all. Certain gentlemen of the Opposition claimed that, whereas the Government of his right hon. friend were prepared to let the Canadian Pacific Railway, without submitting the contracts to Parliament, their successors had changed all that, and had decided that every contract must first have the approval of Parliament before a single blow was struck. He was surprised, when he came to look at the law, at the discovery that there was no such law, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874 was divided into two parts; one part dealt with the proposed construction of the railway, or sections of it, by a company, aided by a grant of lands or money; and, having provided all the machinery for constructing it in that way, there was a clause declaring that all contracts must be submitted to Parliament; but then it went on to provide another way if, in the wisdom of the Government, it was thought better that it should be done directly by the action of the Government, and, strange to say, no such clause requiring the submission of contracts to the Government in that event could be found. He sent this law to the Deputy Minister of Justice, in whose legal acumen hon. gentlemen opposite had the same confidence as him-

MR. TUPPER.

self, and that gentleman stated that there was no law on the Statute-book requiring the submission to Parliament of any contract made by the Government for the construction of any portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work. So far from taking advantage of this Statute, he was going beyond it, and endorsing the sound principle that where it was possible it was desirable that all these contracts should be submitted to Parliament. He would tell the hon. gentleman that of all the most important contracts that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had made in connection with the Pacific Railway, now covering an expenditure when completed of over \$28,000,000, he had scarcely submitted a contract to Parliament for its approval. He was not blaming him, he believed that, in asking power from the House from time to time to override what was supposed to be the law, the hon. gentleman believed he was doing what was in the public interest. No person gave him a more hearty support in this direction than he (Mr. Tupper) did, because he believed that it would facilitate the work. Therefore, he was asking nothing from the hon. gentleman which the hon. gentleman had not asked and obtained from the House when he and his friends were sitting on the Government benches. When the Government asked power to let a section, they did not engage to let the whole 125 miles, but they had adopted the policy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had assumed in the advertisements asking for tenders for contracts which were to be closed on the 31st of December last. He did not believe that, if the Bute Inlet route was adopted, it would be possible to submit 125 miles of that route to contract, but he would say to the hon. gentleman that sixty-two miles from Waddington Harbour through Cascade Range was in a better condition, and was far more accurately surveyed, to be submitted to the contractors than the large sections of difficult contracts that the hon. gentleman took power from the House to let without the previous sanction of Parliament. So much for the engagement the Government were now asking the House to assume, and he now came to the criti-

cism offered by the late Minister of Finance, as to the mode they would take to carry out this policy. He was asked whether he proposed to submit an Act. He (Mr. Tupper) replied no. Of course they could not carry out the resolutions without an Act, but they were tentative to an Act. The Government proposed to invite the attention of the Imperial Government to the matter, and to endeavour to obtain assistance from them in accomplishing this work. If the Imperial Government gave the required aid, of course it would be necessary to come to Parliament to authorise the appointment of Commissioners, and to define by law the mode by which the scheme was to be carried out. But that legislature would be premature until they had first, under these resolutions, made those efforts which they hoped would be successful to obtain aid and co-operation from the Imperial Government. The ex-Minister of Finance had accused the Government, at different times, of having introduced a tariff hostile to British interests, and in favour of the United States, and had stated that, therefore, they could not expect to obtain aid in England.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I did not say it was in the interest of the States. I said it was hostile to all interests.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman, at all events, had said that the reason the Government would not go to England was because they had adopted a tariff prejudicial to British interests, that the time was inopportune. The hon. the leader of the Opposition had also taken that ground in the most emphatic terms. He stated that the tariff was in favour of American and against British interests. He held a different view. One of the reasons which led the Government to consider the necessity of re-adjusting the tariff was, that all the trade of Canada was flowing in the direction of the United States instead of the Mother Country. He (Mr. Tupper) maintained that the present time was opportune. This Government could go to the Imperial Government with the confidence of receiving their support in their application. This Government could do that which their predecessors would not have been warranted in doing. They would be in a position

to say that they felt it their duty, when they found the expenditure of the country exceeding the resources, to come down with a tariff that would give such a revenue as would cover the expenditure. That was not likely to hurt us in the estimation of the English capitalists or Government, when they would be called on to endorse the bonds of Canada, for we had not only given them the assurance that all the credit they had given us had been fully redeemed, but that the Government, in order to show to the world that the credit of the country always should remain unimpaired, had brought down a tariff which would create a revenue ample to meet all expenditure. He had endeavoured to show hon. gentlemen opposite that there was no increase of obligation, no demand for power such as had not been given by Parliament to our predecessors, and that the Government was warranted in the effort they were making. He had been asked by the Opposition how it was that he had portrayed a paradise in the North-West, when in discussing the tariff he pointed to the want of prosperity in Canada itself. He (Mr. Tupper) would not have ventured to propound such a policy if the Government had not dealt with the one grievance before they brought in a measure in relation to the other question. The first effort of the Government was to provide the means by which Canada was to return, as she would at a very early day, to a condition of things in which the great demand would be not for labour but for labourers. That was the cardinal point of their policy. The Government, by these resolutions, provided for the demand for a vast body of unemployed men in addition to all our own country supplied.

MR. MILLS: What class?

MR. TUPPER said that 10,000 of the best men in Canada were at this moment pouring into the North-West to create a great fertile and prosperous country, and a demand would shortly be felt here for every class of labour that could be brought into this country. He had stated that the Government had proposed no additional obligation, that in those resolutions were propounded the means by which those* obligations now

before us could be met. There was no Canadian with a spark of patriotism within his heart who could look at this great Canada of ours, and could dwell for a single moment upon the fact that here in Canada, washed by the two great oceans, was a country below the arctic circle as great as Europe, if they took the small countries of Spain and Italy out of it. We not only had this magnificent country, but we had it endowed by nature with all those natural features which were necessary to make a country great and prosperous. We had within our country over 200,000,000 acres of the most fertile land in the world, inhabited by a people who, though only numbering 4,000,000 now, were as industrious, as intelligent and as enterprising a population as could be found on the face of the globe. Under these circumstances, what Canadian statesman was there, with the responsibility of developing this magnificent country thrown upon his hands, who would not be a traitor to the best interests of his country if he did not put forward every effort to construct a great national highway that was to be a bond of union from one end of this magnificent country to the other? They ought not to appeal in vain to the hon. gentlemen opposite. Instead of raising an old exploded cry, instead of raising a single feeling that was calculated to damage their efforts, it was their duty, it was the duty of every patriotic Canadian to unite on this grand question; and, fight as they might upon questions of personal or party politics, on this great question of a great national highway for Canada, to which all parties in this country had been committed in the most solemn manner, they should all unite in one steady continued patriotic effort to bring to consummation a scheme on which the undoubted prosperity and rapid progress of the whole country depended.

House resolved itself into Committee on the Whole on the Resolutions.

(In the Committee.)

On Resolution 7,

MR. HOLTON said he would be obliged to the hon. the Minister of Pub-

MR. TUPPER.

lic Works for definite information as to where the 100,000,000 acres of fertile land in the North-West, of which he had spoken, were situated.

MR. TUPPER said it was not contemplated that it should all be found near the railway; though, provided the lands within twenty miles on either side of the line of railway were all good, there would be no difficulty in getting the 100,000,000 acres.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Between what points?

MR. TUPPER said from one end of the line to the other; from the terminus at Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean. They might not be able—though that was not at all certain—to get on all parts of the line land 20 miles in breadth for farming purposes; but there was no doubt it could be obtained in the neighbourhood of the line. The report of Professor Macoun, who had given special attention to this subject, warranted the conclusion that that country may be fairly estimated to possess 180,000,000 acres of arable land. On Vancouver Island, on the table lands of British Columbia, and on Queen Charlotte Island, there was a very large amount of such lands.

MR. TROW said he had travelled very much in the North-West. The fertile lands were not continuous, and it was his impression that these 100,000,000 would absorb all the fertile lands in that quarter. Too much land was already locked up, and, in case these lands were held at \$2 an acre, this fact would discourage immigration into the North-West, while the United States would hold out to settlers superior advantages.

MR. TUPPER said that he was astonished at the hon. gentleman's remarks. While supporting the late Government, the hon. gentleman had extolled the boundless resources of the North-West, and had voted for a grant of 50,000,000 acres for this purpose. He ascribed the hon. gentleman's changed tone to his change of position in the House.

MR. TROW said that he had opposed the late Government's policy with regard to the route. He believed that there

were homes for millions in the North-West, but he did not believe in locking up the lands available for free settlement.

MR. DECOSMOS said that, at the time Lord Dufferin travelled to British Columbia in 1876, the *Globe* stated that the distance between Kaministiquia and Bute Inlet was 2,000 miles. Taking that to be the distance, and the width of the reservation being forty miles, twenty miles on each side of the line, it would give 51,200,000 acres of land. He did not suppose that it would be found to be all good land, but what could not be obtained along the line could, no doubt, be obtained elsewhere, and provision had been made in the resolutions for that. He had not the slightest hesitation in saying that the 100,000,000 referred to could be obtained. The Central Pacific Railway Company received a certain acreage per mile, for which they were allowed to charge \$2.50. But according to a recent return to Congress they sold the land at \$7.50 per acre, \$5.50 above the price for which the Government proposed to sell the land along the Canadian line.

MR. DAWSON said that there was much more arable land in the North-West than was imagined. Much land that was set down as valueless, was, in reality, available for agricultural purposes.

MR. MILLS said, with reference to the quantity of land to be reserved on each side of the railway, in his opinion, the Government would be wasting the public resources in dedicating land in aid of the railway at any distance from it. The hon. gentleman knew he could not count on available lands except between the Red River and the Rocky Mountains. He would find, no doubt, wherever he went, a considerable portion of waste lands. But, on the line of the railway, it was doubtful if he would find more than thirty or forty million acres of good land within any reasonable distance of it. They would be made capable of settlement, and desirable only by the construction of a railway. If they selected lands at any point in the North-West, more than a few miles away from the road, they would, unless independent lines or branch railways were

run to them, not be available. They could not find any fertile tract fifty miles wide on each side, and 1,500 miles long, such as was required to make up the 100,000,000 acres; and much of the land could have no value till reached or opened up by railroads. Then, just in proportion as they locked up those lands, or dedicated them to the construction of this road, would they interfere with the colonisation of the North-West. The Government could have had a road constructed without the contribution of a single dollar from the Public Treasury. He knew that from the proposition made to the late Government last year. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) said he was going to obtain immigration from Great Britain. His colleague, however, said they wanted none but agricultural immigrants, and intended discouraging all others. The Minister of Public Works had spoken about everybody being favourable to those terms for the construction of the Pacific Railway. Now he (Mr. Mills) and a great many others had never approved of them. He proposed to take North-West lands, no matter how far from the road, though 300 miles away, and dedicate them to the construction of a railway that would give them no value; he would simply sacrifice them to its construction. The hon. gentleman had taken this matter out of the hands of his colleagues, having proposed to place the lands in the hands of a Commission. Why? Because capitalists and others would not trust the Government. The conduct of the hon. gentleman showed he believed that the people of England would not advance money upon those lands as security, if allowed to remain in charge of the Administration—a very extraordinary compliment for those hon. gentlemen to pay themselves.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he thought it was hardly worth while at this late stage of the Session to discuss at much length the question of the obligations of Canada towards British Columbia. There was a difference of opinion in this House on the subject. He had never, however, been persuaded that Canada was under any obligation to ruin itself for the sake of carrying out a particular construction of the terms of Union between British Columbia and

Canada. He did not think that the fair meaning of those terms involved such consequences. It was not so construed or understood at the time the Union was effected. He took it, that a very large number in the House and country desired to see a railway constructed from Thunder Bay to the Rocky Mountains as speedily as possible, for the purpose of opening up and settling that great and fertile country west of the Red River. Whether they could, after reaching that point, acquire the means or establish a credit that would enable them to borrow money enough to cross the Rocky Mountains and reach the Pacific Ocean in British Columbia, was a question which, perhaps, their success would have to determine. This Parliament should do what it could in the meantime to bridge the great space that intervened between us and the boundary of British Columbia. With regard to the resolutions themselves, he had some doubt as to whether they ought to lock up all the cultivable lands in the fertile belt, for he presumed, after taking 100,000,000 acres for the railway there would be little left to attract free grant settlers. Even if they adopted the florid views that prevailed in some quarters as to the extent of the arable land of that region, he doubted whether any one could figure out of the country now unoccupied between Red River and the Rocky Mountains, 100,000,000 acres of good land within reach of a railway. He thought they must penetrate the Peace River country to make up that quantity. In that case, if recent reports could be relied upon, it might be possible to find it. But what he objected to in the resolutions was the absolute, unconditional form of expression. If they were to be binding in future—and, judging from past experience in dealing with British Columbia, they had need to act cautiously, lest their successors should be charged with a breach of faith—they ought not to fix so arbitrarily the price of the lands. If they were to appropriate 100,000,000 acres for the Pacific Railway, with a condition that it was not to be sold at less than \$2 an acre, how did the Government expect to induce poor settlers from the old country to go there? They would certainly not be able to persuade settlers from eastern Canada to go to the North-West, and pay

\$2 an acre, when they could secure homesteads in a more southern latitude, with, perhaps, as good land for nothing. They would be compelled to wait till the free homesteads and good lands of the Western States were all taken up, before they could persuade people to pass them by and purchase lands from the Canadian Government at \$2 an acre. He (Mr. Macdougall) saw, therefore, great difficulty ahead. The wave of settlement now setting towards our country would, he feared, be stayed if these resolutions were passed. He assumed that no more free grants could be made within any reasonable distance of the line of railway. There would be an inconsistency in it, and if Parliament was to be pledged so that hereafter, upon further information and more experience as to the difficulties of settlement, and the circumstances which determined its course, they were not at liberty to change their policy, he was afraid they were moving too fast. They had the fact admitted in these resolutions that the reservation of land along the line of railway had deflected settlement away from the forty miles reservation, and this was given as a reason for changing the line so as to accommodate the settlers, and the same thing must happen again. There were few settlers, if any, north of the present line, and he apprehended that there was no land unoccupied and fit for settlement east of Lake Manitoba that could be made available under these resolutions. He only desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the probable effect of his policy. He did not think it was wise to pass resolutions in so absolute a form, if the object were really to facilitate settlement. It was proposed to lock up this enormous quantity of land until they could sell it at \$2 an acre, in order to raise money for building the Pacific Railway. But would they be able to sell the land for \$2 an acre? Could they induce settlers to pay that price? Would the immigrants they were likely to get have the means, after buying horses, cattle and implements, and building houses and barns, to pay the Government this \$2 an acre? He was afraid that it would prove a great hindrance to rapid settlement, while he agreed, on the other hand, that it was unfair to ask the people of the

old Provinces of Canada to tax themselves, and to lay burdens upon their children for the purpose of building a railway through a new but naturally rich country, for the benefit of strangers, immigrants not yet on this side of the Atlantic. He thought they ought to make the country itself pay for the road. It was rich enough. It was large enough. It was able, out of its own resources, to furnish the means for constructing one railway, at all events, from end to end of it. Any scheme which would accomplish that object, he, as a representative of an Ontario constituency, was ready to give his assent to. The objection he now made was that there appeared to be in these resolutions an absolute, unconditional reservation of—as he and many people believed—all the good land within reach of the railway at the minimum price of \$2 an acre. If so, they could no longer grant lands to settlers as homesteads. That would deter people from coming into the country and turn them aside into the United States, and so they would be killing the goose that laid the golden egg. He feared that would be the result unless some means could be found to reserve land fit for settlement within a reasonable distance of the proposed line of railway for those persons who would go into the country as settlers, but who would not be able to settle on lands and pay \$2 an acre for it. He presumed, the Government, in carrying out this scheme, if they did not exact the money down, would exact interest from the day of sale, otherwise the scheme would not be a success financially. Indeed, the scheme as a whole involved a fallacy. They owned this land already, and did not increase the area of their estate by passing these resolutions. They could not convince a farmer that he would make a good financial operation, if, when he wanted to build a barn, he should set apart for that purpose the produce of a certain field, and appropriate that particular money for the construction of the barn. He did not think they could lift themselves over the fence by pulling at their boot straps, nor that they would be any richer in the eyes of capitalists after the adoption of this scheme than before. They owed it to their constituents to see that, in the development of that new country, it produced the means to pay

for the national improvements they were constructing there; but they must remember that they could not have their cake and eat it at the same time.

MR. DECOSMOS said he could not allow the utterance of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) to pass unchallenged, namely, that the Dominion had not made a deliberate and solemn engagement with the Government and the people of British Columbia. When the hon. gentleman dared to influence the members of this House with such utterances, he (Mr. DeCosmos) would tell him that he was advocating that Punic faith that had carried one nationality down to eternal obloquy. This country could never be built up by violated pledges, but the utterances of his hon. friend ran in that direction. If we, as Canadians, could not carry out our obligations, let us take the honourable and manly course of saying to the people of British Columbia that we could not do this thing, and then, if the people of British Columbia wished to leave the Confederation, let them have the opportunity of doing so. But as long as hon. gentlemen here stated that the obligations of this Government toward British Columbia need not be carried out—

MR. MACDOUGALL: I said nothing of the kind; no member of this House will go further, or urge more earnestly the fulfilment of all honest obligations that Canada has made with British Columbia, but I interpret them in my sense, and not in the hon. gentleman's sense.

Resolution agreed to.

On Resolution 14,

MR. MACDOUGALL said a difficulty seemed here to present itself. It was proposed to send further exploring parties to the Pine River Pass. From past experience, he thought it was perfectly clear it would occupy the whole of this season to send explorers from Ottawa now. They would not be able to make much of an exploration and send in their reports before the season would have expired. But in this resolution it was stated to be the intention to commence the work of construction this season;

how then were they to benefit by the result of the explorations? How were they to determine the propriety of any particular line in British Columbia unless they had more information than they had now?

MR. TUPPER said he admitted it would be desirable not to be so much hurried, but a great pressure existed for the commencement of the work of construction in order to meet the long deferred hope of the people of British Columbia. They wanted to obtain further information, and, at the same time, satisfy the people of British Columbia that the construction of the road would not be unnecessarily delayed. There were now 125 miles ready for the contractors on the Burrard Inlet route, and 60 miles on which the line had been located by the Bute Inlet route from Waddington Harbour, westwardly. They expected to have a hurried but sufficient exploration, not a survey, to settle the question as to the character of the country in the region of the Pine River Pass, and to see how far they might reasonably hope they could, by the Bute Inlet route, bring a large tract of country available for settlement nearer to the Pacific.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he understood, then, the hon. gentleman to say that he expected, by this hasty exploration, to get sufficient information to justify him in deciding either upon the Burrard Inlet or Bute Inlet route, because, of course, he must decide that before beginning the work of construction, or was there only a small portion of the country that required to be examined by the engineers in order to determine the question of routes?

MR. TUPPER said, yes, and he thought it could be accomplished in time to offer it to the contractors. The work could be proceeded with in winter as well as summer. As soon as the exploration was made, the Government would be able, finally, to settle upon the line that would be best in the interests of the country.

MR. MILLS asked if the hon. gentleman meant if it should be found that the Pine River Pass, or the Peace River Pass, was not as favourable as the route already selected by the engineers, that then the Burrard Inlet route would

be adhered to. He would like to know whether there had been such an exploration of the country between the Riding Mountains and the Rocky Mountains in the Peace River district, or at the Peace River Pass, as would enable the Government to know what might be the engineering difficulties on the line to the Rocky Mountains?

MR. TUPPER said that, unless the exploration which it was intended to make should reveal the fact of there being a large tract of valuable country fit for settlement, through which the railway could be brought, nearer to the Pacific than by the other line, the Government would not be warranted in changing the location that had been made. A rapid exploration would settle this question.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had already called the attention of this House to the fact that there had been a hurried exploration already. Mr. Horetzky had examined the Peace River in 1874. Mr. Hunter, one of their best engineers, crossed the Rocky Mountains by the Pine River Pass, in 1877, and the result of his exploration was before the House.

MR. TUPPER: That was too hurried.

MR. MACKENZIE said that if engineers were to be sent from Ottawa on the 1st of May, to travel a thousand miles to the Pine River Pass, and spend all the summer there, they would not be able to accomplish more than was done in 1877. Hunter was near the base of his operations; he had only to proceed from the neighbourhood of Fort George, and within a few days reached the scenes of his year's operation, and even then he was only able to accomplish a rapid survey. His report was not a favourable one. He reported it was possible to get a line through, but that in one place, five miles in length, there would have been a gradient of 60ft. to the mile, which was greater than any on the Burrard Inlet route. The Peace River Pass had been explored not merely by Mr. Horetzky, but by Alexander Mackenzie, Professor Selwyn, and a number of others who had examined it so thoroughly that it was known nearly as well as the Jasper House Pass.

MR. RYMAL said it was evident, from the nature of the discussion, that they were not ready to commence the construction of this road. He had always looked upon this scheme as one calculated to outweigh the capacity of Canada. He did not believe there were 100,000,000 acres of fertile land in the North-West, and he feared that the price of \$2 per acre placed upon the land there would turn the tide of emigration to the United States. He would advise the hon. the Minister of Public Works not to act hastily in this matter, to consider carefully before assuming this great responsibility which would, sooner or later, bring tribulation on Canada.

MR. DECOSMOS said that the hon. member's statement, with reference to gradients in Pine River Pass, was not correct, and read Mr. Hunter's report, Sessional Paper No. 20, 1878, to prove that the gradients were not as high as the hon. the Minister of Public Works represented them to be.

MR. DAWSON said that the railroad would open up a far greater extent of country than that immediately bordering on the line. It would cross great rivers having hundreds of miles of navigation on either side of it, and when it reached Peace River it would connect with more than a thousand miles of navigation, broken by only one little fall. But he would suggest to the Government that great care should be observed in the selection of engineers to examine the Pine River region. They should be without prejudices in favour of any other route. A great mistake had been made in the country between Lake Superior and Manitoba, a mistake which would involve, and was involving, the waste of millions. Such mistakes should be avoided in the future, and the best way to guard against them was to re-organise the engineering staff. It should be remodelled and a Board of Engineers formed, a Board which should see that the surveys and explorations were made economically and organised with a somewhat greater degree of intelligence than that which had hitherto marked their management.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, and read the first and second times.

MR. TUPPER moved concurrence in Resolution 1.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would not be at all surprising if he should refer for a few minutes to what took place last Saturday. He considered that in that debate he had confined himself very strictly to the subject before the House. His criticisms might have been light or heavy in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite, but, at all events, they were fair criticisms called for by the necessity and the nature of the subject under discussion. The remarks of the Minister of Public Works were not such as he (Mr. Mackenzie) had a right to complain of, but, on the other hand, they traversed, to a great extent, the position which he (Mr. Mackenzie) had taken when he was leader of the Government. The First Minister made a speech remarkable for its unfairness. In his effort to break the force of such remarks as he (Mr. Mackenzie) had made, the hon. gentleman did not scruple to attribute to him designs which it was impossible for any patriotic Canadian to entertain. He (Mr. Mackenzie) never made any effort to discredit either the Government or the progress of the work, the manner of doing which by the Government he (Mr. Mackenzie) opposed. There was nothing in his whole record, as a public man, which he did not challenge the hon. gentleman to bring up, if he could, to prove the calumnious statements he had made.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What were they?

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had stated that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had deliberately misrepresented the country, that he had tried in every way to prevent the company which had been organised in 1872 from succeeding, and that it was owing to the efforts of him (Mr. Mackenzie) and of his friends, that the company had failed to succeed. He had

challenged the hon. gentleman before, and he now challenged him again, to substantiate these statements. It was well known that the scheme to which the hon. gentleman had alluded had broken down before there was a whisper of the transaction known as the Pacific Railway scandal. It was known that, during the Session, when these gentlemen were in England, the Minister of Public Works announced a few days before the close of the Session that he had every reason to believe that the contractors were meeting with success in negotiating their bonds. He (Mr. Mackenzie) expressed his pleasure at hearing the good news. He was suspicious of the correctness of the news from what he had seen in other correspondence, but, assuming that the Minister himself must necessarily have known the facts, he accepted the hon. gentleman's declaration. It was known to all in official circles that the scheme had hopelessly failed, and the hon. gentleman opposite, on Saturday, as on other occasions, tried to throw the odium of the breakdown upon his political opponents, when he knew it was owing to his own crude, undigested scheme, which could find no favour with English capitalists. The hon. gentleman was afterwards guilty of such transactions as did bring discredit upon the scheme and the country. The hon. gentleman had not only made this unwarranted attack on him (Mr. Mackenzie) but also said that the late Government had lost five years. He would ask the hon. gentleman to take any five years he chose from 1867 to the time he left office, and to show that he had accomplished as much work on the Intercolonial as he (Mr. Mackenzie) had on the Pacific. In no single undertaking that could be named in this country was there any such progress made as had been made with that scheme in the five years. Almost the entire surveys were completed. Nearly 300 miles of railroad were made ready in that time, and all the rest was ready for placing under contract, and yet the hon. gentleman would deliberately say, in that extravagant style of his, that no progress had been made. He also said that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had initiated an absurd scheme of land and water, and he was pleased to diverge from the line of

MR. MACKENZIE.

argument, if any of his speech could be called an argument, to characterise the product of these as what he would designate mud. In the first place, he (Mr. Mackenzie) would have no hesitation in abandoning any plan conceived, if he found any better plan could be devised. He came into office with his late colleagues at a time when this enterprise was but in its infancy, finding the country committed to an extent of work that was impracticable. They had, at one and the same time, to get a mitigation of those terms with British Columbia, and to conduct the work, to some extent, forward to completion. In endeavouring to do that, he conceived this plan; he conceived that it would be desirable to utilise the great stretches of water navigation, and he failed to see in that scheme anything that should or could provoke the merriment of even hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman, in his scheme, proposed to commence at Lake Nipissing, and build continuously westward around Lake Superior, in a country that was, perhaps, the most barren of any we had in Canada. He did not know very much of that country, but he thought he was warranted in saying that he knew more than any of the present Ministry, for they were never there. But they all knew enough to understand that, while, no doubt, there might be portions of it here and there valuable for settlement, a great part of the country westward to Lake of the Woods was not favourable for settlement, and it presents very rough natural features. Its topography was of a very forbidding character generally, and there was very little arable land to be found there. They concluded, then, to utilise the waters from the east end of Georgian Bay to the west end of Lake Superior, in the first place. Had hon. gentlemen opposite put an end to that scheme? They proposed to let out contracts from Lake Nipissing to the west end of Lake Superior. If they had faith in their own scheme, and objected to this mixture of land and water, termed mud by the hon. gentleman, why did they not change their present policy?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Un bon jour viendra.

MR. MACKENZIE said yes, but, in the meantime, the hon. gentleman adopts

a plan that he ridicules whilst he acts upon it. Well, west of Selkirk they had again to use the water stretches. If the road were completed to the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, very little work, indeed, would enable them to connect Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis with the Saskatchewan River, and to obtain 700 or 800 miles continuous navigation there, which would serve a very good purpose in promoting the settlement of the Saskatchewan Valley. Such was his scheme. He proposed, also, in the first place, to build the road towards the Narrows of the Lake of the Woods, passing by Sturgeon Falls; and from Sturgeon Falls, by building a lock at Fort Francis, there would be continuous navigation to the Narrows of the Lake of the Woods. That was the scheme they devised. It was a wise one, as by it they would have a large investment of money by Canada, and it would, in the meantime, be a great and undoubted blessing. The hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald) seemed to think it would be no blessing, and that the grand scheme which he had initiated, and which met with such a total failure, rejecting all considerations obtained by experience, and all the teachings which they had acquired by the exploration surveys, should be carried out. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was not ashamed, at this moment, to say that in devising that scheme of using the water-stretches of navigation, they did what was in the public interest. At all events, they did it in the most perfect good faith, and in making use of that plan they did not build a mile of railway but what could be utilised in acquiring the most direct route to the places where they intended to go, and they proposed to utilise as much of the railway as was possible in settling up the interior of the country. He had not deviated one iota from that plan, because he saw no reason to deviate from it; but, as he said a little while ago, he would not be ashamed to depart from a preconceived notion, if he found a plan that would suit better and save money to the country. As the Minister of Public Works, as the Premier, and as a Canadian, he was bound to do the best for the country. He did try his best to accomplish what was in the interests of the country, and he had no doubt that

what they did was done with all the wisdom which could be collected at the time from those employed as engineers under them. The hon. the First Minister also referred with a jeer to his suppressing a map.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I ?

MR. MACKENZIE : Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I said nothing about suppressing a map.

MR. MACKENZIE : At all events, as the thing is mentioned, I will simply refer to it in this way. When Mr. Sandford Fleming came home, he found a map prepared by Mr. Marcus Smith, his deputy, and the Deputy Minister of the Interior, Colonel Dennis. He represented to me, in the strongest terms, that the map misrepresented the country, that there was much better country than the map represented, and he protested against it being published with any report of his. Acting upon the Chief Engineer's strong protest, the map was not published. As to suppressing the map, why it was my object to give the greatest amount of information to the public, but I would never publish anything against the evidence of those responsible as engineers for the road. The hon. gentleman said I deliberately misrepresented the extent of good land. I am not aware of having made any such misrepresentations. I recollect, very well, when the hon. gentleman, with a recklessness which no information in his possession could have justified, stated there were 350,000,000 acres of valuable land in that country. I never gave any information except that given to me in public documents, at the disposal of every member of the House, consequently I could have made no misrepresentation. The fact is, I have been personally and politically a devotee to the settlement of that country, and the promotion of the interests of Canada there. I have looked upon the North-West as the place that was to give solidity and power to us. Two years ago I employed a well-known gentleman, a writer in this city, to prepare a condensed statement of all the facts that could be found out respecting the country, its geological and topographical features, its waters, its woods, and its

soil. That statement was circulated in England amongst those who it was supposed might be induced to become contractors for the road, as the best means of giving them the information they might require.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Who was the writer ?

MR. MACKENZIE : Mr. Ryan.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Which Mr. Ryan ?

MR. MACKENZIE : Mr. Carroll Ryan.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Oh !

MR. MACKENZIE : Well, what about it ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I wanted to know merely.

MR. MACKENZIE : The hon. gentleman knew quite well. Of course, the hon. gentleman can sneer.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I am not sneering.

MR. MACKENZIE : The humblest man in the country is entitled to respect, and the gentleman I have mentioned commands respect from every person.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I have said nothing against Mr. Ryan.

MR. MACKENZIE : Of course not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : It is only the *Globe* talks against him.

MR. MACKENZIE : The hon. gentleman always accepts the opinions of the *Globe*, when he finds anything to suit his purpose ; but, when it finds fault, it is only the *Globe*. I have known the hon. gentleman and his colleagues to read passages of the *Globe* to prove that they were right. The hon. gentleman will remember reading two columns of the *Globe* to prove that they were right in attaching all the importance they did to the Pacific Railway, and, the next day, speaking of the *Globe* as an authority which no person would ever dream of giving. I have now to call the attention of the House to the present position of

MR. MACKENZIE.

the matter. The hon. the Minister of Public Works referred to various matters upon which I desire to make some remarks. In the first place he complained of the debate on Saturday. He complained of party questions being introduced. Why, the hon. gentleman must see that this is a party question as much as any question that comes into this House.

MR. TUPPER : I did not complain so particularly of you, as of your colleagues.

MR. MACKENZIE : I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman. I say I conducted the discussion in a proper manner, and criticised what was squarely before the House ; but the leader of the Government immediately afterwards got up and changed it into a party discussion, and he accused me falsely of having determined to injure the country, and with endeavouring to influence English capitalists and contractors against the enterprise of his former Government, and then it became the duty apparently of my late colleagues to point out that, if there was any wrong-doing, it was not on my part, but on the part of the hon. gentleman himself. If the leader of the Government had not dragged the discussion in that direction, it would not have gone in that direction, and the hon. gentleman has himself and his friends to blame for forcing the discussion into a channel in which we did not intend to go. I have no desire to discuss these unpleasant things. I prefer infinitely to have a dignified discussion purely on the merits of questions of this sort, and I did so conduct the debate. Now, I am bound to say that the Minister of Public Works did not say anything which I could take exception to as unfair, and he gave statements which clearly suited his own views. I deny at once that I for a moment tried to, or dreamed of making it a mere party question ; but the hon. gentleman will not forget that, on several occasions, he and his colleague, the First Minister, did so act in this House. Why, after obtaining authority from the House to let some contracts, does not the hon. gentleman recollect moving that the contracts be not approved of ?

MR. TUPPER: No.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, the hon. gentleman will find in the Journals of 1875, page 350, that "Mr. Tupper moved, seconded by Sir John A. Macdonald, that the question of approving contracts 13 and 14 be postponed for three months." When there was no possible objection, why was this done? Why should the initial sections at each end, between Fort William and Selkirk, be postponed for three months? If the motion had carried, the hon. gentleman knows that it would have delayed the construction of the initial portion for a year. Was this done for party interests? The leader of the Government also blamed me because I asked for a definition of the place where these 125 miles of road were to be located. What was the hon. gentleman's reply to my demand? Why, he said we did the very same thing. Now, did we do the very same thing?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: I shall read a motion to the hon. gentleman, and ask any member on his own side of the House, if the question justified the hon. gentleman's quibbling on that particular matter. On the same page will be found a resolution that the Government be authorised to enter into a contract during the recess with the party sending in the lowest available tender for the construction of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway extending from Rat Portage to Cross Lake, a distance of thirty-seven miles. There is one of the instances; the mileage is mentioned, and the two objective points of the road given. The Government proposition is to make further explorations, and, as soon as they have located a line, to give out a contract for a portion not exceeding 125 miles. Where are those 125 miles? The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) replied in British Columbia, which extends several hundred miles along the Pacific coast. There are a number of possible routes for a railway, all of which I rejected, but the most southerly. The present Government do not give any indication of which one they propose to accept. They

wish to have further explorations as they may see fit, in that vast country, and power to build 125 miles of railway anywhere in it; and the hon. gentleman says that this is a precisely similar proposition to that of the late Government. Is it so? The most devoted adherent of the right hon. gentleman would not venture the assertion that they are one and the same thing. I would not object to the further explorations proposed in the Pine River Pass, if the Government deliberately intended to make an elaborate survey, for only upon an elaborate survey can reasonable estimates be framed. It would require at least two years for an intelligent, reliable survey of the Pine River region. I do not consider that we should discuss, in an exhaustive way, the question brought up by the leader of the Government on Saturday, in connection with immigration. I would merely reiterate what I have said already, that I do not believe in any land scheme that will lock up the great mass of the valuable land of the country, and prevent settlers entering upon it. I believe that, if the country is to be settled, if a certain breadth, say twenty miles on each side, is to be made available, other lands must be given cheap, or for nothing, to attract people into the country. Because, after all, the money obtained for the land is no equivalent for the labour and prosperity produced by a large influx of immigrants. Those people will do far more to enrich the country than will the holding of the entire land for settlement, at a high price. As to the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) in which, in closing, he spoke loudly and eloquently of the character and achievements of the men of the North, it had nothing to do with this question. But it is not true that the men of the North are always triumphant. The Grecians, Carthaginians and Romans were not Northmen. All that kind of remark is mere nonsense, and has no proper place in a serious debate. What Canadians have to determine at present is the wisdom, or unwisdom, of adopting the policy foreshadowed in these resolutions. I believe the hon. gentleman was mistaken in the effect those resolutions will produce. If I believed that we would get \$200,000,000

for those 100,000,000 acres, no person would be more delighted. But the hon. gentleman must not be offended if we, on the Opposition side, do not agree with him in this notion. The emigration into Manitoba during the present year is claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite as one of the meritorious things accomplished by the National Policy; but it has no more to do with it than with the emigration of the negroes from Louisiana to Kansas. There was precisely as much emigration to Manitoba last year, when the National Policy was not contemplated. I have endeavoured, as a member of Parliament and Minister of the Crown, to conduct the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway as earnestly and anxiously as I could in the interest of the country, and with a fair regard to the claims upon us, which, rightly or wrongly, have been given to British Columbia. I was quite conscious that an enormous expenditure upon that road would, to a greater or lesser extent, affect the stability of my own Administration. I was aware that it was impossible to satisfy what I considered to be the unreasonable attitude and demands of some of the people of British Columbia. But, while anxious so to conduct the enterprise as to show that we were doing everything in our power, we, at the same time, resolved, at all hazards, not to commit the country to such an expenditure as would overbalance the reasonable expectation of obtaining a revenue to meet it without increasing the burden of taxation. I believe we went as far as it was possible, certainly as far as it was prudent, to go. I am, therefore, very much surprised that the hon. the Premier should have declared that the late Government had lost five years. We shall see what the next five years will bring forth, and the result of the right hon. gentleman's engineering and planning. I will not venture upon any prophecy, although I know tolerably well what must be the inevitable result of a certain course, if followed, and of a certain other course if not followed. The first resolution resolves that engagements have been entered into with British Columbia as a condition to the union with Canada; that a line of railway shall be constructed between the Atlantic and

MR. MACKENZIE.

the Pacific, and that it shall be constructed with all possible speed. I have not been able to find any language anywhere that justifies that resolution. I think it much better that the resolution should be properly worded, and give the truth in the matter, as well as the exact opinion of the Canadian people.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It conveys the present opinion of the people of Canada.

MR. MACKENZIE said it conveyed it only to some extent. He, therefore, moved in amendment:—

“That the said resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same, by inserting the following words after the word ‘That,’ in the said resolution:—‘The Government of the Dominion undertook to secure the commencement simultaneously within two years from the date of the said Union, of the construction of a railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains towards the Pacific, to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada; and, further, to secure the completion of such railway within ten years from the date of the Union; that the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1872, provided—“that the public aid to be given to secure that undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land, and such subsidy in money or other aid not increasing the (then) existing rate of taxation as the Government of Canada should thereafter determine;” that the Canada Pacific Railway Act, 1874, provided that “it is proper to make provision for the construction of said work as rapidly as the same can be accomplished without further raising the rate of taxation;” that, during the Session of 1876, the following words were added to a resolution appropriating money for the Canada Pacific Railway, viz.: “While granting this sum, this House desires to record its view that the arrangements for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be such as the resources of the country will permit, without increasing the existing rates of taxation; that the circumstances of the country are not now such as would justify a departure from the ground taken in the said Acts and resolution, and that the construction of the railway should only be proceeded with at such a rate as will not necessitate increasing the rate of taxation beyond that existing at the date of the above recited resolution in the Session of 1876.”’

MR. BOULTBEE said it did not seem to him that the leader of the Opposition had spoken directly to his amendment.

He spoke with a good deal of feeling with having been charged by the leader of the Government with having, with his friends, tried to defeat this scheme from its inception. He denied it here to-day, but the conviction of the Canadian people was that the charge was correct, that, both in Parliament and in the press, they had endeavoured to thwart that scheme. The people generally believed that if that scheme had been dealt with in a fair statesmanlike manner, it would have gone through then, and that the impetus which this country would have gained would have saved the people from the severe depression which they had been suffering from. That was the impression that remained on the minds of the people, and it was not too much to say, from the utterance of the leader of the Opposition, that he was still instinct with the same feeling. When this plan was now launched before the House and the country, what position did they find the leader of the Opposition taking? He said that, while he would be glad to see it succeed, and would do everything he could to help it forward, yet that such was the treatment received by the people of England from this country, if he were an English statesman he would not give a cent. Was that the utterance of a patriot who wished a great scheme to succeed? This was not the expression of a man who wished well to this scheme. The hon. gentleman and his friends hoped this scheme would fail, so that they could make use of the common expression afterwards, "I told you so." The hon. gentleman challenged the leader of the Government to show that progress had not been made in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the last five years. Well, what had we got? We had got a piece of road, partially completed at one end, badly constructed at another, with a large gap between. It was a most inferior road. The only great progress that seemed to have been made was the purchase of a large quantity of steel rails at an enormous price, that had never been used. The hon. gentleman and his friends had selected a terminus on the Kaministiquia River at an enormous expense, and it was the conviction of everybody who knew anything about the matter that it would have to be ab-

andoned. Everyone acquainted with the facts admitted that it should be at Prince Arthur's Landing, where it should have been originally located. The hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) seemed to doubt the assertion of the leader of the Government that there were from 200,000,000 to 250,000,000 acres of land in that country to be made available. He (Mr. Boulton) had taken some interest in this subject, had read the reports of experts, and he found, upon collecting the most reliable information, that the fertile belt had an extent of 900 miles in length by 600 miles in breadth, and the evidence of experts showed it to be one of the finest tracts of lands in the world. This tract contained nearly 300,000,000 acres of land, or nearly three times more than would be required for the purpose. The leader of the Opposition said that he desired to conduct this discussion in a fair and legitimate way. He (Mr. Boulton) had heard nothing at all from the leader of the Opposition, except what was fair and legitimate, but he was sorry to see that the hon. gentleman did not seem to look with disapprobation on the conduct of some of his colleagues, who were the first to travel out of the legitimate line of debate. Why did not the hon. gentleman get his colleagues to take the same stand as himself and discuss this matter fairly? Considerable exception was taken by the leaders of the Opposition to the fact that the Government asked for power from this House to construct 125 miles of road at the western extremity as soon as they should have ascertained the proper route. It was well understood that one of the two routes must be taken to reach the Pacific coast, and it seemed that the explorers had not yet satisfactorily determined which was the best. But if this House had confidence in this Government, or any other Government, it could safely leave this matter to the discretion and good sense of the gentlemen composing that Government. In winding up his speech, the leader of the Opposition said that, after all, these things amounted to very little, that what we had to do was to consider the wisdom of the plan submitted to this House, and decide on its merits; but he did not then proceed to

discuss the scheme on its merits, and he (Mr. Boulton) would venture to say that the hon. gentleman would find it difficult in discussing this scheme on its merits to show it was not the best one that could be proposed. He said he did not like to lock up large quantities of land for the purpose of building the railroad; but, as we were bound by obligations to build this road, we should construct it through this land, and what would be the use of these fertile lands unless there was a railroad running through them? It was a bad position to take to say this scheme was not a good one, and yet not attempt to show that it was bad, nor attempt to find a better one. The hon. leader of the Opposition said he had always tried to do the best he could for the country. It would be hard to say here that he had not; it would be hard to charge any man holding his high position, with not having tried to do the best he could for the country; but in doing so the hon. gentleman seemed, on many occasions, to have acted hastily, and not to have been at all successful in his efforts.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not think that the hon. member for Lambton, with all his abilities, had in any way impaired the position that either the hon. the Minister of Public Works or himself (Sir John A. Macdonald) had taken on Saturday. Therefore, as they must get through the Session, he would say no more, but ask the House to concur in the resolutions. The hon. gentleman had also been good enough to allude to what he called "The Pacific Railway Scandal," and so did the hon. member for Shefford. True, the country had replied to it, but he should be glad to meet this House as he would be glad to meet anyone of his countrymen whenever they chose to bring up that matter for discussion. The Minister of Public Works disposed of that matter very summarily in his remarks to-day. They said, whilst supposing it to be true that the Government which existed before 1873 had committed all kinds of possible atrocities, and that they had been corrupt, what must be the estimation of the people of the Administration that existed from 1873 to 1878, when, with all the faults

of John A. Macdonald, Sir George Cartier and Mr. Langevin, they deliberately, by an overwhelming majority, chose to accept those gentlemen, and all their friends, with all their faults, rather than retain that Government. Such an exhibition of imbecility and corruption never was exhibited to the country, as was exhibited by the Government which was formed in the end of 1873, and expired on the 17th day of September, 1878. What condemnation could be so great as the condemnation that was pronounced on the 17th day of September, 1878?

MR. MILLS: 1874.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, yes, there was the night-march, there was the plot, there was the conspiracy. Let the hon. gentleman bring that subject up again, either now or at any time. Let him bring up the Pacific Railway question again, with the charges that were made against him and his colleagues, and they would have the means of meeting those charges, because they had the evidence now, that they had not in 1873-74, showing the foul conspiracy of 1873, and they would prove it whenever hon. gentlemen opposite chose to challenge it again. He offered the challenge that night—not a challenge like that which was offered in 1877, on very nearly the last day of the Session, when the then leader of the Government, the hon. member for Lambton, said that, if at the beginning of the next Session the members of the Opposition did not choose to move for Committees, with respect to the charges that were brought against the late Government, the Macdonald-Cartier Administration, he would move for them himself. Week after week passed, until, in the last week of the Session, the hon. member for Lambton rose and asked: "Why did not hon. gentlemen opposite move for a Committee?" They waited and trusted to the hon. member for Lambton to move early in the Session for a Committee to examine into the charges that were brought against their Cabinet. He did not do so. Now, the hon. gentleman had stated, with regard to the extension of the railway westward, that he was at one with them, and that, in respect to the water stretches, Lake Huron and Lake

MR. BOULTON.

Superior were the water stretches he meant.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not say so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said yes, his understanding of the statement of the hon. gentleman was that the selection of the head of Lake Superior as the starting point was agreed upon by all. It was the policy of the Government of which he was a member, that they should start from some point on Lake Superior, and work westward. The only point of departure, then, from the present policy, was that the point of departure was west of Lake Nepigon, instead of starting from Prince Arthur's Landing.

MR. MACKENZIE: Why did he send surveyors to Lake Nipissing?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they sent surveyors everywhere, as did the hon. gentleman, and sometimes it was useless. He knew the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Fleming, was in favour of Lake Nepigon, and he remembered quite well that the hon. gentleman said the starting point would be from Nepigon River.

MR. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was the joint opinion of both sides of the House that they should start from Lake Superior, and move westward, and afterwards work eastward. Now, when the hon. gentleman stated that the water stretches he spoke of were Lakes Huron and Superior—

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman has misstated me again. He asked me if there were any other water stretches, and I said yes, from Lac des Mille Lacs to the west end of Lake of the Woods, then west by the Saskatchewan and Lake Manitoba.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman must remember that the member for South Huron attempted to explain on Saturday night that they meant to run to Lake Shebandowan. The hon. gentleman plainly proposed a combination of lock, river, and railway, instead of one through line. He was driven from the water stretches to the through railway course, and then, on the

other hand, he attacked the policy of the present Government. The hon. gentleman had said that the terminus of the Pacific Railway should be either Bute Inlet or Dean Inlet.

MR. MACKENZIE said he stated on Saturday that his own bias was in favour of the Bute Inlet route until two years ago, and that his bias was derived from engineers' reports, and that he had no personal choice. He desired only to get the best route. Dean Channel and Gardiner Channel were also commended to him. When they found more favourable reports of Burrard Inlet, they had no hesitation in taking that route, as stated in the Order in Council last year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that long explanation did not answer his question. The question he put was simply this: Whether he did not settle that either Dean Inlet or Bute Inlet should be the terminus of the Pacific Railway?

MR. MACKENZIE: I have already said we did not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would read the Order in Council.

MR. MACKENZIE said they adopted the route as far as would leave it possible to select either of those points as terminal points, but they never adopted the road to either of them. They went past Fort George to the Black Water Valley. It was for the purpose of having a telegraph line erected.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the thing was perfectly clear. He asked him simply whether his Government had not finally settled on the terminus, and he said his Government was in favour of Bute Inlet. He did not ask the hon. gentleman if he had been in favour of that Inlet, but whether his Government had not decided that either Bute Inlet or the Dean Channel should be the Pacific Railway terminus. Here was an Order in Council passed by the Government of the day, stating that there were two lines for the Pacific Railway, either by Bute Inlet or by Dean Inlet. Going to Burrard Inlet never crossed the mind of the hon. gentleman, as Minister of Public Works of

that day. Therefore, when he (Mr. Mackenzie) pointed out the superior advantages of Burrard Inlet, it was most remarkable that on June 1st, 1877, not only he, but all the Government decided that the terminus on the Pacific must be either at Bute Inlet or Dean Inlet. Therefore, he did not think there could be any very grave charge against the Government, if they still held the matter in suspense. Some more enquiry should be made as to the reasons which led to the conversion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) which occurred in 1878, shortly before he left office; because it was very remarkable, and an evidence of the way in which business was conducted in those days. On the 1st of July, 1877, the Government of that day pronounced that the Pacific Railway terminus must be at Bute Inlet or Dean Channel. On the 23rd of May, previously, an Order in Council was passed, stating that an Order in Council of the 7th June, 1873, fixing Esquimalt as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and appropriating a strip of land twenty miles in width, was revoked. There had been one Order in Council that Esquimalt should be the terminus, but, by a subsequent Order in Council, the terminus was to be at Bute Inlet or Dean Channel. They deliberately gave up twenty miles in width of the finest mineral lands on the Pacific coast, by this Order in Council on the 23rd May, and yet, on the 29th May, without an Order in Council, without authority, they found a letter written by the Secretary of the Department of Public Works, using these words:

"I am further directed to state that Burrard Inlet will, in all probability, be adopted as the western terminus of the Canada Pacific Railway."

It was not until the 13th July that the Government finally made up their minds that the Burrard Inlet route should be adopted. The Minister of Public Works, had, without the authority of his Government, ordered his officer to rescind and to give up all the land on Vancouver Island. Yet only a year before the Order in Council of the 13th July, 1878, an Order in Council defined the route to be followed in British Columbia in the event of Bute Inlet or Dean Channel being ultimately adopted,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

one of which it seemed probable would be adopted. That was the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. They, at one time, adopted water stretches; at another, Dean Inlet, then Bute Inlet, and then, at the last moment, Burrard Inlet. Yet they attacked the present Government because they thought that, in view of all the contradictory opinions offered, they ought to have some time to consider what terminus should, in the best interests of the Dominion, be adopted. In the meantime he (Sir John A. Macdonald) believed and knew that the Government would carry out the policy which had been indicated—that they would vigorously prosecute the Canadian Pacific Railway, and press it to a successful completion, and he hoped, believed, and knew, that, not only this House, but the whole country, would sustain them in doing so.

MR. TUPPER said he wished to take up the time of the House for a moment in settling a question of personal accuracy, in reference to a statement he had made this afternoon, and the contradiction of that statement which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had made to the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: I simply read from the Journals.

MR. TUPPER said that the hon. gentlemen, in stating that he (Mr. Tupper) had voted against certain contracts, was entirely mistaken. The statement he (Mr. Tupper) made was that, in asking gentlemen opposite to support the Government in a proposition to put 125 miles of railway under contract, he was only asking from hon. gentlemen opposite that which they asked the late Opposition to concede to them. He had called the attention of the leader of the Opposition to the fact that, while he (Mr. Mackenzie) had on several occasions asked the House in advance to give him its approval before the contracts were let, so that he might proceed with the work, the late Opposition had cheerfully accorded their approval. The hon. gentleman brought up, as evidence that he (Mr. Tupper) was not accurate in that statement, the fact that he had opposed a resolution to sanction a contract from Thunder Bay for Kaministiquia to Shebanowan. It was

quite true he had opposed that resolution, and, if the hon. gentleman would refer to the *Hansard*, to the discussion that took place on that resolution, on April 3rd, he would find the reason there given; and that was that the contract proposed was not for a portion of the main line. The hon. gentleman stated to-day that their policy was to construct 45 miles of railway from Kaminstiquia to Shebandowan. Was it for the purpose of constructing a through line to Red River? Not at all. The hon. gentleman told the House that his object was to go to Sturgeon Falls, and use 276 miles of water stretches. The late Opposition opposed it, on the ground that it was not a direct portion of the Pacific Railway. It would take three or four days to get through by that route, and a large sum of money had been spent for nothing, as passengers or freight would not go by that route when the road by Duluth was available. Resolutions were moved by the hon. gentleman in 1875 to let contracts for two lines, one from Selkirk to Rat Portage, and the other from Rat Portage to Keewatin, 117 miles in all, and the hon. gentleman was mistaken in supposing that objections were taken by his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) to the proposition submitted to the House. The late Government did not object to these contracts, because they were portion of the main line. He merely drew the attention of the hon. gentlemen to these facts, because he (Mr. Mackenzie) had questioned the consistency of his (Mr. Tupper's) statements. He was amused at the resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman, for the reason that the hon. gentleman had wasted so much paper in expressing what he (Mr. Tupper) had put—and he thought in improved language—in a couple of lines, and that was a proposition to proceed with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as rapidly as practicable. But what more? Why, the hon. gentleman wished to put on record the fact that the late Government had been grossly violating the laws of this country and the authority of this Parliament for five years. The hon. gentleman asked the House to-night to vote for a resolution, which, the moment it was passed, would

cancel every contract now entered into, and stop the expenditure of \$25,000,000. It would also prevent the expenditure of one dollar of public money on the Canadian Pacific Railway, if such expenditure would increase the taxation. Yet the first act of the hon. gentleman, when he got into office, was to ask the House to vote \$3,000,000 additional taxation, and his colleague, Mr. Blake, had declared that it was intended to secure the construction of the Pacific Railway. His first act was to violate the decision of Parliament, by taxing the people of this country, according to the statement of Mr. Blake, to the extent of \$3,000,000 for the construction of the Pacific Railway. Did the hon. gentleman venture to state, after meeting this House three years in succession, with the statement from the mouth of the Finance Minister that there was a serious deficit, that he did not know that every dollar of the \$25,000,000 engagements to which he committed the country, was not a gross and direct violation of the authority of Parliament? Did not the hon. gentleman know, a year ago, after having had deficits to the extent of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, when he asked to put under contract 125 miles of railway from Yale to Kamloops, that it involved, in the clearest and most distinct terms, largely increased taxation upon the people of this country? And now, with the practice of five years against those declarations, he (Mr. Mackenzie) finished up the resolution he submitted to the House with the declaration:—

“That the circumstances of the country are not now such as would justify a departure from the ground taken in such Acts and resolution, and that the construction of the railway should only be proceeded with at such a rate as will not increase the rate of taxation beyond that existing at the date recited in the above resolution in the Session of 1876.”

Not a blow had been struck on the 1,500 miles of railway required between Selkirk and the Pacific coast, yet a solemn binding engagement had been entered into between the hon. gentleman, British Columbia and the Imperial Government, that, before 1890, that 1,500 miles should be completed, no matter whether additional taxation would be required or not. He had also entered into engagements which involved the

expenditure of \$25,000,000, and now he stultified himself by asking the House to cancel all these engagements.

MR. MACKENZIE said he utterly denied having violated the law regarding contracts. As to the reproach that there had been deficits, he had explained that twenty times, and he need not do it again. If there had been a deficit in the revenue, it was because there had been a deficit in the pockets of the people. If it was wrong for the late Government to have a deficit, how much more so was it for the hon. gentleman to have a deficit five times the amount in five years. The late Government had a deficit because they declined to tax the people in any way. The hon. gentleman assumed that, because he (Mr. Mackenzie) invited tenders for one line, he was bound to proceed with no other line. That by no means followed. They might proceed with a dozen, provided they obtained money for the purpose, and, besides, they had power under the contract, as the hon. gentleman knew, to stop any contractor at any moment.

MR. TUPPER: No; the Statute says the reverse of that.

MR. MACKENZIE said the Statute said that the Governor in Council should have the power at any time to suspend work until the next meeting of Parliament, and that provision was in the contracts themselves, if he mistook not. He knew it was in the contracts for canal works, and it seemed to him that there was the same proviso in railway contracts, that the Government could stop the work whenever they pleased. The contracts provided specifically that, when the money voted by Parliament was expended, the work must stop, and there could be no claim for damages in such cases. As to the solemn binding engagement of the Carnarvon terms, from his recollection of the despatch of 17th September, 1874, agreeing to the terms proposed by Lord Carnarvon, he was of opinion that such action as that by the late Government could be taken without any violation of any enactment or Parliamentary resolution. In another despatch, in 1876, it was stated that that engagement was predicated upon, and

MR. TUPPER.

subject to the conditions embodied in the law.

MR. TUPPER: It is not in the terms.

MR. MACKENZIE said there were no terms signed by two parties as in a contract; there was simply the Minutes of Council. The Minister of Public Works complained that the late Government had not carried out the Terms of Union which said that the railway should be built as a condition of Union upon certain terms therein mentioned. The Government which preceded his had already violated the terms as to the accomplishment of certain work on the Pacific Railway; when his Government took office, two years had passed without work being done. He had always understood that the execution of the terms made with Lord Carnarvon was subject to Canada's ability to proceed with the work, subject to the Act they passed themselves, without any amendment having been proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, or any serious opposition to it from them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Was not the Carnarvon arrangement between Canada and British Columbia and the British Government, just as binding and conclusive as to the road being finished in 1890, as the original engagement?

MR. MACKENZIE: It was qualified by the terms of our Act.

MR. TUPPER said that on or before the 1st September, 1890, the railway was to be completed and opened for traffic, and so forth. Those were the terms, and the hon. member for Lambton had told the House, having, in the recess of Parliament, made a compact with the British Government and British Columbia that, by 1890, 2,000 miles of railway should be completed, in answer to Mr. Blake's question as to what authority the hon. gentleman proposed to take from Parliament to sanction that enormous engagement, that, instead of \$1,500,000 the Government proposed to spend \$2,000,000 a year within British Columbia, and finish the railway connections within that Province, and downward to the point indicated, before 1890; and that they had nothing to ask from Parliament. So he had power to make a solemn binding engagement, re-

ardless altogether of the financial condition of the country, and complete those 2,000 miles in eleven years. The terms were sealed, and all Parliament had to do was to vote him the money; and yet they had these captious objections made to a proposition that involved no expenditure, no additional burden, which they believed was calculated to relieve the country from the enormous obligations already contracted.

MR. MACKENZIE said he wished to say, in answer to a remark about an Order in Council of the late Government, rescinding or giving up lands on Vancouver Island, that that did not affect the Pacific road, but only the railway from Nanaimo to Esquimalt. It was agreed they should give that quantity of land if they built the road, and when they found themselves unable to proceed with it, they gave up the land as a matter of course.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no record of any promise by the Government of British Columbia to give that land.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman will not find on record that a single acre was to be given except as a portion of the road.

MR. MILLS said that, with regard to the Carnarvon terms, it was declared and formally agreed that their execution was not to be inconsistent with the law. The Act of 1874 was still upon the Statute-book, and the Government of the day had no authority to set it at defiance, or declare that the rate of taxation should be inconsistent with it. When the hon. member for Lambton invited him (Mr. Mills) to join his Administration, he spoke to him on the subject, reminding him that the rate of taxation was not to be increased under the Act of 1874, in constructing the railway, when the hon. gentleman assured him that the Carnarvon terms were to be construed as he (Mr. Mills) understood them—that they were intended to be so understood in dealing with the Colonial Secretary.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, that that might have been the understanding of the late Government, but the

resolutions were absolute in their terms—the promise to finish the railway by 1890 was absolute; and they could only judge, and British Columbia would hold England and Canada to the promise, not only implied but expressed, that in 1890 it should be built.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he distinctly contradicted the argument of the First Minister from the Carnarvon terms. British Columbia was bound to take cognisance of the Act of 1874, and so was the British Secretary of State, and their never having asked for its repeal, showed they knew they were to be bound by it, and they had a right to hold that there was an understanding that there was no intention to vary the Act of 1874. If they had expected it to be varied, it was their duty to insist on its repeal. An Act of the Parliament of the Dominion affected every part, and British Columbia was a part, and neither Lord Carnarvon nor anybody else could expect that they were going to look beyond that.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman says that, although the Carnarvon terms are specific and peremptory in language, although there is a positive engagement to finish the road in 1890, yet both England and British Columbia are bound to take notice of the previous legislation.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do say so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What has been the stock-in-trade of the Opposition, with regard to the original terms with British Columbia? When we agreed to commence the road in two and finish it in ten years, there was a cry made throughout the country that this was a foolish and absurd bargain, but an obligation that must be carried out, when, in the same Session, there was passed a resolution, with the consent of the British Columbia delegates, and the whole continent, that there should be no increased taxation, and that the road should only be built by private enterprise. It has been cried through the country, and even in the present debate, that we made a foolish binding obligation that could not be got rid of, and yet the British Columbia delegates

were here and agreed to it as did England also, but still, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, we were bound to finish the railway in ten years; and, though they made an equally binding obligation to finish the road in 1890, there was no meaning in that; it must be read through the spectacles of hon. gentlemen opposite, that all these engagements are not to increase the obligations of the country. The Finance Minister of the late Government acknowledged that they construed the Carnarvon terms simply by the light of the surrounding circumstances, while their predecessors made an improvident irreversible bargain. The Government preceding the last made no agreement as they did—agreed to finish the road in ten years, they agreeing to finish it in 1890. The member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) says this must be read in connection with all the surrounding circumstances; the present Government say that British Columbia agreed there should be no increase of taxation, and that the road should be commenced and finished with the assistance of private enterprise, and not by the Government.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I objected most decidedly to the hon. gentleman's terms, because he put them without any qualification or modification whatever in an Imperial Act, or in resolutions which were to have the force of one, and, because he deliberately voted down, by his then majority, a proposition of myself and Sir A. T. Galt, to introduce modifying terms. Had he not done that, his case would, to some extent, have been parallel to ours. What I always accused hon. gentlemen opposite of, was their deliberate and repeated ignoring of every proposition to limit the liability of Canada. We do not act in that way.

MR. TUPPER said, as to the observation of the hon. gentleman, that the Governments of England and British Columbia were bound to take notice of the Act of 1874, limiting the financial obligations of Canada in regard to the construction of the railway by 1890, he wanted to ask this question: If that were true, if that Act left no room for doubt, why was it that, when he (Mr. Tupper) called the attention of

the House to the fact that the late Government had entered into that obligation, regardless of any qualification, their colleague (Mr. Blake) drafted a resolution to reaffirm the proposition that it should be subject to the financial condition of the country, and put it in the hands of the member for West Middlesex to move?

Question put, and amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messrs.

Anglin	Holton
Bain	Huntington
Béchar	Killam
Bourassa	LaRue
Brown	Mackenzie
Burk	Mills
Burpee (St. John)	Oliver
Cameron (S. Huron)	Olivier
Cartwright	Paterson (S. Brant.)
Casey	Pickard
Chandler	Rinfret
Coupal	Robertson (Shelburne)
Dumont	Ross (W. Middlesex)
Fleming	Rymal
Galbraith	Scriver
Geoffrion	Skinner
Gillies	Thompson (Haldimand)
Gillmor	Trow.—37.
Gunn	

NAYS:

Messrs.

Allison	Daoust
Arnell	Dawson
Baby	DeCosmos
Baker	Desaulniers
Bannerman	Desjardins
Benoit	Dewdney
Bergeron	Domville
Bergin	Drew
Bill	Dubuc
Bolduc	Elliott
Boulbee	Farrow
Bourbeau	Ferguson
Bowell	Fitzsimmons
Brecken	Fortin
Brooks	Fulton
Bunting	Gault
Burnham	Gigault
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Gill
Caron	Girouard (J. Cartier)
Cockburn (W. Nthbid.)	Grandbois
Colby	Haggart
Connell	Hay
Costigan	Hesson
Coughlin	Hilliard
Coursol	Hooper
Currier	Houde
Cuthbert	Hurteau
Daly	Jones

Kaulback	Pope (Compton)
Keeler	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Kilvert	Richey
Kranz	Robertson (Hamilton)
Landry	Robinson
Lane	Robitaille
Lantier	Rochester
Longley	Ross (Dundas)
Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)	Rouleau
McDonald (Pictou)	Routhier
Macmillan	Ryan (Marquette)
McCallum	Rykert
McCarthy	Shaw
McCuaig	Sproule
McDougall	Stephenson
McInnes	Strange
McLennan	Tassé
McLeod	Tellier
McRory	Thompson (Cariboo)
Massue	Tilley
Merner	Tupper
Mongenais	Vallée
Mousseau	Wade
Muttart	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Orton	Wallace (W. York)
Quimet	White (Cardwell)
Patterson (Essex)	White (E. Hastings)
Pinsonneault	Williams
Platt	Wright.—115.
Plumb	

MR. CARON said that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. LaRue) had voted, though he had paired with the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Perreault). He (Mr. Caron) held the proof of the fact in the initials of one of the Liberal whips.

MR. TROW said that such was the case.

MR. LARUE said he had not paired with anyone, and, if the whips had paired him against his knowledge, he did not think that he should be bound by it. He insisted on his right to vote.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it rested with the hon. member to say whether his vote should remain on the record or not. If he chose to have his name recorded, it was for him to say so. Every member in the House, if called upon, was compelled to vote, and, even if a gentleman got up and stated that he had paired, the House could compel him to vote, because, if he had paired, he must leave the House before the vote was taken. This was English practice. Therefore, if the hon. member for Bellechasse chose to have his name recorded on the paper, he had a right to do so,

and no man had a right to make any objection to it.

Resolution *agreed to*.

Resolutions 2 to 11 *agreed to*.

On Resolution 12,

MR. MACKENZIE said it was quite impossible for him to vote for that resolution; he therefore moved in amendment, to leave out all the words after "that," and insert the following instead thereof:

"The route by the Thompson and Lower Frazer Rivers was recommended by Mr. Sandford Fleming, Chief Engineer of the Canada Pacific Railway; that this route possesses the most favourable grades of any route through British Columbia; that it is the shortest and cheapest to the side waters of the Pacific Ocean; that it reaches a capacious and safe harbour of easy access from the sea; that it passes through a country partially settled, possessing a good road on the proposed line of the railway and some navigable waters, thus offering many advantages over the Bute Inlet route."

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman had told part of the truth, but not all. It was affirmed in this resolution that this road was recommended by Mr. Fleming; but it was only just to state that Mr. Fleming, at the same time, put on record his opinion that the selection of the route was premature. The hon. gentleman ought to have embodied in his amendment the fact that Mr. Fleming recommended further examination.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no doubt, as against the Bute Inlet route, he did recommend it without any qualification, and I put it as against Bute Inlet. With regard to the vote, I am content to take the same vote that the House has just given.

Question *put* and amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) *negatived*, on the same division as on the amendment to Resolution 1.

Resolution *agreed to*.

Resolutions 13 and 14 *agreed to*, on a division.

CANADA PACIFIC RAILWAY ACT, 1874.
AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Tupper)

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD READINGS.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 116) To amend the Canada Pacific Railway Act, 1874.

Bill read the first, second, and third times, and passed.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Baby.)

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD READINGS.

MR. BABY introduced a Bill (No. 117) To amend an Act of this Session intituled an Act to provide for the inspection, safe-keeping and storage of Petroleum, and the products thereof.

Bill read the first, second and third times, and passed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had promised to state this evening to the House what steps he proposed to take regarding the violation of the privileges of the House which he (Mr. Mackenzie) had brought up in the afternoon.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that he had looked into the practice, and he had come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman should formulate in writing the statement he had made, in order to get it on the Journals of the House. That was the practice followed in reference to the Pacific Railway in 1873, and the same practice should be adopted now. As soon as that was done, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) would move that Mr. John Macdonell be summoned to the bar of the House at the next sitting.

MR. MACKENZIE stated that, when he made his statement, he did so for the purpose of having it entered on the Journals of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The procedure in such a case is this: The motion is made,

MR. MACKENZIE.

then the letter complained of is read by the Clerk, and then a motion is made to bring the person accused to the bar of the House.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said there was a marked distinction between any of the authorities published and the present case. In all the precedents he had been able to find in cases of letters written to members of the House in regard to their course, conduct, votes, or language on the floor of the House, he did not find a case in which a letter written to a member of the House about the personal or private conduct, or private character of a member, outside of the House, had been treated as a breach of the privileges of Parliament. Before a man was condemned, he should be heard, and there was no evidence that the letter in question had been written by the person by whom it purported to be signed. He held that the question should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to enquire as to these points.

MR. MACKENZIE said the writing of the letter was not the only offence. The hon. member for Shefford had complained that this person called him a swindler, and some other opprobrious epithet. This person had also offended in other ways. The attention of Mr. Speaker had been called to it, and there could be no doubt that the letter was written by the party mentioned. The letter was only an aggravation of the offence. If the letter had not been written, the offence could not be overlooked by any Parliament having the slightest regard for its own dignity.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said that the explanation of the hon. member for Lambton showed the necessity of a charge being formulated.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. member for Lambton had stated the case correctly. He had made the charge, as he had repeated to-day, that this gentleman or person insulted a member of this House, and afterwards came in at another door, and entered the House a third time. This the hon. gentleman stated before, and he said the aggravation of the offence was that he

wrote a certain paper, which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) asked him to place on the table of the House. It was quite true that what the hon. gentleman said was a repetition of what he stated before, but it only showed that the request which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) made, that the charge should be formulated, should be carried out. He thought that the hon. gentleman had better, before the House adjourned, place in writing the statement which he had made, in order that the House might see exactly what the charge was, and in what respect the privileges of this House had been offended against.

MR. HOLTON said Mr. Macdonell should have been arrested at once. In this case, the letter would have formed no element of the charge. It was very much to be regretted that the course which he instanced had not been taken.

MR. MACKENZIE rose in his place and stated :

"That on Saturday last, a person named John A. Macdonell, while sitting inside the House, made offensive remarks towards a member of this House, namely the member for Shefford, who, at the time was sitting in his place in the House, viz. : That the said member was a cheat and a swindler ; that the offending person was ordered by the Speaker to withdraw from the House, but that he nevertheless again returned, when he was again expelled by the Sergeant-at-Arms. That immediately afterwards a letter was received by the member for Shefford in the following terms, presumably written by this same person :—

"To the Hon. L. S. Huntington, M.P. :—

"Sir.—I desire to state out of the House, what I stated in it. You are a cheat and a swindler.

"J. A. MACDONELL."

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) : It is not very complimentary to the member for Shefford.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Order, order.

MR. MACKENZIE : That remark is not very complimentary to the member who makes it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : This is a very serious matter, and ought to be treated seriously, and I have no doubt the House will so treat it. The fact of language being used on the floor of the House against a member, and, I suppose,

within his hearing, is an offence that ought to be treated seriously by the House. The statements of the motion of the hon. member for Lambton must be taken to be true, so far as the hon. gentleman knows them. The hon. member for Lambton, having taken the responsibility of proposing this motion, I have no hesitation in moving that John A. Macdonell, the person named, be summoned to attend at the bar of the House, at the next sitting of the House.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) moved in amendment that the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, for an investigation and report to the House thereon.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he hoped the amendment would not carry, but that the main motion would. The statement respecting an insult to a member was made by a leading member of the House, and must be followed up at once. He had no doubt the accused party would have every opportunity of being heard at the right time, and in the proper way. Meantime, the privileges of members of Parliament ought to be protected, and he hoped his hon. friend would not press his motion to a division.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said that his sole desire was that they should not establish a wrong precedent. The most material part of the motion contained the word "presumably ;" the author did not state the fact as of his own knowledge, and, when a statement of this kind was made, and a party was put on trial, he (Mr. Cameron) believed it was in accordance with precedent, as well as with the principles of law, that the matter ought to be investigated.

MR. HOLTON : Investigated at the bar.

MR. CAMERON : When a man is brought to the bar, he is brought as a criminal, and put on trial. If a party was reported *in flagrante delictu*, it would be proper to bring him to account promptly ; but it should be different with a case brought up a few days afterwards, and resting merely on information, belief, or presumptive evidence only. But, as he understood such an experienced Par-

liamentarian as the Premier to say that his motion was strictly in accordance with the precedents of Parliament, he would yield to the right hon. gentleman's suggestion, and withdraw his amendment.

Motion (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

PURCHASE OF RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH, G.T.R.

RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider certain resolutions authorising the purchase by the Government, from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of their line of railway from Rivière du Loup to Hadlow.

(In the Committee.)

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. TILLEY delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

"LORNE.

"The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons the additional Supplementary Estimates of the amounts required for the service of Canada for the year ending the 30th June, 1880; and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends those Estimates to the House of Commons.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"OTTAWA, 10th May, 1879.

SUPPLY.

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

MR. CAMERON.

(In the Committee.)

294	{	Intercolonial Railway :—	
		Estimated amount required for the purchase from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of their line of railway from Rivière du Loup to Hadlow, except certain iron rails thereon, and for running powers between the Chaudière Junction and Point Lévis	\$1,500,000 00
295		Repairing and laying the same with steel rails.....	375,000 00

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Railways.

296	{	Intercolonial Railway :—	
		Working expenses of above-mentioned line of railway.....	255,000 00

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes before

Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 13th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REMISSION OF FEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. McCUAIG moved that the fees, less the cost of printing, on Bill (No. 49) to amend so much of the Act 33 Vict., chap. 46, as relates to the collection of dues and tolls upon logs, timber, cedar, pine, and railway ties, passing down the Moira River, through the port of Belleville, be refunded, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

MR. HOLTON said the House should understand the proposition now submitted to it. This Bill was introduced as a Private Bill, founded on petition, and had passed through both Houses. The proposal now was that the fees should be remitted, on the ground that it was not so much a Private Bill as a Local Bill. Now, the scale of fees contemplated both Private and Local Bills. This was, undoubtedly, a Local Bill, promoted by private parties. The very exception made by the report of the Committee, that the printing should be paid for by these parties, maintained its Private Bill character. It related also to the city of Belleville, imposing certain obligations upon it; it was, therefore, a mixed Private and Local Bill.

MR. McCUAIG said he had been requested to present this Bill by two large lumbering firms, having a large amount of property passing through the port of Belleville. He had no personal interest in the matter, and was sure the promoters of this Bill had no desire to infringe any rule of the House. But the Bill itself was a Public Bill, it was a tax upon property passing through the River Moira to the port of Belleville. The Clerk of the Private Bills Committee had stated to him that it was not usual to exact fees on a Bill of this character.

MR. TILLEY said it appeared, from the statement of the Committee, that it would be an exceptional proceeding, but, the Committee having considered the matter carefully, he thought there was no such objection to it as his hon. friend opposite had presented.

MR. HOLTON said he made no objection, he merely pointed out that the consequences would be to enfranchise all that class of Private Bills which partook of a local character, as contradistinguished from those affecting merely private individuals.

MR. SCRIVER said, as a member of the Committee, he would state that the recommendation of the Committee was based on the representation that the Act was really a Public Act.

Motion agreed to.

VICE-CHANCELLOR BLAKE.

MR. McCUAIG said he wished to draw the attention of the House to a very important matter. Through the public press, charges had been preferred against one of our most distinguished Judges occupying a high position in the Chancery Court, the charge being insulting a witness while in the witness-box. He would read from a newspaper what these charges were :

"When his Grace Archbishop Lynch had testified before the Vice-Chancellor on a question of fact which arose in the Mercer case, his testimony was received by the learned Judge in terms so improper as to have been open to suspicion of an intention to throw discredit on statements made by his Grace under oath. And on another occasion, when a Mother Superior of the Ladies of St. Joseph appeared before Mr. Blake as a witness in a case in which she had no interest whatever, and when giving her name, she, as was both natural and proper, gave her name in religion, the Vice-Chancellor, with a coarse brutality which would have done little credit to a street rough in the excitement of a faction fight, remarked, 'that it was one of those fine Italian names employed in such cases as a disguise for a Bridget Maloney!'

"In Osgoode Hall general opinion declares that Vice-Chancellor Blake discriminates in his manner, if not in his judgments, against counsel and suitors who are Catholics. Catholic lawyers accept that opinion so fully that, rather than prejudice the interests of their clients, they endeavour to have their cases brought before some other Judge, or, when brought before Vice-Chancellor Blake, to hand their briefs to Protestant Counsel."

He knew nothing whatever about the facts; but he contended, as a Protestant, that, if Catholic ladies went before a Court of Justice, the Judge had nothing to do with their religious opinions or belief, and they should be treated with courtesy, consideration, and kindness. There were safeguards thrown around Judges of the Courts of Great Britain and this country, for the purpose of securing an independent judgment in all matters of this kind.

MR. HOLTON said he rose to a point of order. He would ask whether his hon. friend proposed to conclude with a motion.

MR. McCUAIG: No, Sir, I do not; but I wish the Judges to understand that there is a public opinion in this country, and I wish them to respect it.

MR. HOLTON said he heard his hon. friend referring to Judges and so forth, matters which would be quite irregular to refer to unless speaking to a motion, and therefore he inquired whether the hon. gentleman intended to conclude with a motion; when he (Mr. McCuaig) said he did not, the matter should end.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: When a member gets up and addresses the House on a matter, it is always supposed the hon. gentleman is going to conclude with a motion, but any hon. member has a right to interrupt for the purpose of asking him if he is going to conclude with a motion. But, if no one interrupts him, and the speaking goes on, it is supposed he is going to conclude with a motion.

MR. COSTIGAN said he desired to call the attention of the House to a matter which had been referred to some time ago.

MR. HOLTON: Is the hon. gentleman going to conclude with a motion?

MR. COSTIGAN: Yes.

MR. HOLTON: The hon. gentleman says he intends to conclude with a motion. I now ask if it is a motion of which notice was given? I find no notice of a motion that can be reached at this stage of the proceedings on a Government day.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think that, when "motions" are called, the hon. member can rise and propose a motion, and, when he says he is going to conclude with a motion, the House is obliged to listen to the hon. member. When he makes a motion, and it is a motion which requires notice, then, and not before, can objection be taken.

MR. HOLTON: Then the right hon. gentleman holds that members may trifle with the time and Rules of this House. No gentleman can speak to a motion of which notice has not been given, if that notice be insisted on by any member.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would like to have the question decided. I believe, when an hon. member states he is going to conclude with a motion, the

MR. McCUAIG.

House must listen to him until he presents his motion. When he presents his motion, any member can object that he is out of order.

MR. HOLTON: The right hon. gentleman has a great habit of improvising Parliamentary Rules to suit himself. The inconvenience to which that practice to which he adverts would lead must be obvious to everyone. There would be nothing to prevent any hon. member making a speech of two or three hours in length, at any moment, however inopportune, to thwart any business, however important, by simply rising and saying: I propose to conclude with a motion. It is the very essence of orderly discussion, that, when a gentleman speaks to a motion, the House should be seized with the nature of that motion, even when it is proposed to move that the House do adjourn. The House must not be trifled with by an evasion of the rules, of which the right hon. gentleman indicates a feasible and facile method on any day of the week, and against which, if it were put in practice, he would be the first to protest.

MR. SPEAKER: The practice is this: Before the Orders of the Day are called, very often some hon. member rises in his place, and expresses himself on some question, or calls the attention of the House to some matter. This is allowed by the practice of the House. Any hon. member may object, and put the question whether the hon. member addressing the House intends to finish with a motion. That question had been put to the hon. member for Victoria, N. B., (Mr. Costigan), and he stated in reply that he would conclude with a motion. I have the motion in my hands. I cannot say whether it has a notice or not, but the proper time to call the attention of the Chair to the question whether a notice of it has been given or not is before putting the question to the House.

MR. COSTIGAN said that, had he been allowed to proceed when he first rose, the discussion would have been over by this time. He had stated that, when he brought the question up before, he did so merely in order to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to

what he believed to be a very serious charge that had been preferred against a gentleman holding a high judicial position. His object was to obtain from some prominent members of this House an expression, if not in condemnation of that gentleman, at least in condemnation of the language supposed to have been used by him, and of the course said to have been pursued by him in the discharge of his duties as a Judge in this country. He referred to this, not to find fault with the Minister of Justice for having taken the ground he did on that occasion. Had he known what the Minister of Justice's duty was then, he would have placed himself in a position to speak as one of the members of this House, and afford to other hon. gentlemen an opportunity for doing the same. The charges to which he (Mr. Costigan) alluded were very serious ones, and he now took this opportunity of referring to them and to the fact that they had never been contradicted, and, in his mind, they were worthy the consideration of the Government. He was not disposed to point out a particular line of duty to the Government in this case, but he had a right, as a representative, to express his views upon it. In the first place, that hon. gentleman Vice-Chancellor Blake had been charged with having made use of language at a certain meeting in Toronto, which was unwise, uncharitable, unworthy of any gentleman holding the position he held. He (Mr. Costigan) alluded to the occasion where he expressed the hope that the different Protestant elements in this country would unite and put down Popery. Such an expression from a Judge was uncalled-for, and unworthy of his position. He had been told that he had no right to refer to this language, because it was not used on the Bench, that the hon. gentleman might be a good Judge, and was perfectly entitled to speak as he thought fit on other occasions. He (Mr. Costigan) might be wrong, but he entertained a very different idea from that. His opinion was that a gentleman holding the position of Judge must not forget, even though he were off the Bench, that he occupied the position of Judge. It would be quite reasonable for anyone to come to the conclusion that an hon. gentleman who held

the position of Judge, and made such an exhibition of fanaticism and bigotry off the Bench, would lead those who looked for justice at his hands, to believe that, when on the Bench, he would be actuated by the same spirit. This appeared to be reason, and he had a right to refer to it as a duty. He must not forget that, when he was on the Bench, he was called upon to measure out even-handed justice to the people of this country. Now, there was another serious charge against that hon. gentleman. He was not here to say that these charges were true. He was here to say the charges had been made before the public, and no one had contradicted them. It was charged that he was actuated by so severe a feeling of hostility to the Catholic element, that Catholics did not feel justified in appealing to him. If that were true, it was their duty to remove him. He did not believe it was trifling with the House to call the attention of the representatives of the people to these charges. They had the charge of an uncalled-for insult to a lady summoned to appear before that Judge. This had been published in most of the leading newspapers. We, in this country, entertained different religious beliefs, and considered that all ought to receive even-handed justice. It was not only a discredit to the hon. gentleman himself, but it was a discredit to the country, that a gentleman holding Vice-Chancellor Blake's position should so far forget himself as to make use of the language he was charged with using, and to pursue the course he was charged with pursuing. He trusted the Government would not allow this matter to be passed over.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had pledged his honour that he would conclude with a motion, and he had not done so.

MR. COSTIGAN : I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. MILLS said that was not a motion at all. The hon. gentleman had made a speech which he had no right to make, and which he had been allowed to make upon the supposition that he was prepared to make a motion. The hon. gentleman made a violent and unjust attack upon a Judge, and he made a

statement which, either in the press or anywhere else—

MR. RYKERT: I rise to a point of order.

MR. COSTIGAN: I rise to ask a question.

MR. MILLS: I do not propose to be questioned by the hon. gentleman. His course is highly censurable, and he has practiced a deception upon the House.

MR. McCALLUM: I rise to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is to adjourn the House.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman had made a slanderous speech without giving the House an opportunity of discussing what was said.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. COSTIGAN: I move that all the papers and correspondence touching this matter, in the hands of the Government, be brought down.

MR. MACKENZIE: That requires notice.

MR. COSTIGAN: Then I move that an Order of the House do issue for all papers and correspondence relating to any charges against Vice-Chancellor Blake to be brought to the House.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, in the first place, there had been no notice of that motion, and, in the second place, they were not in the habit of allowing a fishing motion to be passed. If the hon. gentleman could specify the charges moved for, he would not object to a motion for the papers concerning those charges. The hon. gentleman had made a speech based wholly on rumour. He had seen something stated in a newspaper, and he gave his own fiat to that statement. The hon. gentleman assumed that Judge Blake had done something wrong. He (Mr. Mackenzie) did not believe Judge Blake had done anything wrong. He did not believe Judge Blake had insulted, or was capable of insulting, any religious denomination. The hon. gentleman's speech was to him (Mr. Mackenzie) one of the most wanton

MR. MILLS.

attacks he ever heard made on a Judge since he had been in Parliament. It was a serious thing to attack a Judge. There was no man more free from party spirit—there was no more benevolent or kind man on the Bench than Judge Blake. Every one that knew him knew that he never, by word or deed, would do anything that could be construed into an insult to any religious denomination. He (Mr. Mackenzie) protested against any such motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is of a character which requires two days' notice, and I do not think that a debate ought to be allowed upon it.

MR. COSTIGAN: I rise for the purpose—

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. COSTIGAN: I do not rise to question your ruling, only I would like to call attention to this fact—

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is entirely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate is over.

MR. COUGHLIN moved the adjournment of the House. He said he was of opinion that, if the Hon. Vice-Chancellor Blake was guilty, it was right that he should be exposed. As far as he was concerned, he had received several letters both from Catholics and Protestants respecting Judge Blake.

MR. McCUAIG said he was one of those who believed a Judge was responsible to public opinion and to the House. He wished particularly to call attention to the salaries of Judges. The Act of Confederation distinctly provided that the Dominion Government should pay the salaries of the Judges. Now, in consequence of the opinion that they were insufficiently paid, the Government of Ontario introduced some motion by which they increased their Judges' salaries \$1,000 a year. This was an illegal act, and the Judges knew it was illegal, and he would ask what respect could they have for a Bench that would accept that pay. When they took that into consideration in connection with the charge of respect-

able journals, he thought it was high time members of this House should pronounce upon it. He had great reluctance in referring to another matter in connection with this. A few short months' after his ascent to the Bench, Mr. Blake made a most gross attack upon the character of the late John Hillyard Cameron. He put his signature to a paper, accusing that gentleman of a gross injustice and wrong, when he might be called upon to try an election case in which the late Mr. Cameron might be interested. He (Mr. McCuaig) maintained that he was justified in bringing this matter before the House, and in insisting that Judges should discharge their duties impartially. Judges had no right to comment upon a man's religious or political opinions. In the county where he resided, they had many Catholics and Orangemen, between whom there was no difficulty whatever. The course he (Mr. McCuaig) had taken was in the interest of the people. He hoped that, by addressing the Judges on this matter, and calling the attention of Parliament to it, a stop would be put to such conduct as that under consideration.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal Centre) said he desired to make a few remarks in reply to the member for Lambton. He certainly thought that any question which occupied the attention of the public press, and concerned a large minority of the people of Canada, might well be considered in the House, and could not be termed trivial or unimportant. This was not purely a Catholic question, and it was not a Catholic who brought it up to-day, but the member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig), who felt that this Judge had exceeded his duty. If the charges brought against that Judge were true, he was unworthy to fill the position of Vice-Chancellor. The remark that this charge had only appeared in the Catholic press was not correct; a long article was published in the *National*, in Toronto, reiterating the charge, and up to this moment he (Mr. Ryan) was not aware that either the Vice-Chancellor or any other gentleman had denied it, though Mr. Blake was apt to rush into print and defend himself when he could do so. He had no desire to do anything

but protest against the language of the members for Lambton and Chateaugay, from whom he expected better, having looked upon the hon. member for Chateaugay as straightforward and honourable. He had hoped that hon. gentleman would not have taken advantage of points of order to rule an hon. gentleman out of order in calling attention to an insult to more than a million and a half of the people.

Mr. RYKERT said he regretted the conduct of the Judges should be called in question in the House. There were occasions when Judges went beyond legitimate bounds and brought their conduct under notice of the House. When they found a Judge insulting a large portion of their fellow countrymen, they were bound, as members of the House, to defend them, and see whether the charges had any foundation. If they had any it was their bounden duty to ask the House or Government to investigate them. The House had power to impeach the Judges, and it was the duty of the Government to see that something was done in regard to such charges. He (Mr. Rykert) thought that the only fault or great mistake he could point to in the course of the Premier was his appointment of Mr. Blake to the Bench. A more petulant, technical, prejudiced Judge never sat on the Bench, for which he was totally unfit. In his (Mr. Rykert's) professional experience of twenty-five years he had never found a man but him lose his temper on the Bench. When he found him mixing in all kinds of controversies, one day with hotel keepers about tavern licenses, and the next in discussions at prayer meetings and synods, he could judge of his character. Was it proper to find a Judge violating the Dunkin Act in the county of Grey; was he in his proper place? When he was found in an assailable position like that, the Government ought to take action. He was sorry to impugn the character of a Judge, but, as a professional man, he must take issue with the statement that Judge Blake was an honest, upright man. His conduct as a Judge, on several occasions brought before the notice of the country, showed conclusively that he was most petulant and prejudiced.

MR. BOULTBEE said that he thought this discussion had been dragged to an improper length. There was nothing of greater importance than the respect due to the Bench, which a debate like this was calculated to militate against. He must confess that he thought the proceeding this afternoon had been pushed too far, and, as an English subject and a man, he thought it was cowardly to strike at a man who could not be here to answer. All who knew him (Mr. Boulton) were aware that his political relations had been antagonistic to the Messrs. Blake; but he was proud to confess that, from his personal experience, he was able to say that the Vice-Chancellor had always conducted himself as a Judge ought, and with extra consideration towards himself, for which he felt obliged. He believed it was an unfortunate and unhappy thing that discussions of this kind should arise in the House.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he entirely agreed with what the last speaker had said, and he felt it was only right that, as the article in the *Irish Canadian* had been referred to, he should state that, within a few days, when in Toronto, he had been informed by a gentleman practicing in the Court of Chancery that Mr. Blake had not made use of the language attributed to him. The mere fact that it was questionable whether he did or not, showed that this House was scarcely the arena in which to discuss the question whether a Judge, on a particular occasion, said a particular thing, or not; and, considering the position in which the Judges stood, he was not prepared to accede to the doctrine that every Judge was immediately compelled to contradict every untrue statement that happened to be made about him. He did not think it was desirable that professional gentlemen should express their opinions in the House *pro* or *con.* as to the excellence or impartiality of any Judge on the Bench. He thought it was not desirable they should do so. If the learned Judges did wrong, they were liable to impeachment, and he thought that unofficial discussions as to the conduct or language of Judges on the Bench were to be deprecated. At the same time, he (Mr. Cameron) quite sympathised with

MR. RYKERT.

his hon. friend who had referred to that subject, and he was bound to admit that, if any Judge had pursued conduct or used expressions that placed him in hostility to a very large class of Her Majesty's subjects, he had shown his unfitness for the judicial position. It had been said that Mr. Blake had done so; that a tavern-keeper, a Roman Catholic, or high churchman of the Church of England would not expect from him impartial justice, which opinion was stated to have originated from the fact that the learned Judge had taken a very active and prominent part in extrajudicial discussions, involving opinions hostile to theirs. It was deeply to be regretted that any Judge should place himself in a position of antagonism to the opinions of large classes among whom he officiated. He (Mr. Cameron) did not say that this Judge had done so; but, as that had been alleged, he must say that it was contrary to the idea of the proper administration of justice for a Judge to place himself in a position in which any suitor might doubt his impartiality. He did not think this Judge should be condemned without satisfactory evidence. He (Mr. Cameron) felt bound to say that he heard the principal charge against him contradicted by a gentleman who, he thought, had an excellent opportunity of knowing whether it was well founded or not.

MR. MILLS said he never supposed that a Judge ceased to be a member of a particular denomination on ascending the Bench. How far he might express his views or theological opinions, was a matter of taste, of which he alone might be considered the judge. He (Mr. Mills) did not suppose that a member of the Bar, who had taken a certain part in proceedings outside the profession, should cease to do so on attaining the Bench. The only way in a country like Canada, where they were so much divided, was to allow every man to entertain what opinions he pleased, and defend them as he thought best, so long as he did not intrude them upon people in his official capacity. They had men of various denominations on the Bench, and, if they said to them: You must leave your religion behind you, and no more go near a Church synod or conference, because all who hold differences of opinion would be

offended at your conduct—what would be thought? They knew that this discussion was suggested by the hon. the leader of the House; that there were elections taking place in Ontario, and, although it would be a bad principle, attended with mischievous effects, to attack the Bench on the religious opinions of the Judges, before the House, it was necessary to defeat the Mowat Administration in the interest of Mr. Meredith and those who followed him. These considerations were undoubtedly paramount with the hon. gentleman. The confidence of the people in the administration of justice was a secondary matter. It was of consequence, however, that one gentleman after another should rise in the House, and attack a gentleman on the Bench, an eminent member of the Court of Equity. It was because this gentleman was a brother of a gentleman occupying a prominent position in the country, who had taken an active part in the administration of affairs, and for whom hon. gentlemen opposite had no great admiration or affection, that these hon. gentlemen thought they would wound the feelings of that distinguished gentleman, and by doing so influence the elections, and the Catholic people of Ontario, by the course which they had taken towards Judge Blake; but the opinions expressed by Father Stafford showed that these views were not very likely to be shared by many of that denomination in the Province of Ontario, who were not likely to be misled by the cries of hon. gentleman opposite. He apprehended that, when these elections had taken place, hon. gentlemen opposite would find that, although they might have degraded the Bench, and caused the people to distrust the uprightness of the Judges, and the fairness with which justice was administered, they would not obtain much politically by the course they had seen proper to adopt here this afternoon, or accomplish the results which were being aimed at.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had ventured to make the statement that this debate was brought up and initiated by himself (Sir John A. Macdonald). He would ask the hon. gentleman, as a man of honour, and as a member of Parliament, what ground he had for making such an allegation?

MR. MILLS said that the hon. gentleman was leader of the House, he had seen proper to assist the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan), in bringing forward this question for discussion, and he must have known that the hon. gentleman could not conclude with a motion which was proper for the consideration of the House, and yet friends of the hon. gentleman's, in the last days of the Session, had seen proper, one after another, to rise and attack Vice-Chancellor Blake, and the object of the attack was well understood by the House. There could be no doubt on this point.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had asked the hon. gentleman a plain question—what right, what authority, what evidence he had that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had initiated or encouraged this motion, or the bringing up of this question at all? The hon. gentleman said it was because he assisted his hon. friend in being heard. When a member made a statement of this kind, so gross a statement of this kind, he was bound to prove it, and if he could not prove it he was bound to retract; and, if he did not retract, he must be held up to be a man wanting in veracity, and as a calumniator; and he was obliged to brand the hon. gentleman as being untruthful in this respect, and as a calumniator.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman has assisted members here in calumniating.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD appealed to the member for the county of Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) and his hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Costigan) if there was any communication, directly or indirectly, on this subject by them with him—if their action was prompted by or known to him. He declared, upon his honour as a gentleman, and in his place as a member of Parliament, that there had been no communication, directly or indirectly, with him upon this subject, and the hon. gentleman had ventured to make this statement which was untrue in fact, and which he could not suppose to be true. No man had a right to suppose or assert such a thing unless he had evidence for it. It

was untrue, it was false, it was unvarnished, and the hon. gentleman would be stamped hereafter in this House and out of the House as a man who got up for party motives and made unjust and unwarrantable and false assertions. It was quite true that, when this matter was brought up, he saw there was an evident attempt to put down some young members, and it was his duty to give them fair play. He had laid down a correct principle with respect to motions, and Mr. Speaker had upheld the opinion he ventured to express with respect to the practice of Parliament, and there could be no doubt of the accuracy of Mr. Speaker's judgment, and of his ruling on this point. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) had made an unfounded and unwarrantable attack on him, as having got up this scene. The hon. gentleman should not measure other people by his own bushel, for a man who charged others with unworthy motives, was capable of acting unworthily himself. There was not a shadow of foundation for the hon. gentleman's charge. The subject was divided into two branches, the duty of the House and the duty of the Government. It was quite true that Judges held almost sacred positions, and that their dignity should be maintained. Their characters should be defended, their positions should not be degraded, all the moral weight that Parliament could give should be given to the Judges undoubtedly, but, at the same time, Parliament had authority which governed and guided the country. If a Judge was unworthy of his office, this should be brought before Parliament in a constitutional way, and the Judge should have an opportunity to defend himself. On a joint address to the Crown, if Parliament thought proper, he could be removed, but the Government had no right to make any fishing investigation, or on mere rumour to try and get up evidence against a Judge. Satisfactory evidence must be laid before the Government before they could bring it before Parliament; but a Judge who had exhibited improper traits of temper, or indolence, or habits of procrastination, or who, from other causes, was not so efficient as he ought to be, was liable to be censured or warned by a discussion in Parliament. Such com-

plaints had been often made in the British House of Commons, and, in the case of Baron Smith, an actual adverse vote was taken on account of his political bias and hasty temperament, though this did not involve the Baron's removal. Sir Robert Peel subsequently informed the House that, while it was quite right that such complaints should be aired before the House, and that Judges should be warned that they were not infallible, and that the great public opinion stood over them, there should be no conclusive vote against a Judge unless he had a fair opportunity of being heard, and the House of Commons rescinded their vote. All through the English *Hansard* were strewn matters brought up, not involving the seat of the Judge, but letting him know that, in some way or other, he had failed in his duty, and calling his attention to the necessity of mending his ways. This discussion, he took it, was brought up in this spirit. They must and did read the newspapers. These charges were spread through the country. He did not know whether they were true, but there was no reason in the world why the attention of Parliament should not be drawn to them. If, in an unguarded moment, Judge Blake, or any other Judge, had used unseemly expressions, it was well that he should be warned of it so that he might not commit a like error again. It was useful that Judges should be occasionally informed that they were neither infallible nor immortal. An hon. member had disapproved of the appointment. Mr. Blake did not belong, and never did, to the same party as himself. He was quite aware of this fact when, in his capacity of Minister of Justice, he recommended him. He did so because he believed that Mr. Blake was a good equity lawyer, and would make a good equity Judge, and he was not ashamed of the recommendation. He thought that the course of Mr. Blake was, on the whole—he was, of course, fallible, like other men—such as to justify the recommendation and appointment by the Crown. He had no hesitation in saying it. If the expression mentioned had been really used by Mr. Blake, it was an unseemly remark, and there could be no objection, when unseemly remarks were made by Judges, that they should be spoken of not only in the press, but in the great

council of the nation. He believed from what he could learn, he could not speak at all from personal acquaintance himself, that Mr. Blake's demeanour and conduct and capacity on the Bench were worthy of praise. He found, from talking with leading members of the profession that they considered this gentleman on the whole a worthy and good Judge, and no disgrace to the Bench of Ontario.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said no rebuke to the gentlemen who had been participating in the charges against Vice-Chancellor Blake had been equal to that administered by the Prime Minister. That hon. gentleman, in order to clear his skirts of this matter, had found it necessary to describe the person who had brought it up as a calumniator, and as a man whose word was not to be taken outside of the House or in it. How despicable must be the position of the hon. gentlemen who were described by their leader in such terms. Was it right or proper that an hon. Judge's name should be brought before this House by a member who was not prepared to formulate any charge or to take any steps that would result in anything? His action was based on mere newspaper rumours, and he had reason to believe that they were without foundation. With reference to the motion itself, no one would deny any right or any measure of justice to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan), but was it proper that an honourable Judge of this country should have his name brought before this House on mere newspaper rumours, a member rising, and not prepared to formulate any charge against him, and whose motion, when it appeared before the House, was only to the effect that certain rumours were going about in the newspapers? And yet these very rumours, according to the testimony of a political friend of the hon. gentleman himself, were without foundation.

MR. COSTIGAN said there had been *bonâ fide* charges made in writing by responsible parties, and the names of witnesses given who could prove those charges. He was not resting his claim upon mere charges as they appeared in the newspapers.

MR. PATERSON said it could not be denied that the hon. gentleman saw fit to bring it up at a time when a regular motion could not be made, and that he received the countenance of the First Minister in doing so.

MR. HAY said he had known Vice-Chancellor Blake for twenty-five years, and knew that he was totally incapable of insulting any class of the community. He would say, further, that there was no gentleman in Toronto who stood higher in the esteem of the people than did that gentleman.

MR. WALLACE (South Norfolk) said the hon. member for South Brant had misapprehended the tenor of the remarks of the Premier, as regarded the member for Bothwell. The charge of calumny was not in the statement that was brought forward by the member for Victoria, but it was based upon the motive imputed to the hon. the Premier for allowing that motion to be brought forward. The hon. member for Bothwell charged the hon. the Premier with having invited his followers to bring forward this motion, that he might influence the election in Ontario. That charge the Premier designated as a calumny, and the originator of it as a calumniator.

MR. MCCARTHY said he regretted very much the painful discussion they had listened to. He regretted it because it tended to degrade the Bench, in the stability, and in the honour and integrity of which every member of this House and of the community was interested. He felt that, when a charge of this kind was made, the gentleman who made it ought to put it in a more formal shape than the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) had done. He did not suppose the hon. gentleman had brought it up without believing that it was his duty to do so. He felt some delicacy in attempting to pass an opinion regarding the conduct of that learned Judge, because he had to practise before him from time to time, but, his conduct as a Judge having been impugned, he felt it would be unworthy of him to sit here and not say that, so far as he was acquainted with him, he was not open to the imputations which had been made against him on the floor of the House.

He knew, and he thought he expressed the general opinion of the Bar in Ontario, that, whatever his faults might be—and, like every other man, no doubt he had his faults—he endeavoured to discharge, and did discharge, his duty to the satisfaction of the Bar and the public generally. Now, with regard to the opinion that the Vice-Chancellor formed with regard to a witness who was examined before him, and who happened to have been Archbishop Lynch of Toronto, he (Mr. McCarthy) did not know what right any hon. gentleman had to question the right of a Judge to form an opinion regarding any witness who was examined before him. A Judge was sworn to discharge his duty, and to discharge it impartially, irrespective of persons, and, if he did, on this particular occasion, form a judgment which did not exactly square with the evidence given by the Archbishop, he did not know that the hon. Judge ought to be called to account by that particular reason. Another charge that had been made, if it was true—and he was glad to hear the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) say that he had the best reason to think it was not true—was one that would be painful if it were true, because a lady, having been brought before the learned Judge as a witness, ought to have been protected and not insulted, as it was alleged she had been insulted. He never heard that charge until it was mentioned in the newspapers, and it appeared it had happened several years ago. He felt satisfied the charge could not be true—he trusted, at all events, it was not true. Having said so much, he had only to add that he thought the hon. member for Bothwell had made a most grave and unfair charge against the Premier. There was no desire—and the action taken by a number of gentlemen on that side of the House showed in the plainest way there was no possible desire—to influence the pending elections, by allowing this matter to be brought up. There could have been no such intention, and he was sorry his hon. friend had not the good taste to withdraw the charge thus made.

MR. COSTIGAN said the hon. the leader of the Government had appealed to him with regard to the charge made by the hon. member for Bothwell. He

MR. MCCARTHY.

wished to inform this House that the hon. member for Bothwell himself had as much to do with his action in this matter as the right hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman knew no more that he was to rise at all than the hon. member for Bothwell. He was to have taken a minor part in this debate, but, finding that the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) was blocked by the hon. member for Chateauguay, he then came to his assistance. With the permission of the House, he would ask leave to withdraw the motion.

MR. MCCUAIG : I have had no communication with any member of the Government whatever.

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

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House *resumed* the further consideration of Resolution 88, Pacific Railway, British Columbia, \$600,000, reported from Committee of Supply (April 30th).

MR. MACKENZIE said he objected to this resolution because the money was to be expended in some place not defined ; but there was no use attempting to discuss an amendment in such a small House at this period of the Session.

Resolution *read the first and second times*, and *agreed to*, on a division.

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH PURCHASE BILL.

(*Mr. Tupper.*)

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for House to consider certain resolutions authorising arrangements for the purchase by the Government from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of their line of railway from Rivière du Loup to Hadlow, *read*.

MR. TUPPER said he regretted exceedingly that a measure of such impor-

tance as this should have been postponed to so late a period. It was not his fault, nor could he say it was the fault of any person. He took up this question where it was left by his predecessor, who had it under his consideration, and subsequently the Government decided that, if they could obtain the ownership of that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway between the Chaudière Junction and Rivière du Loup, and the connection with Quebec Harbour at Point Lévis, it would be very desirable to do so. He then communicated to the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. Hickson, that the Government were prepared to receive an offer for the purchase of that portion of the road; in reply to which, that gentleman informed him that he would take an early opportunity to submit a formal offer to the Government. In the meantime that gentleman met with a very severe accident, which prevented his coming here to discuss the question before a very short time ago. From the moment he had been able to come here, no time had been lost in bringing the matter to its present point, and in putting the House in possession of it. The necessity for the purchase of that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway was evident on several grounds. In the first instance, the Act of Union provided that the Intercolonial Railway should be built to connect the waters of the Gulf of the St. Lawrence with the ocean at Halifax. That, practically, could not be carried out in the spirit of the Act without obtaining this connection at Quebec. Then, again, the Grand Trunk Railway had not been enabled to keep up this portion of their railway at all in the condition in which the rest of the Intercolonial Railway was and a great obstruction on the latter railway arose from that fact. It was, he believed, the only portion of the Grand Trunk Railway that had not been relaid with steel rails. It only, therefore, became necessary that they should provide, in the present condition of that company, the means of putting this road in a proper condition; but the fact also was not unimportant in pressing the immediate necessity of carrying out this project that the Grand Trunk Railway had experienced a good deal of difficulty in protecting their trade and maintain-

ing their connection with the West, and the Government had reason to believe that it was at present almost essential in Canadian interests that they should have the means of securing a connection upon which their western trade would considerably depend. Under these circumstances the Government arrived at the conclusion that it was desirable they should obtain the ownership of a railway from Rivière du Loup not only to the Chaudière Junction, but also to Quebec Harbour. They thought that a fair mode of arriving at the price was to look at what expenditure the Government would be obliged to make, provided that road was not in existence. They addressed themselves to that consideration, and those who looked at the papers would see that the road was obtained from Rivière du Loup to the Chaudière Junction, the old iron rails not being purchased, but merely retained until they could relay the road with steel rails very cheaply, at a cost of about \$13,000, or a little under, per mile. Mr. Schreiber had examined this road in 1876, and was instructed to give the Government an estimate of what it would cost to build a similar road. Mr. Schreiber came to the conclusion that it would cost \$1,859,256 to build the road from Rivière du Loup to Chaudière Junction, 119 miles, in the same condition as the Intercolonial. He then estimated the cost of relaying the track with steel rails, and putting it in the same condition as the Intercolonial, at \$356,280, which would leave \$1,502,976, as the lowest sum for which they could obtain a road in the same condition as the Intercolonial. The road from the Chaudière Junction was a very expensive one. The heavy cuttings, and everything else connected with it, would involve a very much greater expenditure than the other portions of the road. They required also to have a terminus at Quebec harbour, and, in order to obtain that, it was necessary to run up six and a quarter miles from Chaudière Junction to Hadlow, a property on which the Grand Trunk Railway, at this moment, with their wharves, engine-house, shops, etc., were paying on an assessment of \$120,000 a year. The 6½ miles with the Hadlow property fur-

nishing them with an independent means of access to the harbour, were put down at \$200,000, which was a very low price, and which brought the total amount, at Mr. Schrieber's estimate, to \$1,700,000 for this property as a very low sum at which they could hope to provide it. It was thought desirable that they should not only have running powers, but that the Government should have actually fee simple, including the terminal property at Hadlow, with a view to being entirely independent of the Grand Trunk connection at Point Lévis. Although the Government did not wish to acquire the valuable station property at Hadlow, the Government arranged that the Grand Trunk Company should have free running powers over the line from the Chaudière Junction to Hadlow, and that they should have free running powers through their station, only paying the actual expense of moving their traffic. These were the propositions, but the Government felt that, although their own engineer had arrived at the conclusion that it was the very lowest estimate he could put on this property, yet, inasmuch as the property was an unprofitable one to the Grand Trunk, that company should not expect to receive the full amount at the hands of the Government, and they, therefore, made a proposition that the highest they could give for the whole of this property was \$1,500,000. The receipts of the line at present exceeded the working expenses by about \$28,000 per annum.

MR. MACKENZIE: Surely not.

MR. TUPPER said he was informed upon good authority, that the receipts during the past year, which was not a profitable one, exceeded the working expenses of the line by about \$28,000. The Government deemed, in a matter of such importance, that it would not be unwise to have additional information, and, although they had carefully scrutinised and verified Mr. Schrieber's statements, so as to leave no doubt that he had made a very low estimate, they sent his report to Mr. Shanly, with a request that he would favour the Government with his opinion on it. Among the papers submitted would be found a letter from Mr. Shanly, in which he estimated the 119 miles, in the property the Gov-

ernment had purchased, exclusive of the old iron rails, at a value of \$1,758,000, and Mr. Shanly assured him (Mr. Tupper), in the most emphatic terms, that, even with the low price of labour and steel rails, and the favourable time for railway construction, if the ground was clear he did not believe it would be possible to build a road in the same condition for that amount of money. To that he added, for the 6½ miles with the Hadlow property, \$300,000, or a total of \$2,100,000, which was the value Mr. Shanly placed upon the property. He had already stated that their offer to the Grand Trunk was over \$200,000 below Mr. Schrieber's estimate, and \$600,000 below Mr. Shanly's estimate. The House could see that the Government had attached a good deal of importance to the object for which this money was to be used by the Grand Trunk Railway, and they had, in the resolutions, made provision for the retention of power in their hands, which would enable them to see that this money was expended in a way that they believed would eminently conduce to promote the trade and business interests of Canada.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is, expended on the railway.

MR. TUPPER said no, it was to be expended in securing the Western connections of the Grand Trunk Railway, not the existing line. When the subject was brought to the attention of Parliament, last year, he then, as he had always done, regarded it as of the greatest importance. He drew the attention of the then First Minister and Minister of Public Works, to the importance of securing, in the negotiations with the Grand Trunk, in regard to the Rivière du Loup line, bonds by which the Intercolonial would be secure against any desire or interest, on the part of the Grand Trunk, to divert the trade to Portland. They had provided for that here.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not understand that it is provided for.

MR. TUPPER said he thought they were effectually secured against the contingency to which he drew attention. There was, of course, the additional ad-

MR. TUPPER.

vantage that, by securing the ownership of the harbour of Quebec, they would be in connection with the railway on the North Shore, and would not be so entirely dependent on the Grand Trunk for all their traffic as they were before the construction of that line. That would be an additional guarantee to the country; a guarantee that they would always obtain from the Grand Trunk most favourable rates as an inducement to continue the connection of trade and business as it previously and now existed. He thought hon. gentlemen would find that they had made arrangements, which, if ratified by the House, would enable them to obtain possession of the property at a reasonable rate, and upon terms which would thoroughly secure the interests of Canada in relation to its purchase.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, when he gave notice last year, he gave it simply for the purpose of obtaining the sanction of Parliament before acting. The matter had occupied his attention for more than two years before, because he found trains were seriously delayed on the Intercolonial. On the other hand, he was extremely anxious to avoid purchasing any more railroads. He believed no railroads should be purchased by the State, and he believed they were only making them until some arrangement could be made to transfer them to private companies. He was, therefore, indisposed to purchase it at almost any rate. Another thing naturally occurred to him, which must have occurred to hon. gentlemen opposite, and that was, that the commercial value of the road was nothing compared with the actual value of the road. The Grand Trunk invariably complained that they had lost a large sum in operating it up to the time the Intercolonial was opened, and he understood that, even up to the end of last year, there was a loss. It was, therefore, desirable for the Grand Trunk, at almost any price, to get rid of the burden of maintaining this road. He must recal to the House the fact that they had already a very large interest in the road. There was 864 miles altogether of the Grand Trunk Railway in Canada, and upon that the Government of Canada had advanced a sum considerably in excess of

\$15,000,000, or something over \$17,000 per mile. So if they took the \$4,500,000 applied on the Victoria bridge, which cost a large sum of money, there would still remain an amount of over \$10,000 per mile which the old Province of Canada had paid for the purpose of constructing the Grand Trunk Railway. He felt that, whatever price they might pay for this branch, if they paid it at all, they were buying back a road which had been constructed with Government money to a great extent. He felt that branch was of practically little value to anyone and of much less value to Canada than anyone else. There was nothing in the Terms of Union which compelled them to keep up a communication with Quebec. They reached the connecting link long before they reached Rivière du Loup, but, as a commercial enterprise, it was undoubtedly necessary to maintain connection with Quebec. In some way they must have control of the Rivière du Loup Branch, but he would have preferred that control to have been by lease. The objection to extend their railway proprietorship was what led him to this conclusion. But there was another thing of serious import, and that was, if the Grand Trunk Railroad had its line terminating at Point Lévis there would be a direct temptation to send traffic to Portland. The hon. Minister of Public Works thought he had done what would prevent that by Order in Council. That simply provided that the charges should be *pro rata* on both lines. The hon. gentleman would see something more than that was required. He (Mr. Mackenzie) discussed that matter with the railroad authorities several times, and he was never able to obtain satisfaction upon that point. The Grand Trunk had about 120 more miles of railroad to Portland than they had to the junction of the Government road at Point Lévis. Although the rate was the same they would naturally desire to send more of their traffic where they had the larger mileage. He would like to see something more provided in order to insure the Western traffic over their road. He would not blame the Grand Trunk authorities if they sent the bulk of their traffic over the road that paid them best, but he de-

sired to point out that there was a direct temptation in every way to send the bulk of their freight to Portland. He knew the hon. gentleman would get his resolutions through the House, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) would point out this danger to him in the expectation that he would yet be able to make some more stringent arrangement that would secure the passage of the traffic over our own road.

MR. TUPPER: If the hon. gentleman will give me any suggestion, it is not too late to offer it.

MR. MACKENZIE said he quite admitted the difficulty. All that took place between himself and the railroad authorities was an assurance from them that they would be prepared to enter into any arrangement that would be made to secure the Government against the anticipated loss of traffic. If the papers had come down sooner, so that they could have had them printed, and had some preliminary discussion two or three weeks ago, they might have suggested some ideas which it would have been advisable to utilise. As it was, he had only to mention that as serious objection to acquiring the proprietorship. By having only a lease of the road, and the Grand Trunk Company still interested as proprietor, they would have a hold on them, and it was for that reason, chiefly, with the other, a dislike of acquiring any further railroad property, that he had almost concluded that the leasing of the road, even if they should advance some money or guarantee a certain amount of bonds, instead of an annual rent, would have been the preferable plan. But he quite admitted there were difficulties in the way of carrying it out. But he saw very clearly that the actual purchase of the road put us out of the field in competing with them when they had an Atlantic terminus so much nearer than ours. Mr. Schrieber's valuation was, as nearly as he (Mr. Mackenzie) could ascertain, correct, as a valuation of property, but it was not correct as a valuation of it as a commercial property. Its value, in that respect, was extremely small. They could not have taken traffic over it another winter. It would have become absolutely necessary to have

MR. MACKENZIE.

had the road relaid with new rails. As the matter stood, he could only express his regret that something of that kind was not done, rather than the purchase of the road.

MR. TUPPER said that he had in his hands a statement of receipts and expenditures for the last two years. For the year ending 30th June, 1877, the receipts were \$176,998, expenditures, \$156,892.14, or a surplus of \$25,605.86.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does that embrace the usual repairs to locomotives, cars, and everything of that kind?

MR. TUPPER said it covered everything usually charged against revenue. For the year ending June 30th, 1878, the receipts were \$221,220, and expenditure \$192,649.18, or a surplus of \$28,670.82. He wanted to ask the hon. gentleman if he did not recognise the advantage of purchasing instead of leasing that road, in connection with the other feature to which he had adverted, the aid it would afford the Grand Trunk at a crisis in its history, in the struggle in which it was engaged for the purpose of retaining Canadian trade, and maintaining the Grand Trunk as a great through route for Canada. The acquisition of that branch would give a degree of assistance to the Grand Trunk that, in the interest of Canada, was not undesirable.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no doubt about that, as stated by the Minister of Public Works, being a very serious matter. His (Mr. Mackenzie's) own attention was directed to it more than a year ago—to the connection of the Canadian railroads with the West. The knowledge of what our two great railroads had done for the development of the country would induce him to go a great way in giving such aid as the Government might reasonably and properly afford. But, on the other hand, this scheme amounted to giving \$2,000,000 to a road largely aided before, though he did not say too largely aided, in view of its benefits to Canada. Still, for those \$2,000,000 they would receive very little. He admitted that if the thing was properly done, and the money wisely disposed of, it would produce, in a general way, some little return in benefits to

trade and increased traffic through the country.

MR. PLUMB said that, as the member for Lambton had observed, the Grand Trunk had laid out a vast amount of money in Canada, and the Government of Canada had advanced a large amount for the purpose of aiding the Grand Trunk to build its line. But it must be remembered that the Government of Canada had given up its lien upon the Grand Trunk, and to say that they were buying back their own road was certainly a fallacy. The Grand Trunk, staggering under an enormous debt, without the means of extending its line, was encountering an opposition which would utterly destroy it and take away its traffic, if not in some way protected by legislation in Canada. If they wanted in any way to protect their Canadian system, over which they could send their freight, and travel with any kind of safety, they must regard the conditions by which the Grand Trunk was connected with the traffic towards Halifax. Everyone knew that the Rivière du Loup Branch was an excrescence and tax upon the Grand Trunk; but it was a mistake to say it had no value. The bondholders paid for it, giving Canada that accommodation which Canadians did not half appreciate; and it was in the interest of the bondholders that he hoped that the Parliament of Canada would, in every case of this kind, remember their sacrifices, and deal with them not in a captious, but in a liberal spirit. He believed that what the Government proposed was a perfectly legitimate thing for Parliament to do. He thought it was in the interest of the country to acquire that road and put it in repair. While the negotiations proceeded, the line had been allowed to run down. The price named was far below the actual cost of the line, as estimated by Mr. Shanly. There could be no bargain, or such a thing, in this matter. They would be possessing themselves of a property necessary for the establishment of a through line from the west to the east in the public interests of Canada; and, in order to make that line perfect, they could not ask the bondholders, or others interested, to put that

piece of the road into repair, or in as good condition as the line to the west and east of it. If they leased the line they could not control the repairs. This scheme seemed to be a practical necessity. It seemed to be a business matter, which, he thought, commended itself to the judgment of everyone who had heard the statements on the subject made in the House.

MR. DOMVILLE said he would throw the responsibility for this scheme on Mr. Schreiber, and other engineers, who had advocated this purchase. The Minister of Public Works said it was Messrs. Schreiber and Shanly. If the scheme was a good one, it would stand for itself. Considering the discouragement he (Mr. Domville) had met with the other night, in the advocacy of the rights of New Brunswick, he felt he had a right to demand that, if that railroad were purchased, the Lower Provinces should receive some guarantee that they were to receive better service, and be relieved of the difficulty they were informed of the other night, in regard to through freights. If they were to make that large expenditure, it should be for the benefit of the whole country. The representatives of the Lower Provinces had a right to demand that, while they experienced the odium of a large expenditure of money on the railroad to Halifax, they should receive concurrent advantages. He would say nothing in regard to the purchase of the railroad, because he believed the Minister of Public Works had taken the advice of the engineers. It was something that he would be able to inform his constituents that the late and the present Ministers of Public Works had worked hand-in-hand for that purchase, which consequently must be right.

MR. ANGLIN said there must be some considerations to induce the country to purchase that road at so large a price beyond its actual and productive value. True, it had been in very poor condition for some years. He supposed they might take it for granted that the company were not willing or able to expend a very large amount to keep it in proper condition. While it remained in its present condition, the carrying of freight and passengers over it must be unsatisfactory. The other consideration

for the purchase and the payment of so large a price, that it would enable the Grand Trunk to meet its connections in the far West, was a consideration that ought to have much weight with the Government and Parliament, although it was directly contrary to the consideration which the Minister of Public Works asked them to give way to when determining whether they should build the Pacific Railway to Burrard Inlet or not. It was considered a strong objection to the Burrard Inlet route that they should have any connection with the United States railway system. On this side of the Rocky Mountains it was of very great importance that their connections with the American system should be as complete as possible, so that they might bring in and carry over Canadian railroads all possible American traffic. But the Minister of Public Works did not perceive the inconsistency of his arguments and course with regard to those two subjects. He trusted that, as that hon. gentleman attached so much importance to completing the connection of the Grand Trunk in the west with the American system, he would be similarly influenced in determining the selection of the route, in the far West, which would regard the probability of connection with the Oregon system of railroads in a proper light. He thought the hon. gentleman had made a mistake in saying it was an objection to the Burrard Inlet route that it would be possible to connect with the American system of railroads. He (Mr. Anglin) had felt himself, for a long time, that the Dominion, having built the rest of the railroad, should also own that portion between Rivière du Loup and Quebec, that the original idea of connecting Halifax and Quebec by a great public railway should be fully carried out. He had always attached much importance to that, and yet he admitted that, if they did carry it out, they would have to pay a very large price for what, after all, was very little more than sentiment in the matter. It mattered very little to the public whether flour went over the Grand Trunk, or over the Government railway, but it mattered very much to the company who owned this branch at present if they got rid of it on favourable terms. The expense of

maintaining this road would be very heavy, and a very large additional burden would be imposed on the people of this country thereby. There could be no doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway Company were making a splendid bargain. The Government were going to pay for this property very much more than it was worth, in a commercial point of view,—he would not say an excessive price, in view of the opinions of Messrs. Schreiber and Shanly; nevertheless, it was a very handsome price to pay for it.

Mr. HOLTON said there could be no doubt that the purchase of the property, so far as commercial purposes were concerned, however necessary it might be as a connecting link between the Grand Trunk above and the Intercolonial below, was equivalent to a grant of money directly to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It might be judicious to make that grant for the reasons stated, but it would be infinitely preferable to make that grant direct, with certain clearly defined stipulations as to the use to be made of the money, and let them keep the road, because they could operate it more economically than the Government. It was a great misfortune that the Government of this country should be placed in the position of being obliged to operate a great many hundreds of miles of railway, and it was a great objection to this scheme that it proposed to add to these hundreds of miles of railway a line already in existence, while it was the obvious interest of this country to diminish this railway responsibility, so long as the proper service of the country could be performed through private agencies. He thought there was a great deal in the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), as to the inducement which the company would have by the diminution of their interest in the direction of this line, to take freight by way of Portland. If they continued to hold this branch, they would have a much more lively interest in attracting traffic to the public railway, than if they were deprived of this 125 miles of road. His (Mr. Holton's) view would be to let the Grand Trunk Railway Company keep this line of railroad and operate it,

which they could do more advantageously than the Government could. The Government might aid the company in obtaining the traffic from the extreme west to the extreme east, and extending its western connections. He preferred that the Government should aid them directly by a money grant than that there should be any more losses. There was another point to which he wished to call attention. It was the habit, in discussing the partition of public works paid for by the Dominion, to compute the expenditure in the various Provinces, and the first effect of the proposition now before the House would be computed as an expenditure in the Province of Quebec, where \$2,000,000, was about being paid for a road which the Province did not want, and for that reason alone the expenditure would not be received with much pleasure by the people of that Province.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that, after hearing the proposition discussed on its merits, he was not disposed to assume any responsibility, but he left that on the shoulders of the Government. Hon. gentlemen would recollect that, whenever the predecessor of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), quoted the opinion of his engineers, as he was always ready to take their advice, and be guided by their professional knowledge and experience, he used to be a good deal laughed at; but, after listening to this discussion, he (Mr. Huntington) wished to know if the hon. the Minister of Public Works had not come round to the advisability of adopting such a course himself. The hon. gentleman had himself assumed the mantle worn by the hon. member for Lambton, and found that he too must take advantage of the knowledge of the engineers by whom he was surrounded, although he had laughed at his predecessor for doing the same thing.

Resolutions read the first and second times, and agreed to, on a division.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 119) For the acquisition by the Dominion of a certain portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, to be made part of the Intercolonial Railway.

Bill read the first time.

MR. TUPPER moved the second reading of the Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE asked what was meant by these words in the 1st section: "Interest shall be paid on the value of such rails as may not be taken up or delivered to the company, according to agreement?"

MR. TUPPER said the agreement would provide that they should have free use of the rails for a year and-a-half, to give them an opportunity to relay the track with steel rails, and, if they were not ready to do so, they would pay a rate of six per cent. interest on the portion they were still using, until they were delivered.

MR. MACKENZIE: What are the terms of the agreement as to the payment?

MR. TUPPER: That whenever the road is handed over under the agreement, they will be entitled to their money.

MR. MACKENZIE: How does this sale of the road by the company, and its purchase by the Government, affect the position of the bondholders of the company, because I fear that the Company are parting with rights which are not theirs to sell?

MR. TUPPER: They must acquire them before they can sell them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: They must give a good title before they can get the money.

MR. MACKENZIE said he feared if the company parted with two millions' worth of that road, we would have demands made upon us by the English bondholders to recoup them.

MR. TUPPER said he was instructed that the bondholders had the same right to vote as the other members of the company, and, therefore, no sale could be effected until they were all committed to it. At all events, he could say to the hon. gentleman, that care would be taken that no money would be paid until an undefeasible title to the property was obtained.

MR. HOLTON asked if the sale should not be made subject to the ap-

proval of the various classes of security-holders who had a right to vote. He knew that in some Grand Trunk Acts which had been before the House in past years, a reservation was inserted, subject to the approval of the shareholders of the various classes, naming them, if it were necessary, as the security-holders, the shareholders and the bondholders. He mentioned that in conversation a few days ago with a gentleman representing the Grand Trunk, who told him that that would be done.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he believed, as a matter of fact, all the holders of securities, whether preferential or original bondholders, had a right to vote, and, therefore, he thought that under this clause that matter would be settled. If it were not, he should have deemed it inadvisable to put in a clause in this Bill which might be held to recognise a lien or mortgage of these various classes of bondholders. It was no affair of the Government what the various claims, or the moral or equitable considerations of these people might be; all they had to do was to see that in any case the titles were good.

MR. HOLTON said the position of all these classes of security-holders was defined by Canadian Statute at this moment in force. It seemed to him that, in any legislation that ensued, they ought to be consistent with themselves.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, according to his recollection of transactions with the Grand Trunk, he did not think the bonds were made specific mortgages. He did not think that these bonds were specific liens or mortgages on any square inch of the Grand Trunk. They were claims against the assets of the Grand Trunk, and nothing more; and, it would be a great mistake if they were, by legislative enactment, to declare that these people had a mortgage or lien. All the Crown had to do was to take the best legal advice, and, if it appeared that there was a clear legal and equitable title, conveyed by the Grand Trunk to the Government, the money would be paid, and not before. It would be infinitely better to leave it in that way. But, if they put a clause in, recognising directly, or indirectly, in any way

the different classes, they would be doing what the bondholders had no right to ask from them. They had no right to ask any additional legislation, or to get any new recognition of their various interests under this Act. It was better to leave it as it stood for the protection of the interest of the Dominion, and for the quiet and early settlement of this title.

MR. HOLTON suggested that it would be better to allow it to stand until tomorrow, and, the Government, in the meantime, could look into the question. Of course, the Bill would pass in five minutes, if the Government satisfied the House that it was prudent to pass it as it was.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that in a Bill carried through some years ago, under the auspices of Mr. Brydges, an agent of the Grand Trunk, by Mr. Dorion, Minister of Justice, all the bonds were made into stock, and the bondholders were made shareholders, except in the equipment bonds, and they were principally charged on the rolling stock, so that there would be no difficulty really in making a good title. It was of great consequence that Parliament should not, directly or indirectly, by any legislation, alter, amend, or improve, or affect in any way the condition of the old bondholders. Whatever their rights were, they were there by law; they could be ascertained by legal men, and it must be seen that all equitable or legal claims of bondholders were fully swept off before a clear and marketable title was made and the money paid over. He thought it would be safe to leave it as it was, as in an ordinary case of expropriation for any Government purpose whatever.

MR. HOLTON said, if the right hon. gentleman, after looking at the Statute, thought so, they would all be of that opinion too, but he really thought a more recent Statute, at all events, ought to be examined before the Bill went any further, especially as no time would be lost. The line recommended by the right hon. gentleman might be a true line, but they were adopting it ignorantly. In a matter of this sort they ought to look at the Statutes. They did not want

MR. HOLTON.

to hamper the Grand Trunk Railway in any way, but they did not want to put it into the power of a certain class of bondholders to say that they were legislating away their rights. At all events, they ought to see they were not doing it.

SIR JOHN. A. MACDONALD said he could understand that his hon. friend was a Conservative in all these matters; he wished he was a Conservative in another higher and better sense. In this sense his hon. friend was a great protector of vested rights, and as such was one of the most valuable members of this House. But, really, they had got very little time before them, and he would like to see some progress made. He would be glad to go with his hon. friend to-morrow and look into the Statutes. If they found they had made a mistake in this legislation, they could easily get the Senate to correct it. In the meanwhile, it would be a great thing to get through the Bill to-night.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he noticed, in the second section of this Act, that the payment of the purchase money was made absolute in cash. Now, he could understand there might be necessary reasons for doing that, but he should have thought it would have been more expedient to have taken the option of paying in bonds at a certain rate. They were about to require to raise a very large sum of money; \$10,000,000 at least were asked for on capital account in the Estimates of the next year. There was also a very large sum of money falling due in England, and it did appear to him that it was exposing them to the gravest inconvenience to stipulate absolutely for the payment of the sum of \$1,500,000 in cash. It would have been more prudent to have reserved, at any rate, the option of handing over the bonds at some fixed rate, or paying cash, as might be found most convenient.

MR. TILLEY said there was some difficulty in handing over bonds to individuals, especially as the Government might be in the market at the same time. It might affect the Government to have \$1,500,000 in the hands of the Grand Trunk Company, disposing of them

at the same time the Government were placing securities on the market.

Bill read the second and third times, and passed.

SUPPLY.—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions 294 to 296, reported from Committee of Supply (May 12th), read the first and second times, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and means.

(In the Committee.)

The following Resolutions were agreed to, and ordered to be reported:—

"1. Resolved, That, towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1879, the sum of \$1,003,370.24 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

"2. Resolved, That, towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1880, the sum of \$23,612,455.31 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada."

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

MR. TILLEY moved concurrence in the resolutions.

MR. MACKENZIE said the House had yet to get the information concerning the Letellier matter. He spoke on behalf the of hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) and the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), neither of whom was in his place. He could not let this opportunity pass without getting the information in their absence.

MR. HOLTON said he supposed the right hon. gentleman would come to an agreement that the matter should be taken up on the second reading of the Supply Bill, to-morrow, as the House had been promised an opportunity to discuss the matter. It would be in the last degree improper that Parliament should rise without the fullest informa-

tion in the possession of the Government being placed before them.

MR. TUPPER said that matters must reach a certain stage before they could be submitted to Parliament. An old Parliamentarian like his hon. friend from Châteauguay would attach no great importance to procedure and form to insist that a matter of this kind should be laid before Parliament before it had reached its full development.

MR. HOLTON said that the Government, on their responsibility, announced to Parliament that a leading member of their Administration had been despatched on an important mission to the Court of St. James. That gentleman was now at sea, and, in a matter of such importance, the Government might hold Parliament until his return, which they were assured would be very speedy. At all events, the House was entitled to the fullest information which the Government could give in regard to the whole matter.

MR. MILLS said it had always been the practice in England, in fact it was by that that the authority of the House of Commons grew up, that all grounds of complaint should receive consideration, and be redressed when the supplies were under consideration, as a condition under which these supplies were obtained. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had informed the House that His Excellency had not seen proper to accept their advice, and had referred this question to England. Therefore, a supporter of the Administration put a notice on the paper, intended as an attack on His Excellency, and an exculpation of the Administration. The notice declared, in effect, that the reference of these affairs to England was an unconstitutional proceeding. The speech of the hon. the Premier, in answer to the hon. member who had complained of this reference, invited the motion which that hon. gentleman put on the notice paper. The press of Quebec, which supported the Administration, had indulged in violent attacks upon His Excellency from that hour down to the present. Those hon. gentlemen, members of the Administration, it was true, came down afterwards and informed the House that they were responsible for this reference to England,

MR. HOLTON.

but they had previously informed the House that they regretted it had been made. In fact, they intimated to Parliament that the advice they had given had not been acted on, and it was with reference to the conduct of His Excellency, as distinguished from the advice given by the Government, that the motion was made. Had the Government regarded this notice as a vote of want of confidence, they would have insisted on the motion being dealt with; but the motion, having been intended to extenuate their conduct, and to aim at that of His Excellency, a wholly different course had been adopted. The Government had taken every step necessary to complete the business of the Session, yet had allowed the motion to stand for weeks on the paper, and were prepared to allow the House to rise without the question being dealt with.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said hon. gentlemen opposite would settle among themselves what the meaning of this motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) was. The other day the hon. member for Châteauguay (Mr. Holton) said this was a distinct vote of want of confidence in the present Administration. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did not agree with the great Parliamentary authority, his friend from Châteauguay, and said it was not a vote of want of confidence.

MR. HOLTON: That shows the necessity of a debate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. member for Bothwell said a good follower of the Government had been incited to bring on this motion for the purpose of throwing blame on the Governor-General, and getting the Government out of the scrape. Both cannot be true.

MR. MACKENZIE: Which is true?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said neither was true. It was not a vote of want of confidence, it was not a censure on the Governor-General. The hon. gentleman made a proposition that the reference to England, a thing which had been of annual occurrence since Canada had a Constitution, that the continuance of that practice was subversive of

responsible government. He thought they could fairly afford to discuss the abstract constitutional question, but he did not see the sense of making the motion as it had been made. However, as he said the other day, when discussing this motion, he hoped to have another opportunity of discussing it, but he might be disappointed.

MR. MACKENZIE : What do you think ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, happily, in these days they had means of speedy communication with England, and he would be delighted to be able to give such information regarding the decision of Her Majesty's Ministers as would satisfy hon. gentlemen. The moment the question was decided, Parliament would be able to take it up and deal with it. Our privileges and our rights were safe in the hands of Her Majesty's advisers, whether they were Liberals or Conservatives. Therefore, they could keep their souls in patience and carry the Supply Bill. They knew that no privileges, or rights, or freedom, would be invaded in any way whatever.

MR. HOLTON said the hon. gentleman raised the bugbear of stoppage of supplies. It was not a question of that. They were quite willing to allow the resolutions to be read a second and third time that night, but they wanted it understood that the fulfilment of the promise of the hon. gentlemen, with regard to the Letellier matter, should take place on the second reading of the Supply Bill. These explanations were eminently fit and proper, and he did not think the House should rise without them.

MR. SPEAKER : I put the question.

MR. HOLTON : No ; I want an understanding on this point.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I have stated all I intend to state to-night. I make no agreement at all about it.

Several Hon. MEMBERS : Carried.

MR. HOLTON : Hon. gentlemen may save themselves the trouble of crying "carried" ; it cannot be carried to-night.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : All right. If the hon. gentleman chooses to take the responsibility of objecting, he can do so. It will cost the country \$100,000 more, that is all.

MR. HOLTON : The hon. gentleman throws menaces across the House.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre) : I rise to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : I declare concurrence to be taken to-morrow.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 94.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

SENATE AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House agree to the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill.

MR. MILLS said there was a large number of Indians at Selkirk, half-breeds, who were embraced within the treaty. They were no more entitled to be within the treaty than the people of Ottawa. Some of them were three-fourths white. He was of opinion that it would be better to induce these people to withdraw from the treaty arrangements. It would be better they should come under the regulation with regard to half-breeds, and receive a certain allotment of lands, for they were perfectly competent to take care of themselves and their interests. It was unfortunate that they were embraced in the treaty, but the effect of it would be to keep them in it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that that was the main principle of the Bill—that any half-breeds admitted under the treaty might be allowed to withdraw on refunding all the moneys received under it. There could be no objection to that, for half-breeds who had come under the treaty, and had received money, wished to be treated as half-breeds or whites, rather than as Indians, and, if they paid the money back, there could be no objection.

MR. MILLS said they could withdraw under any circumstances. The only

effect of this would be the preventing of their becoming residents or taking up land as settlers, under the Homestead Law. The effect would be to keep them Indians, if they paid them the money, instead of encouraging them to withdraw from that state. A large number of them were capable of taking care of themselves, and it was for the interest of the country to get rid of them as wards, as soon as possible.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the law already provided that a person claiming to be an Indian should be so considered. This provision enabled him to free himself of that character, and become a half-breed, on paying back the money received. He would move the adoption of the amendment.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) said that the amendment of the Senate was in the direction of that desired by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), though not to the full extent. It was to the effect that the recipient should account for what money he had received; in other words, if a half-breed, he should receive more than if an Indian.

Senate amendments *agreed to.*

ELIZA MARIA CAMPBELL RELIEF BILL.

[BILL 99.]

(*Mr. Macdougall.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on Mr. Macdougall's motion for the third reading of the Bill, and Mr. Mills's motion in amendment thereto (May 9th) *read.*

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had asked for the adjournment of this motion in order that he might say a few words with respect to it. Though the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill had shown that he had thoroughly studied the subject, and though his opinion as an expert was worthy of all consideration, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was not at all convinced by the argument of that hon. gentleman. He thought that his Bill was *ultra vires*, that they had no right to pass such a Bill, and that it would be of no value as a Statute. The line between the powers of the Local and Gen-

MR. MILLS.

eral Legislatures was easily marked. The division was so clear that there could be little or no hesitation as to deciding where the power to deal with the subject rested. If it rested anywhere, it was with the Provincial Legislatures, and not with the Dominion Parliament. It was true, they were told that the Statute providing for all matters relating to marriage and divorce, was to be reserved exclusively for the Dominion Parliament. Obviously it meant it had the sole control of the legislation respecting the formation and dissolution of the marriage tie, and there was no other power given it by the Statute. Now, a divorce *a mensâ et thoro*, a judicial separation, although commonly called a divorce, was not a divorce or breach of the marriage tie; it did not relieve the woman from being a wife, or the man from being a husband, and, therefore, the separation which this Bill contemplated was not a divorce in the sense of the power given in the Statute. Consequently, this House had no right to deal with it. Had the Bill been a Divorce Bill in all its sense and substance, a severance *a vinculo matrimonii*, it would have been distinctly within their power; that was what the Imperial Parliament intended to confer. It did not intend they should deal with the question of husband and wife so long as they were so. That came under the provision that Local Legislatures should have the exclusive right of dealing with all matters of property and civil rights; and unless some question arose, which, *ex necessitate*, was connected with some of the general powers given to the general Parliament, they must belong to the Local. That was his opinion. He believed that the Act would be utterly worthless, and must vote against it. Then, again, he thought it exceedingly inexpedient to mingle, when it could be avoided, the judicial and legislative power. He thought it was very unfortunate when the Legislature interfered with the ordinary tribunals of the country. He did not wish to say a single word as to the merits of this case—as to the guilt or innocence of this woman, or whether it was a conspiracy or not. But they knew there had been an action for criminal conversation brought by the husband against the man,

and a verdict found against him, which had been upheld by the Court. An application was made to the Court of Chancery for alimony, which was dismissed, the Judge giving, as his reasons for it, his belief that the evidence criminated the woman. There was an action for defamation of character brought by the woman against one of the witnesses against her. He pleaded a justification. True, she got a verdict from a jury, but the Court set it aside, as being contrary to the evidence. Under those circumstances, it seemed to him that, if they allowed this Bill to pass, parties, after being defeated, or failing to attain their object by the tribunals, would convert Parliament into a Court for the trial of causes, which would be a blow to the whole of our judicial system; it would make this assembly, which was the best means of legislation, and was believed, by the Constitution, to be well adapted for legislation, a tribunal, though about the worst tribunal possible for such trials. For those reasons he would vote against the Bill.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he was very sorry to be obliged to say a word in opposition to the legal opinion of the right hon. gentleman, for whose opinion no hon. gentleman had a greater regard than himself. But, in the course of twenty years parliamentary service, and in a considerable period of association with the right hon. gentleman, he had had occasion sometimes to differ with him as strongly as now, and sometimes successfully. As he (Mr. Macdougall) read the Constitution, this Parliament had exclusive jurisdiction in the matter now before it. There were two kinds of divorce—the greater and the lesser. The hon. gentleman admitted that this Parliament had jurisdiction over the greater, and, by a parity of reasoning, he (Mr. Macdougall) thought the lesser was included. The only power given to the Local Legislature was to decide as to the mode of solemnising marriage. A large committee of able and experienced men in the other branch of the Legislature, some of whom were lawyers, and one or two of them very distinguished lawyers, heard the whole of this evidence, through a long examination, saw the demeanour of the witnesses,

knew how much credence to give them; and they came deliberately to the conclusion that the charge against this woman was the result of a conspiracy. And, when a case of this kind came before Parliament—the only tribunal that could deal with it—it was not too much to expect that Parliament should exercise its power, and do justice in this case. If the law should turn out to be *ultra vires*, there was the ordinary mode of dealing with it. They had a tribunal established for the purpose of determining just such questions. Let this case then go to that tribunal, where it could be argued, and the power of Parliament in this matter determined upon. He contended they had the power to pass this Bill. This Parliament had the power of making laws with respect to the property of insolvents, then why should not it have the same power in this case?

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said that, after much consideration, he had come to the conclusion that this Parliament had power to pass this Bill. The Court of Chancery of Ontario had power to give Mrs. Campbell alimony, but it could not grant those separate rights, such as were obtained by a woman who had been granted judicial separation, and the Local Legislature could not do so without interference with the subject of marriage and divorce, jurisdiction in which, he (Mr. Cameron) contended, was vested in this Parliament. Therefore, he would vote for the Bill.

MR. MILLS said he would move the three months' hoist. He was of opinion that this Parliament ought not to claim a jurisdiction that did not belong to it. He had looked into the question with some care since the Bill was introduced, and he was very strongly of the opinion that this Parliament had not the jurisdiction, and that it would be very unwise to pass this Bill. If they wished to find a correct interpretation of the word divorce, as used in the British North America Act, they were obliged to look to what the English Government, in dealing with the colonies, spoke of as divorce. It was also necessary to see what was the practice in the English Courts, and the policy of the

English Government, at the time when the subject of divorce was dealt with by the Colonial Office. When they did that, they found that, at one time, in England, the jurisdiction in matters of divorce from bed and board was vested in the Ecclesiastical Courts, but, after the Reformation, divorce from the marriage bond was granted by the Legislature. It was with reference to divorce from the marriage bond that the Colonial Office spoke in the instructions to the Governors of Canada. In the instructions given to Lord Dufferin, and to all his predecessors, there was an express provision that all Bills relating to the subject of divorce should be reserved for Her Majesty's approval. Now, obviously, that meant divorce from the marriage bond, and not from bed and board. In fact, divorce from bed and board, in the earlier works of civilians, was never spoken of as divorce, it was simply judicial separation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdougall) said the British North America Act showed that the subject of the solemnisation of marriage was carved out of the subject of marriage and divorce, and conferred on the Local Legislatures, and he inferred that that power was to be strictly construed; leaving the larger question of marriage and divorce to this Parliament with all the incidents attending it. There was another provision of the Act they must look at if they were to take a proper view of the question, and that was that the Local Legislatures had control over property and civil rights. Now, what was meant by that? It embraced all the civil relations, domestic and commercial, that could interest a people or community, and it would embrace marriage and divorce if there was no qualification or exception of those terms. Now, when they carved the subject of marriage and divorce out of the subject of civil rights, they were strictly to construe the power of marriage and divorce, leaving the large power of property and civil rights to operate in its full extent, apart from this particular provision. Now, if the hon. gentleman who moved this Bill was correct, all the domestic relations would be under the control of this Legislature, for all the domestic relations were incidents of marriage. Whether a child should obtain his or her majority at eighteen or

twenty-one or twenty-five years of age, would be for the Legislature to say; whether property should descend to the eldest son or be distributed among all the children, would be for the Legislature to say; who should be the guardians of children; whether a child should be under the control of the father or the mother—all these questions would be under the control of this Legislature. When they legislated in the various Provinces with regard to these subjects, we were interfering with the subject of marriage in the sense used by the mover of this Bill, because they were dealing with the incidents of marriage. Whether a woman should hold her property independently of her husband, or whether his consent should be necessary in all cases where she sold or encumbered it; whether it should be subject to the debts of the husband; whether the husband should be subjected to an unlimited liability for his wife's debts, prior to marriage, were subjects which, according to the hon. gentleman's views, were all vested in this Legislature. In Ontario, they had legislated as to the rights of married women over property, and all these things which related to the subject of property were the direct subject of property and of civil rights, not incidents of marriage, as the term was used in our Constitution. He was perfectly satisfied of the accuracy of this opinion. He had no doubt the hon. gentleman was equally convinced of the correctness of his own view, but he thought the hon. gentleman had been largely influenced in his conclusions by the fact of his having dealt with the case as counsel, and they all knew to what an extent that relation to the party interested biased one's judgment. He (Mr. Mills) had no motive for refusing to consider the merits of the Bill, if they had jurisdiction, but he was strongly convinced that jurisdiction was vested elsewhere. It would certainly lead to much confusion if they took the view of the hon. gentleman. Take the case of the Province of Quebec, which had a code dealing with the subject according to her own views. If the hon. gentleman was right, as far as Quebec legislation related to the subjects of judicial separation, the rights of a married woman, and her right to a share of her husband's property in case she was cruelly or harshly dealt

with by her husband—all these questions should be dealt with here and not in the Legislature of Quebec. They could alter and amend this code in all these particulars; in fact they could, under this construction, take from the Local Legislatures a large portion of the jurisdiction with which they were supposed to be vested. But there had been a general concurrence of opinion as to where the jurisdiction lay. They found that all the Legislatures of the Provinces in the Dominion had taken a common view on this question, and he had no doubt, whatever, that the Courts would confirm that view. It would be unfortunate if they were, by their action here to affirm the principle which the hon. gentleman had laid down. The hon. gentleman had referred to the question of insolvency. The question of insolvency, in its very nature, dealt with the property of the insolvent. It could not deal with less. They did not deal with property but as the subject-matter of insolvency. There was no analogy between that case and the case of marriage and divorce. His position was that divorce in the British North America Act, simply meant the dissolution of the marriage contract. All the other matters to which the hon. gentleman referred were embraced in the term property and civil rights; they were the express subjects of the grant, and applied to the husband, the wife, and the children of the marriage, as much as to partners in business; and, that being the case, could not be by implication embraced in the power to deal with marriage or with divorce.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) said, as a member of the Private Bills Committee who reported in favour of this Bill, and also as a representative of the Province of Quebec, he desired to make a few remarks on this subject. He had listened very attentively to the arguments presented against the adoption of this Bill, and more especially those made the other night by the hon. the Minister of Justice, and this evening by the right hon. the leader of the Government, and he must say that their reasoning had not convinced him that the opinion he expressed the other day before the Private Bills Committee was wrong.

As to the question of jurisdiction, it seemed to him somewhat of a nice point. They assuredly did not lack English precedents on the point. The Parliament of Great Britain before the establishment of a Divorce Court had not, it was true, pronounced only on the question of judicial separation from bed and board, for the reason that in England there was then, and was still, an Ecclesiastical Court which took cognisance of such matters. But he understood that in Ontario there was no such Ecclesiastical Court, and no Court at all, which could pronounce, not a divorce, but merely a separation between husband and wife. It seemed to him, therefore, that they ought to give this petitioner the relief which she could not obtain from the Courts of her own Province. It had been contended this evening that the word "marriage" used in the 91st section of the British North America Act, meant the marriage tie and nothing else. It seemed to him evident that the moment power was given to the Provincial Legislature to pass laws for the solemnisation of marriage only, its power extended no further, and that all other matters relating to this subject belonged exclusively to the Dominion Parliament, in accordance with paragraph 29 of section 91 of the British North America Act. The hon. member for Bothwell said that the Governor-General of the Dominion was instructed to reserve Divorce Bills for Her Majesty's sanction, but that did not prove that this Parliament had no jurisdiction; they might reasonably infer from these Royal Instructions that other Bills concerning marriage might be sanctioned by the Governor-General. The Bill now before the House merely provided for the separation, not the divorce, of a husband and wife, and could, therefore, be sanctioned by the Governor-General, without consulting Her Majesty. Then, finding that there was no Court in Ontario that could relieve this lady, he held that, believing they had jurisdiction, it was the duty of this Parliament to come to her relief. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) had stated that if they had jurisdiction over this matter, this Parliament might also alter the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec in this respect. He (Mr. Girouard) was of opinion that

this Parliament had jurisdiction to alter the Code of Quebec, and particularly in matters of marriage, solemnisation of marriage being excepted. This Code was passed before Confederation, and since that time no other Legislature had jurisdiction over matters of marriage and divorce but this Parliament. It must be borne in mind that the present was not a divorce case; if it was, he (Mr. Girouard) would be bound to vote against it; it was purely and simply a case of separation between man and wife, and the parties would still remain husband and wife. The judicial separation would not dissolve, but only suspend, that tie to a certain extent, as it would in Quebec; the wife would have the right to live separate from her husband, to be supplied with the necessary means to maintain herself and one of her children, but she would have no right to marry again. If this case should come before a Court in the Province of Quebec, what would be the duty of the Judge? He considered they were here performing the duties of a Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec, in a case of *separation de corps et de biens*, and this Parliament was the only tribunal which could grant such relief to parties living in Ontario. In the preamble of this Bill they did find the grossest insult that could be addressed to any woman, and especially to a lady of fine feelings. They saw, by the preamble of this Bill, that this husband had accused his wife of adultery. They had, therefore, proof that this lady had been insulted by her husband to such a degree as entitled her to separation. But there was another ground for separation—the refusal of the husband to receive his wife, and to furnish her with the necessaries of life, according to their rank in society. The husband admitted, before the Committee, that he had refused to give his wife the means of procuring the necessaries of life, and that alone was sufficient to entitle her to separation. It had been proved before the Committee that Mr. Campbell was worth \$25,000 or \$30,000, and was, therefore, abundantly able to allow her an alimentary pension. In a case like this, Mrs. Campbell would be entitled to get control, and be intrusted with the care, of all her children, yet the Senate had granted to her the care of only one

MR. GIROUARD.

child, the youngest. For all these reasons he, as a member from Quebec, was satisfied we ought to grant this lady the relief which any woman in Quebec would be entitled to. It was not a divorce case, if it was he should vote against it, as he had already stated, but it was merely a case of separation as to bed and board, *une separation de corps*.

MR. MOUSSEAU said this Bill originated this year in the Senate, and those old and venerable gentlemen thought proper to accept it, though but by a small majority, and this House was now asked to give its sanction to it. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) contended that many members of the Senate were men of high legal standing, and that others were of great consequence, and that they should bow down to their judgment. He (Mr. Mousseau) did not feel so much respect for that venerable House as to accept unhesitatingly their decision in this matter, when, in a previous case, the repeal of the Insolvency Law, they yielded to outside pressure, and, by a very small majority, rejected a Bill for its repeal, which had been passed almost unanimously in this House. Under what shape and circumstances was this Bill before the House. There had been litigation both in the Senate and the Courts of Ontario, and special application for alimony had been made by Mrs. Campbell to the Court of Chancery. The reasons given for alimony in Ontario were the same as those which had been given here. These reasons were cruel treatment, ousting from domicile, and refusal to take her back; and the answer of the husband was, of course, that she had been put out on account of misbehaviour, and that, owing to her misbehaviour, she was not entitled to alimony. They found that evidence had been taken, and a Judge of that Court, against whom nothing could be insinuated, dismissed the demand. Well, she might have appealed from that decision before three Judges of the same Court. She did not go to appeal, but came to this Parliament to get virtually a reverse of the judgment of a Provincial Court. That was, in fact, the whole case. Her advocates tried to conceal the circumstances, by stating that they took some of the clauses of the

Civil Code of Quebec to obtain for her separation of bed and board. This was proof under false pretences. Now he (Mr. Mousseau) came to another point. He had listened with much pleasure to the observations of the leader of the Government, who was one of the fathers of Confederation, and one of the masters of Constitutional Law; and, when such a man rose against his own friends to hit them forcibly, they were mistaken. Young members, like the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), ought to have more modesty than to assert the opposite opinion. When the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) heard the common sense views enunciated by the right hon. the leader of the Government, he began to hesitate, and did not dare enter into a discussion of the merits of the question, but left them to understand that, having been engaged, he would stick to his opinion, and vote. With regard to the question of jurisdiction, the hon. member for Halton said that this Parliament had the exclusive right, on what he called the subject-matter of marriage. Let them examine that proposition. In the section of the Imperial Act relating to the subject-matters on which they had a right to legislate were included marriage and divorce. These two words were well explained by the right hon. gentleman to relate to the tie and its dissolution, and that everything which went beyond those fell under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. On the one side it was said that these words implied a right on the part of this Parliament to legislate on everything that related to the subject-matter of marriage. What conclusion would that proposition lead to? There was another section in the Imperial Act which related to the subject-matters in which the Local Legislatures would have to legislate, and among those were property and civil rights. Civil rights and property were acquired, first, by purchase, and, at other times, by prescription, but the most usual manner was by succession. Well, succession flowed from marriage, and the rights and properties got from succession were got from marriage. Therefore, marriage and divorce only meant the formation of the tie and its dissolution, but, as to all the

rights which flowed from marriage, the civil status of the children, their standing in society, their rights to succession, all these consequences fell under the heads of property and civil rights, which were exclusively to be dealt with in our Provincial Legislatures. By following all the consequences of the principle laid down by the hon. members for Halton and Jacques Cartier, they would reach the absurd. Under these circumstances he felt bound to vote against the Bill.

MR. McCUAIG said that Mr. Campbell had applied to the Senate for relief, and that body, in which were men of influence, men of ability and uninfluenced by public opinion, passed the Bill. He intended to give his vote in favour of the Bill and allow the woman the benefit of the doubt. If any question of constitutional law came up, let Mr. Campbell bring it before the Supreme Court.

MR. COURSOL said they were not bound to take the opinion of the Senate in all cases, especially where there was so much doubt, and when the question was so much controverted. This Bill had been declared by the proper officers for the administration of justice to be unconstitutional. Was the House, for the mere pleasure of having the case decided in the Supreme Court, and having another repetition of this case, to solemnly declare that this would be the law of the land? It would be a dangerous precedent. It would open the doors of this House to a lot of cases of a similar nature. It was true that in Quebec there was a law by which the woman could have the right of separation, and have the alimony granted at once; and, if the other Provinces had not the same law, the sooner they adopted it the better. Was this Parliament to interfere in the judgments of Courts in the Provinces. Was the House of Commons to settle all the questions that had been settled already by the Courts in the different Provinces? Were they to constitute themselves a Court of Appeal, to decide all these cases? They had laws to prevent the publication of and the entry into this country of immoral literature. But, in this case, they had the most revolting scenes published and

printed by order of the Senate, as a standing document, which might fall into the hands of thousands of parties. He had not a word to say against the character of the woman, nor did he wish to interfere with the merits of the case. He only spoke as to the general course the House should adopt. If the Bill were allowed to become law, a precedent would be established which they would regret hereafter.

MR. GEOFFRION said he would not have addressed the House on this question, had it not been for the declaration of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that it was within the province of this House. It was not within their jurisdiction. The Constitution said that the question of marriage and divorce was to be dealt with by this Parliament. Well, the case of divorce had been settled. This was a Bill to take away the property of a man and give it to another party—a stranger to him, which party was at one time his wife, but, by the law of the Province, had no right to his property, so that they were dealing with a question of property, and not with a question of marriage or divorce. He maintained that they had no such right. It was a Bill to take away the property of a man, and give it to a stranger. He regarded the Bill as outside their jurisdiction, and for that reason he would vote against it. It was all very well to say the matter had been discussed in Committee. Hon. gentlemen might sympathise with a woman in this woman's circumstances, but, regarding the Bill from a constitutional standpoint, he would vote against it.

MR. MACMILLAN said he regretted this matter had been brought before the House, because he had always thought that matters of judicial separation should not be intruded upon the House. He had watched this case pretty closely from the time that it first came into the Courts, and it seemed to him that the case was left in a very doubtful manner at the present time, and it was for them to judge from the evidence that was given, not only before the Courts, but before the Committee of the Senate. His hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had stated that this Bill had been defeated before. But it had

never come before the House of Commons before, and it was for them to say whether they should grant this amount asked for. The Senate had taken the matter into their careful consideration, and recommended a certain amount should be granted for the maintenance of Mrs. Campbell and her children. He thought they ought to have a Court established to deal with questions of this kind, and the sooner they got a Court of that kind the better. He intended to vote for the petitioner.

MR. LANE said he did not see any reason why he should change his legal views upon this matter. So far as the legal matter was concerned, they had the opinion of very eminent legal gentlemen on both sides. They knew that lawyers and Judges differed. If they, upon that occasion, acted wrongly, the Supreme Court would probably set the matter right. The constitutional question could be tried there, and he thought it would be best to have it tried. On the merits of the case, he had come to the conclusion that Mrs. Campbell was not guilty of the charge made against her. Having come to that conclusion, he thought she had made out a case for alimony, consequently he would vote in favour of the Bill, as he did in the Committee.

MR. FARROW moved in amendment to the amendment :

"That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend section 3, by inserting \$300 instead of \$500; and that section 5 be amended, by inserting \$100 instead of \$200."

Question *put*, and amendment to the amendment (Mr. Farrow) *negatived*.

Question *put*, and amendment (Mr. Mills) *negatived* on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messrs.

Anglin	Coursol
Baby	Desjardins
Bain	Dumont
Benoit	Farrow
Bourassa	Fleming
Bowell	Geoffrion
Burk	Gill
Cameron (S. Huron)	Gillies
Caron	Gillmer
Cartwright	Houde

MR. COURSOL.

Hurteau	Olivier
Lantier	Paterson (S. Brant)
Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)	Pope (Queen's, P. E. I.)
McDonald (Picton)	Rouleau
Mackenzie	Ryan (Marquette)
Mills	Rymal
Mongenais	Tassé
Mousseau	Tellier
Oliver	Trow.—38

MAYS :

Messrs.

Arkell	Macmillan
Bannerman	McCallum
Bergeron	McCuaig
Bergin	McDougall
Boulbee	McLennan
Brecken	McLeod
Bunting	McRory
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Merner
Connell	Orton
Currier	Patterson (Essex)
Cuthbert	Plumb
Dawson	Poupore
DeCosmos	Robertson (Hamilton)
Domville	Ross (Dundas)
Drew	Rykert
Elliott	Schultz
Ferguson	Shaw
Fitzsimmons	Skinner
Galbraith	Sproule
Girouard (J. Cartier)	Stephenson
Hay	Strange
Hesson	Thompson (Cariboo)
Hooper	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Jones	Wallace (W. York)
Keeler	White (Cardwell)
Kilvert	White (E. Hastings)
Kranz	Williams
Lane	Wright.—56.

Bill read the third time and passed, on the same division reversed.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes after

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 14th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ONTARIO BOUNDARY ARBITRATION.

QUESTION AND REMARKS.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if the Government had decided not to introduce an

Act to confirm the Ontario boundary award this Session.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE said the recent difficulties with the men working on the Pacific Railway showed the necessity of providing means for maintaining the administration of justice in the North-West district. He wished to know if the hon. gentleman had any objection to state what was the intention of the Government with respect to that matter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The intention of the Government is to take the matter into consideration during recess.

WAYS AND MEANS.—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means (May 13th) read the first and second times, and agreed to.

SUPPLY BILL.

(Mr. Tilley.)

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

MR. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 118) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years, ending, respectively, the 30th June, 1879, and the 30th June, 1880 ; and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Bill read the first and second times.

MR. TILLEY moved the third reading of the Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE said, before that motion was adopted, he would like to ask the hon. the leader of the Government if he intended to convey any information to the House upon the subject mentioned yesterday, as one that would probably be spoken of to-day.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was not in a position to convey any information to the House respecting the Letellier matter, for the simple reason that he had no information to give. He had expected that, in all probability, be-

fore the prorogation of Parliament, he would be enabled to inform the House of what the decision of Her Majesty was. No such information had arrived yet, and, therefore, he could not convey any to the House. There would be no object in his addressing the House in any way whatever, because he could only speak after receiving information. The hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) spoke about bringing down the instructions, and so on. He thought it would be in the highest degree inadvisable to do so until the matter had been decided in one way or the other. It would be unprecedented.

MR. HOLTON: The whole thing is unprecedented.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not know that it was. They were not discussing that just now. It would be unprecedented to bring down any papers in the incomplete form in which that question now stood. But he might say that the hon. gentleman would, in all probability, have an opportunity of hearing the information very soon, because he believed that as soon as Her Majesty's decision had been arrived at, those papers would be laid before the House of Commons in England, and, of course, would be open to the world.

MR. MACKENZIE said he felt indisposed to discuss the subject during the period in which it might fairly be said to be in process of solution. When the hon. gentleman had to meet the resolution moved by the hon. member for Bagot, early in the Session, he did not choose, nor did any of his colleagues choose to say anything regarding that motion, but on a subsequent occasion, on pressure from behind, when the hon. gentleman was compelled to take some step or other in the matter, he came down to the House and made the following statement:—

"Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a statement to the House, with reference to the resolution come to by the Senate last Session and by this House some little time ago, with regard to the conduct of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. I have to state that I waited on His Excellency the Governor-General and informed him that, after the resolution of the Senate of last Parliament, and the resolution of the House of Commons, during the present Session, it was

the opinion of his advisers that the usefulness of Mr. Letellier the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was gone."

This was the state of the case as presented by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. The hon. gentleman, in the very brief discussion that took place in regard to this matter, further expressed his regret that the advice that had been tendered to His Excellency had not been at once acted upon. He also expressed the pleasure it would have given him to have had that done. In the first place, he thought it was an objectionable course for Ministers, having tendered advice to the Crown, to come to Parliament, and make known that advice, without having any ultimate conclusion arrived at, either by themselves or the Crown. The usual course was, when advice was offered, that that advice must either be accepted by the Crown, or the Ministry must retire or acquiesce in the decision arrived at by the Crown. These were the three modes of arranging the difficulty. He had not been able to find any instance where a Minister had come down to Parliament and made known the advice that had been tendered, admitting, at the same time, that action upon such advice had either been refused or postponed. Further, on the third of April, the hon. gentleman made the following remarks:—

"He, the representative of the Sovereign, says that he will ask for specific instructions from his own Sovereign. There is nothing unconstitutional in it. I would have been pleased, gratified, and I think it would have been well had our advice been at once accepted. We unanimously thought that it would be for the interest of the country that Mr. Letellier should be dismissed. That advice has not been refused or rejected but the representative of the Queen, of the First Estate in the land, states that he would like to submit the matter to the First Estate, and ascertain what the action of the Sovereign is."

He need not say anything further with regard to what passed on that day. On April 7, there was a little conversation again in connection with this subject, when the hon. gentleman said:

"I beg leave to state, in reply to the hon. member, that the hon. the Postmaster-General will leave by the next Canadian steamer with the consent of the Governor-General, for the purpose of supporting the advice given by the Government for the removal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. He may, perhaps, be ac-

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

accompanied by another gentleman. At all events he goes next Saturday. I need scarcely say, that the fact of our holding the positions we do at this moment shows that the Governor-General did not make that reference against our advice, and the fact of our remaining in office also shows that we hold ourselves responsible for the action of the Governor-General."

This statement was made four days after the last statement, a statement which was understood by almost every member of the House as reflecting upon the action of the Governor-General, and as laying the blame of the non-removal of Lieut.-Governor Letellier upon his shoulders. That expression found vent in the principal newspaper organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the very strongest and most offensive language was used consistent with reasonable propriety of discussion, by certain newspapers in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, in characterising the conduct of the Governor-General. He would not quote the language of the journals, because he did not desire to give them a place in the Debates of the House; but he had no doubt that every member of the House had read the expressions used by Ministerial journals in regard to His Excellency. The hon. gentleman subsequently found it necessary to qualify the statements made, and they had, on that occasion, the further remarkable statement made, that not merely was a member of the Cabinet sent home to lay before the Crown in Britain the views held by the Ministry on this particular transaction, but that a gentleman, who had not even a seat in Parliament, was sent with the Postmaster-General, in order that he also might appear before the Crown and plead in regard to this matter. It would be an entirely novel thing in the history of constitutional government to find a Minister giving advice and then employing counsel to appear before the Crown and enforce the wisdom of his advice. This was precisely what had been done in sending Mr. Abbott with the Postmaster-General to plead before the Crown in Great Britain on a subject which was clearly, by the Constitution of the country, within the province of the constitutional authorities of this country to dispose of. Having said so much in regard to what he conceived to be the constitutional errors which had been committed

in this matter, he might recapitulate them briefly. In the first place, he did not think the Ministry ought to have come down to the House, and informed the House of the advice tendered by the Ministers to the Crown, until a definite conclusion had been arrived at by the Ministers or the Crown. When the hon. member brought this subject up last year, he (Mr. Mackenzie) took the ground that it was not a matter in which they ought to interfere. Had the Government of the day believed that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had acted beyond his powers, and outraged constitutional usage, it would have been the duty of the Government to have acted upon such consideration, and to have informed that gentleman of their views of the position he occupied, and take such action, if necessary, as the Constitution pointed out, submitting reasons therefor to Parliament afterwards. The hon. gentleman, at the time he gave his notice, evidently appeared to take a stronger view of the case than he did when he brought his notice before the consideration of Parliament. In the interval of time between giving the notice and moving the resolution, he appeared to have come to the conclusion that, whatever might be thought by partisans of the conduct of Mr. Letellier, that there was nothing in that conduct which would justify him in giving as a reason for his dismissal that he had acted beyond the powers of his office. That was quite evident from the tone of the hon. gentleman's speech on that occasion, a very large portion of which no one could possibly find fault with. The speech was an able summary of what might be characterised as the principal features of responsible government under a viceroy of the King, but, at the same time, the speech itself neither vindicated or declared that the course taken by the Lieutenant-Governor was unconstitutional; nor did the resolution itself so declare the opinion of the hon. member, and of those who acted with him. It simply declared that, in acting as he did, he had acted unwisely, and that his action was subversive of the position of his advisers in the Ministry. A mere truism, and one that scarcely required to be stated, as it was quite manifest that any dismissal of a Ministry was subversive of their positions as advisers

of the Crown. Then the House of Commons, by a large majority, decided against the assumption that he had even acted unwisely, and so the case stood. In the meantime the general elections had taken place, before the matter was brought before the notice of the public. In that general election the party then in power was defeated, and the administration which had to take cognisance of the action of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, had resigned, and the hon. gentleman, with his colleagues, came into office about the middle of October, last year. If they believed, as was insinuated, rather than declared, that the Lieutenant-Governor had acted unconstitutionally, it was the duty of the Government to have assumed the responsibility of dismissing the Lieutenant-Governor, prepared reasons why he should be dismissed, and submitted those to the Lieutenant-Governor, as provided in the Constitution, which reasons would afterwards be submitted to Parliament, within a certain time after his removal. This action was not taken, and no other assumption could be made but that the new Administration took precisely the same view of the case as the late Administration did, and that, whatever might be the personal views of the Government as to the wisdom or propriety of the course taken by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, they, at all events, were not warranted in declaring that that action was against the powers confided to him by the law of the land. Parliament met, and the Government still made no sign. An independent member of Parliament, not in the Administration, or connected with it, moved the same resolution, word for word, that had been moved by the hon. leader of the Government in the previous Parliament. This was carried—the Ministers voting for it—by a large majority of the House. Some time afterwards the hon. gentleman and his colleagues—for he took care to tell them that they unanimously agreed, though the information was not necessary; but as if to give emphasis to the declaration he told them that his colleagues unanimously concurred in the advice given—tendered certain advice to His Excellency. What was the advice given? That Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had acted unconstitutionally, and should be

dismissed? No, but His Excellency was advised that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's usefulness was gone because this House had passed certain resolutions. This House might do what it pleased within the sanction of its own prerogative, of its own powers, but that action could not be pleaded for the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was not prepared to say what the Government would be required to do in the event of both Houses of Parliament joining in an Address to the Crown, demanding that certain steps should be taken in such a case. The voice of Parliament was omnipotent where the letter of the Constitution—and they had the letter as well as the spirit—did not prevent that action. Even the voice of this Parliament, however, could not set aside the Constitution, because it was not a creation of this Parliament. It was the creation of the Imperial authority, and they only derived such powers in their deliberative and executive action in this country, as had been confided to them by the Imperial authority which framed their Constitution. Then, if there had been an Address from both Houses requiring and stating the reasons for the requirement, that the Lieutenant-Governor should be dismissed, it would have been a matter, at all events, for serious consideration, that action should be taken. No such Address was passed. True, the Senate passed a resolution last Session, but the late House of Commons declined to pass a similar resolution, and the previous Government declined to take the views of the majority of the Senate and the minority of the Commons on the subject, and so the matter, so far as proper constitutional usage was concerned, ended. Then the hon. gentleman, at once to gratify his friends in the Lower House, and take such action as he believed would restore some political equilibrium in the Province of Quebec, advised His Excellency that the usefulness of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had departed, that he should be dismissed from his Government, and another Lieutenant-Governor appointed. Well, the usefulness of a man was a very broad subject. It might be the opinion of the hon. the Premier that the usefulness of many persons was

gone. He was pleased to state a few days ago, though not in those precise words, that his (Mr. Mackenzie's) own usefulness was gone, and that it would be a great mercy to the country if he were removed.

STR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I did not say that.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman might think so, but other people might not. He was merely taking this as an illustration of one of the latest utterances of the hon. the Premier himself. There were other Lieutenant-Governors about whose action gentlemen had strongly differed; but were hon. members or Ministers to declare, whenever they found fault with the political action of a Lieutenant-Governor—whenever that action was adverse to the views of the majority of this House—to His Excellency that the usefulness of that Lieutenant-Governor was gone, and advise that he should be dismissed. He (Mr. Mackenzie) thought that that was one of the most serious questions we had to face in this country, and that there was nothing more important to our system of Government than the maintenance of the autonomy of the Provinces. He believed, and said, after mature deliberation, apart from any prospect of political advantage being gained from it, that it was one of those questions extremely dangerous to the existence of the Confederation, if the Constitution was to be interpreted as the hon. gentlemen opposite thought. The Premier occupied the position of the guardian of our Constitution, of the rights of the Provinces, as much as of the rights of the Dominion, and no wise Minister would think for a moment of interfering with the rights of the Lieutenant-Governors, and the rights of the Governments of the Provinces. Such a system as the hon. gentleman had inaugurated by his action in this case was the most direct blow that could be administered to the independence of the Provinces. It was the first step towards a centralisation of authority, that was not consistent with the Federal compact; and he, therefore, felt it was a subject upon which they ought to deliberate in some way, and endeavour to record their opinion before the House was formally prorogued. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had hoped

that the motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) would come up for discussion. He supposed the hon. gentleman was in earnest when he placed that notice on the paper, and that the Premier would have taken an early opportunity of informing the House fully on a subject of which he had made it partly cognisant. He (Mr. Mackenzie) supposed that, if Ministers had chosen to give hon. members the early portion of their advice in regard to Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, they should have been informed also of the subsequent steps on the subject. Therefore, he considered that the instructions given the Postmaster-General, and his legal colleague, Mr. Abbott, should have been laid before the House. If they were to be informed, they should be fully informed in the matter. If the Government had assumed the responsibility of their action in another way, this question would not have arisen in the precise shape in which it was now presented. But, by having committed themselves by stating what advice they had given His Excellency, and stated their views of His Excellency's conduct in such a manner as led their own partisans and newspapers to believe the Governor-General was guilty of a serious dereliction of duty in his office—having done all that, the matter ought not to stop there, they ought to have brought the matter in this broad manner before the House, recapitulating, as he trusted had been done, fairly, with a desire to act fairly, the various events that had taken place in connection with it. In his (Mr. Mackenzie's) opinion the whole business had been sadly mismanaged. After the late Administration had declined to take action on the advice of the majority of the Senate, having a large majority in the Commons in support of that view, the case was closed. If not closed by such a train of circumstances and facts, what would close it? Was a man to be tried, politically, twice for the same offence, if it was an offence? It was contrary to the principles of justice and law, and, in his opinion, the Government had no right whatever to take that action, especially in view of what had occurred in the meantime. It was quite time that, in a sense, they had just as little to do with what the electorate of Quebec might do, as with what its

Ministers might do, so long as they were within the sphere of their own competency. But, when Mr. Letellier dismissed his Ministers, that being the offence with which he was charged, he summoned other Ministers to his aid, who expressly assumed the responsibility of that dismissal. It was not necessary they should have assumed it, because, according to constitutional usage in the Province, as in the Dominion and the Mother Country, the Ministry necessarily became responsible for such acts without any voluntary assumption of responsibility. Mr. Joly, the Premier, no doubt, simply wished to give emphasis to the acceptance of the usual constitutional usage in declaring that his Government did accept the responsibility for the action of the Lieutenant-Governor. He (Mr. Mackenzie) conceived at the time that the inevitable conclusion must be a general election, and was glad to find, by the action of the Quebec Government, that they entertained the same view. An appeal was made to the country, which sustained the new Administration. So far, therefore, all constitutional proprieties were carried out, and there remained nothing to be done by this House or Government except the action taken here, which he considered a wanton interference with the independence of Provincial action, in attacking the conduct of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier in connection with the administration of affairs in his Province. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had nothing further to remark, as he desired, at that period of the Session, not to waste one word upon useless debate, and not to say one word which could necessarily provoke anything but a calm discussion of the constitutional question involved in the case from beginning to end.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have nothing to object to as regards the tone in which the hon. member for Lambton has brought up this subject again. I quite concede that he is moving within his constitutional right as a member of Parliament in making the remarks we have heard. However, he might as well refrain from allusion to some matters which ought not to affect our consideration of this question. When he spoke about the attacks made by the organs of the hon. gentlemen op-

MR. MACKENZIE.

posite on the Governor-General, he should have remembered that parties were generally supposed to have organs; that is to say, they are known to have papers sympathising with them in their political principles, and advocating them. He said the country was pained when it read the attacks of some of the Conservative papers of Quebec upon His Excellency. Well, I need not repeat what the hon. gentleman so often reiterated when he held my place on the Treasury benches, that the Government were responsible for their own conduct, acts and expressed opinions, but could not hold themselves responsible, in any way, for the occasional action or continuous remarks of the press supporting the Government. The very fact that the hon. gentleman's alluding at this moment, without any necessity, to that real or supposed attack on the Governor-General invites us, of necessity, to look back and remember the attacks made upon His Excellency's predecessor, Lord Dufferin, by the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite on a celebrated occasion. I have no doubt he was infinitely pained himself, and his whole party in the House and out of it, at the continuous and abusive attacks made on Lord Dufferin on that memorable occasion. The fact is, it does no good; it is, on the contrary, prejudicial to calm discussion to drag in the utterances or the language of the press on either side of the question sometimes dealt with in Parliament. The fourth estate have their own responsibility as well as the third; they are responsible to public opinion, pecuniarily, in cases of private assault or wrong. It does no good, whatever, to bring in, as an element in a discussion of this kind, what a newspaper, Reform or Conservative, Rouge, Grit, or Ultramontane, may choose to express on its responsibility, on a great political question. Here we are, the Ministry of the day, responsible for its acts, and the majority is responsible for its legislation, and the minority is also responsible, if it does not expose before the country the short-comings, failures, or errors, either of the majority in Parliament or the Administration. The member for Lambton says that our conduct is unprecedented; that, after having tendered advice that was not accepted, we ought to have resigned. But he was

promptly corrected by the superior constitutional knowledge of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), who said that our advice must be accepted, or we must yield to the conclusions of the Sovereign or her representative. Of course, we all know that the Sovereign is not a mere nonentity, but a person possessing power and influence. In this case, the country should be fully informed, the hon. gentlemen opposite says, of what has taken place, or it was wrong we should have made those communications to the House. It is the bounden duty of the Government, if they desire to retain the confidence of the representatives of the people, to have as few secrets from them as possible, and to confide to them as much as possible, not only their course of conduct, but reasons for it. What did the Government do? They said, after the overwhelming vote of this House, censuring Mr. Letellier, that his usefulness was gone. It is true there was not a new vote this Session in the Senate on the subject, and the reason is obvious. The Senate is a permanent body. A deliberate expression by a body like the Senate must be held to be a continuous expression till reversed.

MR. HOLTON : Or till circumstances have changed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Yes, circumstances must have changed, but they did not in this instance. We considered that we were acting constitutionally and properly, after a vote of this House the present Session, and a vote of the Senate last Session, in the course we took. It is a great thing when this House declares that the conduct of a Lieutenant-Governor, a public servant, was unwise and subversive of those principles by which the Governor ought to govern his action. This House took that responsibility, after mature consideration and full debate ; and, when the two branches solemnly declared that that official's usefulness was gone—that his conduct was unwise,—there was only one conclusion open to the Government, which was merely a Committee of both Houses, for the administration of the affairs of the country, according to the well-understood wishes of the people. What could the Government do but give effect to the deliberately expressed wishes and

opinions of both branches of the Legislature? That was considered sound and true constitutional doctrine. But, oh, says the hon. member for Lambton, in the first place, is it right to try a man twice? It is quite true there was a vote of the last House of Commons against the motion to censure the Lieutenant-Governor, which was adopted by this House—quite true, the motion was rejected by the last Parliament. I may say that, as any Bill passed by one Parliament may be repealed or amended by the next Parliament, so any resolution passed by the House of Commons in one Session may be reversed, or amended, or annulled, or disapproved of, by a succeeding Parliament or a succeeding Session. And you must remember that, at the time the discussion on my motion was brought up, the hon. member for Lambton did not attempt to defend Mr. Letellier, or to justify his conduct. He could not. I believe that, in his heart, and in his own personal opinion, he disapproved of Mr. Letellier's conduct. I believe that, as far as he himself was concerned—and if there had not been influences that he was not aware of, perhaps—Mr. Letellier would never had ventured to act as he did, and, I believe also, that if the hon. gentleman had been left to his own honest conviction of what was right or wrong, he would have declared that, in his opinion, as a statesman, and public man, Mr. Letellier had acted improperly and unconstitutionally. But he did not. Look back at the *Hansard* of last year, at the careful, guarded speech of the hon. gentleman, and you will not find one word in justification of Mr. Letellier's conduct. He could not, holding the responsible position he then held, and with great ability, conscientiously have said that he would have acted as Mr. Letellier did, had he been Lieutenant-Governor at the time. No man having a respect for himself could have acted as Mr. Letellier acted on that occasion. But he took the ground principally that Mr. Letellier had formed a new Government, and that he was about to go to the country, or had gone to the country, and that it would be wrong for the House to interfere at that time. The hon. gentleman, while he could not defend Mr. Letellier's conduct in words, still stood by his own colleagues. But the House

that refused to censure Mr. Letellier was elected by the people before the question arose. The people of the Dominion had never had the question of the conduct of Mr. Letellier before them. It arose suddenly. The people of Canada, who, after all, are the ultimate source of power, had had no opportunity of expressing their opinion on that matter. But, on the 17th September, they pronounced their decision. The question was brought before them. I was, I may say without egotism, not an unimportant member of the last Parliament. I was the leader, perhaps an unworthy and incapable leader, of Her Majesty's Opposition at that time, but I was leader of my party, and I took the responsibility, last Session, of moving a resolution which declared that the conduct of Mr. Letellier was unwise and subversive of the principle under which we had been governed since responsible government was granted. That, and the other resolutions that were proposed by the Opposition during the last Parliament, with many other causes of complaint against the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite, went to the country, and there was not a single hustings or election meeting where the matter was not discussed. I can speak for most of Ontario, and we know we can speak for all of Quebec, and we know that the conduct of Mr. Letellier, the resolution which I had proposed censuring him, and the conduct of the Government of the day in maintaining him in his office, were elements of discussion, and were one of the many reasons which caused the country to withdraw their confidence from the hon. gentlemen opposite. There can be no doubt about that. But the hon. gentlemen now say that Mr. Letellier's conduct was approved. But see what the country did, and look especially at what took place in Quebec. Because Mr. Letellier dismissed Mr. DeBoucherville and appointed Mr. Joly, and Mr. Joly appealed to the country, the hon. gentleman argues that as one reason why Mr. Letellier should escape the censure of this House during the present Session, and because Mr. Joly had been maintained in power ever since. The question at the Local elections was not between Mr. Letellier and the Dominion Government, but between the

merits of the DeBoucherville and the Joly Administrations, the question was whether the policy of Mr. DeBoucherville was the correct one, or whether the policy announced by Mr. Joly, as the leader of the Opposition and the head of the new Government, was preferable. These were the questions that went to the country, and the question of Mr. Letellier's conduct was one with which the local electors had nothing to do in the world, which they had no affair or concern in, it was not a matter of theirs at all. The question was simply whether the railway policy, the taxation policy, the general policy of the DeBoucherville Government should be maintained, or whether the professions and promises of Mr. Joly were entitled to most confidence. And see the difference. When the appeal was made by the Local Government to the country, the parties were nearly a tie; Mr. Joly did not succeed in getting a majority at all events. The majority that formerly supported Mr. DeBoucherville was greatly reduced, and the parties were nearly on an equality. Now, we must remember that the constituencies in Quebec are the same, the electorate is the same, and the electors who, by diminishing Mr. DeBoucherville's majority, showed that he was becoming unpopular, the same electors, the very voters who voted to support the Joly Administration, by an overwhelming majority on the 17th September, returned a majority to this House of 48 to 17, pledged to vote for the censure of Mr. Letellier. There we had the voice of the Province of Quebec. Now, when I say that the Local elections had nothing to do with the question of the removal or appointment of Mr. Letellier, I can support that by ordinary constitutional analogy. What have we got to do with the Governor-General sent to us? We loyally, and frankly, and gladly, accept any nobleman or gentleman who may be the choice of Her Majesty to govern us. We have no word to say about their appointments, and we have no right to complain if a Governor-General is recalled by Her Majesty the day after he arrives here. All we have got to do is to see that the Representative of the Sovereign, whoever may be the distinguished individual who is entrusted by Her Majesty with this great charge, shall

carry out the principles of government here according to British principles, and shall be governed by his advisers enjoying the confidence of Parliament, and shall act constitutionally. Everybody knows how justly popular the last Governor-General was; everybody knows the whole country regretted and grieved that the Earl of Dufferin resigned, and went to other scenes of usefulness; everybody in Canada would have been glad if his term of office had been renewed for five years more, and it may be that we would have been justified if we had passed an Address to Her Majesty, stating that we wanted her to continue the Earl of Dufferin five years more, but it would have been travelling out of our record, going beyond our power, and exceeding our authority. We grieved that he went, but we gladly and readily accepted the successor Her Majesty chose. So, if, from any cause whatever, Her Majesty chose to recall her son-in-law the Marquis of Lorne to-morrow, we have no right to interfere. The principle is precisely the same. It is a matter of no consequence to the electorate of Quebec, or to the Local Legislature, what Lieutenant-Governor is sent there by the Representative of the Sovereign. The Representative of the Sovereign in the choice of the Lieutenant-Governors of our different Provinces, stands in precisely the same position as the Queen stands with respect to Colonial Governors. They may be recalled, or they may be appointed, and therefore the appeal to the electorate in the Local elections had no reference, and could have no reference to the presence of Mr. Letellier or anybody else—just as the men who were elected to support Mr. Joly at the Local election had no right to ask questions. They had no right, it was not their business. The Lieutenant-Governor, whoever he might be for the time being, should maintain the privileges of the Province, should carry out the true principles of the Constitution in the Province, and, if Mr. Letellier died to-morrow, or resigned to-morrow, and if a man of directly opposite politics chosen by the present Administration were placed in his stead, that successor must carry the out principles of responsible government, as Mr. Letellier was bound to do, and, if he went there to-morrow and

found Mr. Joly at the head of the Government, he would be obliged constitutionally to support him, and to give him his confidence to the fullest extent, until the Local Legislature withdrew their confidence from him. Now, we know that, while we cannot interfere, that we cannot even express an opinion about the propriety of the Sovereign recalling the Governor-General, the power must rest somewhere, and the responsibility must rest somewhere. The responsibility rests with Her Majesty's Government to recall a Colonial Governor, and it is the Parliament of England that must censure the Government of the day, if they improperly treat a Colonial Governor, just as it rests with the Dominion Parliament to deal with the question whether our Provincial Governments were improperly treated or scurvily treated, or were unduly favoured. It rests here with this House, just as the question of the proper treatment, or the improper conduct, of a Colonial Governor is a matter to be dealt with by the Imperial Parliament. And we know that they have considered that subject and acted upon it, and have dealt with it in no niggard manner. We see the continuous attacks that are, at this moment, made in the House of Commons against the policy and conduct of Sir Bartle Frere; we see that, in the House of Commons, Sir George Bowen has been censured with respect to his conduct in Victoria, and we see that the Government of the day, while they did not condemn Sir George Bowen, and did not censure him because his usefulness was gone, because, from all appearances, he had set against him the two branches of the Legislature, and a very considerable portion of the people of Victoria, did not dismiss him, because they have the means of removing an erring or unfortunate Governor to other scenes of action, and they removed Sir George Bowen.

MR. MILLS: Three years after the event.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: After the event? Why, at this moment that question is not settled; at this moment representatives from Victoria are in England pressing the continuation and support of the policy of Sir George

Bowen, he having been already removed and sent to the Mauritius.

MR. MILLS: He had served his time.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He had not served his time; he was removed because his usefulness was gone. And so with Pope Hennessy—Pope Hennessy, who, rightly or wrongly, was believed by Her Majesty's Government obnoxious to a portion of the people of Barbadoes, and was censured in the mild way in which the Imperial Government censures a man, by removing him and sending another man, with more discretion and prudence, and who could hold his tongue better than Pope Hennessy did. And then there was the removal of Sir Harry Smith, a great soldier and a capable administrator. That gentleman, when he was Governor of the Cape, was a personal and almost bosom friend of Lord Grey, who was then Colonial Minister; and, because, with military abruptness, and, perhaps, with military want of civil caution, he had diminished, in the opinion of Lord Grey, his usefulness, he was removed, and, if there is anything more instructive with respect to constitutional principles than another, it will be the correspondence between Lord Grey and Sir Harry Smith upon that matter. Their friendly relations were not changed, but a sense of public duty made Lord Grey consider that it was for the interest of the colony that he should be removed to some other sphere of action, and Sir Harry Smith went home, not in the slightest degree offended or annoyed, and their friendship continued to the last moment. Sir Harry Smith felt that Lord Grey was acting from public motives, and not from personal motives, but Lord Grey removed him although he retained the highest estimation of his character and the highest admiration of the heroic gallantry and ability he had displayed in many fields of warfare. Sir Harry Smith admitted that the Colonial Minister could not do any less if he believed that his usefulness was in any degree impaired. The Colonies are not made for the Governors, but the Governors are made for them. It is for the peace, the good government, the contentment of the people, that Governors are

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

sent; and, even if the Governor were possessed of the best intentions, even if you look at his conduct, and there could be no charge against his moral or his personal, or even his political course; if any unhappy accident for which, perhaps, he might not be personally blameable; if by any unhappy accident any step taken by a Governor causes real and substantial dissatisfaction in the Colony, that Governor ought to be removed, because the first object must be to secure, beyond all other things, not only the good government of the country but the satisfaction of the people with their government. The satisfaction, the peace and the contentment of the country must go hand-in-hand with good government, and, whether it be by misfortune, or by the fault, by the poor judgment, or by an obliquity of mind, a Governor fails to satisfy a majority of the people and his remaining is a cause of dissatisfaction and heartburning, then, in the cause of good government, that man ought to be removed. Of course, he ought to be treated well, and every consideration, should be given to his feelings, and his honour and reputation should be protected, if he had not committed anything which had impugned his honour or reputation. But, whether he were the most honourable man or the most dishonourable one, the moment a feeling of discontent or dissatisfaction set in amongst a majority of the people against a Governor, that Governor must go, and it would be the duty of the removing power to reasonably compensate him in every way in their power to prevent his feelings being unduly wounded. The course of the Government, in recommending the removal of Mr. Letellier, was guided by the principles which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had attempted to lay down. The Government believed that, after the representatives of the people, by an enormous majority, in which there was a majority from every Province, except New Brunswick, and a vote of forty-eight to seventeen from Quebec, had declared in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), when this Parliament, which was the selector of the Governor, had declared as they had done—even if the Government of the day thought hard measure was dealt out to Mr. Letellier, and that he might well have been

spared—that they, as a Committee, chosen by Parliament—they, who were elected by the voice of Parliament to give effect to the decision of Parliament, would be unworthy of their duty and position, and would be declared to have forfeited their claim to the confidence of Parliament, if they did not give effect to its solemn decision—the decision of a Legislature composed of representatives coming fresh from the people, with the sound of the electorate still ringing in their ears, and fully aware of the opinions of their constituents. This House would have failed in their duty to their constituents, if they had not carried out the decision at the polls, and the Government would have been unworthy of leading the affairs of the country if they had not given full force and effect to the decision of this House, supported, as it was, by the vast majority of the people of Canada.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman had made a speech that was distinguished rather for its vigour than for its logic. The hon. gentleman had laid down a number of contradictory propositions. The hon. gentleman told the House, in the first place, that the people of Quebec, at the Provincial elections, had nothing whatever to do with this matter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I did not say that.

MR. MILLS : That, although the Government of Mr. DeBoucherville was dismissed, and another Government constituted, which was ready to assume the responsibility of the conduct of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and notwithstanding that the course of Mr. Letellier offended, as they were told, the friends of the DeBoucherville Government, this did not form any part of the issue in the Local elections. But the hon. gentleman said that it was the issue at the general elections—where the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was not put in issue, where the question of the National Policy was put in issue, where the question involved was, as the hon. the Minister of Public Works had told the House an evening or two ago, the question of the Pacific Railway Scandal—and not at the Local elections, where the Administration that assumed the responsibility of this act appealed

to the country. He (Mr. Mills) thought the hon. gentleman would find some difficulty in reconciling those contradictory propositions. If the hon. gentleman would look at the newspapers of the period, he would find the facts against him. The hon. gentleman also made a statement with regard to Sir George Bowen that was not borne out by the facts. Sir George Bowen was appointed Governor of Victoria on January 23rd, 1873. He served something more than the full period of time, and there was no evidence that the majority of the people of Victoria or the Imperial Government in any way disapproved of his conduct. In his (Mr. Mills's) opinion, they did not. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) had referred to Mr. Pope Hennesy, of Barbadoes, and Mr. Smith, of South Africa. It was rather unfortunate for the hon. gentleman that in neither of these cases did parliamentary government exist. The hon. gentleman must know that responsible government did not exist at the Cape at the time of the removal of Mr. Smith.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I did not say it did exist.

MR. MILLS said then the cases were not in point. As Governors of Crown Colonies, Ministers in England were responsible for their acts, as the acts of the Crown. The proper place to challenge the conduct, or misconduct, of a Colonial Governor, as the place of last resort, no matter whether under responsible government or not, was in the Parliament of England. If the hon. gentleman took the trouble to consider the question, he would see that there was no applicability in the analogy he undertook to show. The Imperial Government claimed a sovereign and supervisory authority, and this Government did not. The Imperial Government exercised plenary authority over the entire domain of administrative action, so far as the Crown Colonies were concerned. It recognised the legislative and executive authority as being a trust from the Crown, and, that being the case, it held itself responsible in every particular for the conduct of the Governors within the limits of those Colonies. That was not the position of this Parliament with regard to the various Provinces. The Imperial Govern-

ment could remove a Governor at any time. Could this Government do so? What was the meaning of that section of the British North America Act which provided that, when a Lieutenant-Governor was removed, a reason must be assigned, that he must be informed of the fact, and an opportunity given him to defend his action, that the action must be reported to Parliament, and he could only be removed for cause? The Imperial Government had their authority wholly unrestrained. The Governor-General here was restricted by the Constitution by which Parliament was governed and guided. The authority at Westminster was not liable to be abused in matters of this kind. The reason for the limitation of our authority was obvious. The Imperial Government was supposed to be an impartial judge in these matters. The people of the various colonies were not represented in the Imperial Parliament. The party passions and party contests in a colony, where the conduct of a Governor might be called into question or censured, were not brought in to influence parties in the Imperial Parliament. They occupied an impartial, because an isolated, position. They were uninfluenced by the passions which surrounded the people in the colony. Therefore, there was no motive for restraining Executive action or authority, or limiting Parliamentary interference. The fact that the same constituencies that sent members to the Local Legislature, over which the Lieutenant-Governor presided, sent representatives to this Parliament, induced the framers of the Constitution to provide checks. It was to restrain this Legislature from doing the very thing which hon. gentlemen were now undertaking to do, that these restraining provisions, to which he had referred, had been put in the British North America Act. He (Mr. Mills) would like to know if hon. gentlemen were prepared to accept the doctrine laid down by the First Minister that, if this House, without any reason being assigned, chose arbitrarily to recommend the removal of a Lieutenant-Governor, the Administration were bound to recommend His Excellency the Governor-General to remove that Lieutenant-Governor, law or no law, whether his conduct were meritorious or justly open to censure?

MR. MILLS.

That was not the doctrine contained in this Act, by which the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches had sworn to be guided. In the face of the declaration in this Act that, when a Lieutenant-Governor was to be removed some cause must be assigned, the hon. gentleman stated that, whether the Lieutenant-Governor's conduct were wise or unwise, capable of defence or deserving of censure, if a majority of this Parliament, under any circumstances, declared he should be removed, that it was the bounden duty of the Administration to recommend his removal. That was a doctrine to which he (Mr. Mills) could not subscribe, and which he was inclined to believe many hon. gentlemen in this House—and, he might say, on the Treasury benches—would not be found to defend and uphold. When they examined the conduct of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, he thought it would be found that hon. gentlemen were acting in a way that was wholly incapable of a rational defence. In the first place, the present Government did not, when formerly in power, nor did the late Government, who succeeded them, issue to the Lieutenant-Governor any instructions; and, if they did not instruct him in regard to the policy which was to govern him in the discharge of his constitutional duties, then he was seized of all the powers possessed by Her Majesty with reference to the appointment and dismissal of Ministers. The doctrine had been laid down by an hon. gentleman on a former occasion, in discussing this question, that the Lieutenant-Governor had not the power of Her Majesty. He (Mr. Mills) maintained that, so far as the powers were necessary to the proper discharge of his duty, the Lieutenant-Governor stood in exactly the same position as Her Majesty. By law, he appointed whom he pleased and dismissed them when he pleased. That was the literal construction of the law. This country was governed by the constitutional usage and practice that prevailed in Great Britain. If these did not furnish a rule, then the Lieutenant-Governor was wholly unrestrained under the provision of the Act. It was only the constitutional usage and practice that had grown up and become part of our system of government in the Mother

Country that could afford any ground for restraining the action of the Lieutenant-Governor at all. Now, he maintained that, if the Lieutenant-Governor acted unwisely, improperly, or arbitrarily, in the exercise of a power which he undoubtedly possessed, that was ground for still instructing him. It might have been a ground for the late Government censuring him. They might have said: "We do not concur in the policy you pursue; we think you ought to have acted differently." He did not deny the power of the late Government to have said that; but, as the conduct complained of took place under a former régime, and as the subsequent Administration which Mr. Letellier called to his assistance was sustained on the appeal to the country, he (Mr. Mills) contended that this Parliament had no right to demand the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) said that Mr. Letellier was an officer of this Parliament, and that the Government were the trustees for the people in making the appointment. He (Mr. Mills) contended that, in no such sense, was the Lieutenant-Governor an officer of this Parliament or this Government. Under the British North America Act he was vested with the authority of an independent Chief Magistrate, for the very reason of preventing this Parliament interfering in the administration of the affairs of the Province. The Lieutenant-Governor was appointed for the purpose of carrying on the Government within the Province—for the administration of those affairs which were exclusively within the Province—and, therefore, he was a Provincial officer. He was surrounded by an Administration which he himself called into office, and, if that Administration did not coincide in opinion with the Lieutenant-Governor, he could, under the discretionary power given by this Act, if he saw proper, exercise the prerogative of the Crown, or he might rather say a power similar in kind, and dismiss his advisers. Certainly, it was not a prerogative that had been exercised, but there were cases on record where it had been exercised in England by George III, William IV, and also by Her Majesty Queen Victoria in the case of Lord Palmerston. Our theory of government was that, if the Chief Magistrate

in removing his ministers could find others to accept the responsibility of the dismissal, and who could carry on the government of the country, he undoubtedly had the power to make that removal; but, if those persons were unable to carry on the government, then he must take back his first Ministers and be guided by their advice. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) laid down a doctrine to-day that utterly swept away from beneath his feet the ground upon which he attacked the position of Mr. Letellier. The hon. gentleman, when speaking upon this subject last year, quoted Bagehot, and cited Earl Grey, to show that the Crown was, in the efficient government of the country, a nonentity; that it possessed no real power; that it was simply a cypher; and that the real head was the Administration for the time being. That was the position taken by the right hon. gentleman twelve months ago. Now, the fact that the hon. gentleman advised His Excellency to dismiss, at once, Mr. Letellier, and His Excellency declined, showed that the term cypher did not apply to the Governor-General who, for the time being, declined to act on the advice of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. In his (Mr. Mills's) opinion those hon. gentlemen very improperly advised the reference of this question to England. The hon. gentleman came down to the House, and stated that, although the mind of the Governor-General, with regard to the ultimate action, was in suspense, they disapproved of this reference.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. MILLS: I think I can satisfy the House that that is the effect of what the hon. gentleman said.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I never said anything of the kind. You may argue from what I did say, but I never said that.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman said that it was the unanimous advice of himself and his colleagues to the Governor-General, that the Lieutenant-Governor ought to be removed, and that His

Excellency did not conceive it proper to act upon that advice.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I never used those words. Look at the *Hansard*. You must be accurate literally.

MR. MILLS said he recollected the hon. gentleman's words as they were reported in the *Mail* newspaper.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : There is the *Hansard*.

MR. MILLS said he did know how far the *Hansard* gave the exact words of the hon. gentleman. There were some things there which the hon. gentleman might regard as a calumny to be held responsible for. The words the hon. gentleman was reported as using were these :

"He, the representative of the Sovereign, says he will ask for specific instructions from his and our Sovereign. There is nothing unconstitutional in it. I would have been pleased and gratified, and I think it would have been well, had our advice been at once accepted."

What was the advice of the hon. gentleman that was not accepted? Was it not that Mr. Letellier should be at once removed? Did His Excellency act on this advice? Did not the hon. gentleman tell His Excellency that, because, forsooth, a majority in this House, who had no control over the acts of a Lieutenant-Governor; that could, by their good or bad opinion, neither contribute to his efficiency or to his inefficiency, had voted that Mr. Letellier was censurable for what he did; therefore, his usefulness was gone, and he ought to be removed? The Governor-General saw proper to take a different view, and the hon. gentleman was placed in this position: that he had either to resign or to yield to the opinion of His Excellency. The hon. gentleman preferred to save his own skin, and yielded. If he had not yielded he would have been forced out of the Administration, out of the position of adviser to His Excellency, by the action of the Governor-General himself. What had Mr. Letellier done more than what the Governor-General had done, and, according to the hon. gentleman, in exercise of his undoubted authority? How could the hon. gentleman reconcile the action of the Governor-General with the

MR. MILLS.

theory of the Constitution by which he proposed to test the conduct of Mr. Letellier?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The hon. gentleman says that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier did exactly what the Governor-General did. Did Mr. De Boucherville advise that he himself should be dismissed? He was turned out of office.

MR. MILLS said His Excellency took a line which was not the one that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were pleased to advise, and which they desired him to follow. The hon. gentleman saw a difficulty where none existed. The Crown was continuous in its existence. The Administration might change, but it did not matter whether the action of the Lieutenant-Governor was supported by Mr. DeBoucherville's Administration or by the Administration that took their place. Mr. Joly and his colleagues assumed the responsibility of what the Lieutenant-Governor did, and, having assumed the responsibility, they were for that purpose the Ministers of the Crown, advising the removal of Mr. DeBoucherville just as Sir Robert Peel, although away in Italy at the time of the removal of Lord Melbourne, on his return to England accepting office, sometime after the dismissal took place, and having, with the Duke of Wellington, assumed the responsibility of forming an Administration, was held responsible for the removal of Lord Melbourne, although he came into office subsequent to that event. That was a fiction of our Constitution, which was just as applicable to this particular case, as it was to the case of Lord Melbourne and his Administration. The hon. gentleman had said that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's usefulness was gone. What did that mean? He did not undertake to show in what way the usefulness of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier was gone.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : No man under permanent censure of Parliament can be useful.

MR. MILLS said he denied that proposition. In the first place, there was no permanent censure of Parliament. Last

year the House of Commons refused to censure. The hon. gentleman assumed that the censure passed in the Senate last year was continuous. That censure in the Senate was before the people of Quebec had approved of Mr. Letellier's action, and he had reason to believe that the Senate would have declined to censure Mr. Letellier again, after the Administration which had assumed the responsibility of his acts was sustained by the people of Quebec. The Constitution said the Lieutenant-Governor was to be removed only for cause; that that cause was to be reported to Parliament. That cause must be his bad conduct, not their bad opinion. The hon. gentleman laid down the doctrine that it mattered not how well the Lieutenant-Governor might act—if this House disapproved of his conduct, he must go. Whereas the very provisions of the British North America Act upon the subject were inserted to prevent the possibility of such a policy being carried out. He (Mr. Mills) would say again that there was no analogy between the position of a Lieutenant-Governor in Canada and a Governor in one of the Colonies. The latter was far removed from the Parliament that might censure his act, whereas the Governor of any one of the Provinces of this Dominion was often a gentleman who had been prominent in this House, on the one side or the other, and might have made political enemies here. He must be a person from one side or the other, or, at all events, regarded so by many people, however fairly he might act when he became Governor. The advice of the hon. gentleman meant that the principle—"To the victors belong the spoils"—must extend to the office of Lieutenant-Governor, as to every other office in the country. Whether Mr. Letellier had acted arbitrarily or improperly—and he (Mr. Mills) had never expressed any opinion on the merits of his act; he would take an opportunity after the question was disposed of to give his views on the whole question—this was unquestionably the fact, that he found an Administration willing to assume the responsibility of his act, which obtained a majority in the Province to sustain them. The hon. gentleman had said that in this particular case

the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was highly unconstitutional and improper; but he did not descend to particulars; he did not point out in what respects it was unconstitutional and improper. The Lieutenant-Governor objected to his Administration acting in important public matters without consulting him, and using his name without reference to him. The Administration undertook to assume the functions of the judiciary; they undertook to take away arbitrarily the rights of some of the most important municipalities in Quebec. Upon these questions the Lieutenant-Governor differed widely from his advisers. He said they were surrounded by rings which rendered them powerless to serve the public wisely and well. That being the case, according to the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman to-day, Mr. Letellier had unquestionably the power to do what he did.

MR. OUMET: He had the power, but not the right.

MR. MILLS said that was a matter of judgment, and it was the business of Mr. Letellier to exercise his judgment and not that of hon. gentlemen opposite; and, upon reference to the people of the Province, they concurred in his judgment.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Including Mr. Turcotte.

MR. MILLS: Certainly, including Mr. Turcotte. He was not sitting in judgment on Mr. Turcotte. Mr. Turcotte was elected to the Legislature of Quebec. He was not an officer of this Government, and was not responsible to this House; and it seemed to him to be rather an extreme course for the hon. gentleman to adopt to base his attack on Mr. Letellier upon the motives which he inferred governed the conduct of Mr. Turcotte. The hon. gentleman had no right to intimate that a member of the Quebec Legislature was corruptly purchased by the Government of Quebec, when that member had not an opportunity of defending himself before this House. Those who made this charge here might be what the hon. gentleman called unvarnished calumniators. The hon. gentleman had not only laid down contradictory pro-

positions upon this particular question, but had taken a very unparliamentary course with regard to this whole question. If he thought the conduct of Mr. Letellier was improper, he should have acted. The initiative was with the Governor-General and his advisers. If he thought he had a right to act, after what had been done by the Government that preceded him, if he thought he had a right to drag from its tomb a settled question, as the Restorationists did the bones of Cromwell, he ought to have assumed the responsibility of doing it, and left this House to approve or disapprove of his conduct, instead of inviting the House to assume the responsibility of what he ought himself to have advised the Crown to do. He not only did that, but he informed the House that he differed from the Governor-General on this question; that the Governor declined to act on his advice; that the Governor wanted to consult other parties who were in no way responsible to the people of this country for the advice they gave to His Excellency through Her Majesty. The hon. gentleman employed a gentleman, in no way connected with this House or with the Government, to press on the Crown the advice of the Administration. That was the function of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and of nobody else. It was his duty to have seen that the advice he tendered was acted on in this country. It related to a matter, according to his own showing, with which the Imperial Government had no concern; which concerned this House only. Then, knowing that the course ultimately advised would dissatisfy the Conservative representatives from Quebec, because great expectations had been raised that a system of general slaughter was going to be inaugurated, and that Mr. Letellier was going to be one of the decapitated, he could not afford to disappoint his followers too much at once. The ultimate failure must be reached by gradual stages, and so the House was informed that the Administration regretted that His Excellency did not see proper to act on that advice.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I deny that. I said I would have been pleased and gratified if he had.

MR. MILLS.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman was not pleased, and was not gratified. His advice was not accepted. Did he not regret that that advice, which, if accepted, would have pleased and gratified him, was not accepted? Was the hon. gentleman left in a neutral position, without gratification and without regret? What was the effect of that failure? The indignation of the hon. gentleman's followers from Quebec was let loose on the Governor-General. The hon. gentleman informed the House that he was not responsible for the course the press took. He did not inspire the press. But he knew what course the press of Quebec would take. If not, why did he come down and disclose the advice given to His Excellency before it was finally acted on? The reason was patent. He turned away the indignation that would have fallen upon himself and his colleagues upon His Excellency the Governor-General. He thought it better His Excellency should suffer than that his advisers should. No doubt, in this particular, the policy of the Administration was eminently successful, for the course taken did direct the shafts of obloquy away from the hon. gentleman to the Governor-General from that hour to this. He did not think, when the question was finally disposed of, however this might be done, that the course taken by the hon. gentleman would show that he possessed that superior wisdom and statesmanship which he had, with so much becoming modesty, claimed for himself, and which he had, with so much frankness, and with so much candour, denied to those who preceded him in office.

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

After Recess.

MR. MOUSSEAU said that, inasmuch as he had been connected with this matter, he felt that he was bound to say something in regard to it. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), as leader of the Opposition, had thought proper to bring this matter before the House before prorogation. He (Mr. Mousseau) was glad that he did so in the forcible manner in which he

had introduced the subject. He was sorry to say that this was, perhaps, the only compliment he would have to pay to the hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks. The hon. gentleman complained of the language they had used in reference to this matter. He thought, however, that they did not exceed the license taken by hon. gentlemen in 1873. Their papers then indulged in the greatest abuse of Lord Dufferin, whose only crime was that he followed the advice of Ministers who commanded a majority in the House. The speeches of hon. gentlemen, of which he gave quotations on the 1st of March last, were a sufficient proof of this. None of them had gone so far as hon. gentlemen opposite had done on that occasion. Among the speakers on that occasion were the Hon. Mr. Laflamme, the hon. member for Shefford, and others. He desired to state that he had been misrepresented in the press in regard to the words he uttered on the evening of the announcement to which he alluded. He could not quote from *Hansard* to verify the exact words, because he had discovered that they had not been reported—why, he did not know. But, as these words had been impeached, and as he had always the courage to verify what he had said, he would repeat them. He had said that they had got a new Lord Metcalfe, and he had been taught a lesson. Those were his words, which were reported in papers supporting the hon. gentlemen opposite, and in American journals. When he used those words he had not time to verify or qualify them, or describe the occasion which impelled him to pronounce them. He had not had the time to tell the House that he knew the history of Lord Metcalfe thoroughly, and was a great admirer of his, and that his career in Canada was marked by errors which came only from his *entourage* or surroundings—from the minority that got hold of him, and tried to persuade him that the French majority could not be trusted, and could not administer responsible government properly. He was strongly convinced of the excellency of British institutions, and they saw, by his letters to the Colonial office and his friends the struggles of his conscience. On the one hand, he was firmly convinced that the

full measure of responsible government ought to be established here, while, on the other, having listened to the bad advice of the Ministry, he was always fighting against his principles and neglecting the opportunity of their application. His career in other countries was admirable; he was highly educated, and possessed critical taste and a sound judgment. When, therefore, he (Mr. Mousseau) had compared Lord Lorne with Lord Metcalfe, it was with no intention to be unjust, unfair, or insulting to the Governor-General. His constitutional sincerity, in wishing to refer the case to England was, in his (Mr. Mousseau's) opinion, erroneous. He had compared the two noble Lords to show the similarity of their circumstances—that the one might have yielded, as had the other, to bad advice. He had been accused of a want of courage in not bringing forward his motion earlier. What the leader of the Government said to-day, and the member for Lambton had admitted, entirely proved the wisdom of his (Mr. Mousseau's) course. When he submitted his motion there was only one declaration, nothing being said of the intended mission to England, as asserted to by the Marquis of Lorne, the object of which was to maintain the course of his Ministers. In face of the earnestness of the Government, and of His Excellency, and with good tidings from England, as to the good disposition of the English Government, he thought it better to delay his motion, to await the course of events. The hon. member for Lambton stated that, in his motion of March last, and in his observations, he (Mr. Mousseau) had not gone so far as to say the course of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier was unconstitutional, in dismissing his Ministers in March, 1878. He maintained that those words of his motion: "Subversive of all responsible government," were strong enough to imply the violation of that principle. He had cited cases on constitutional law to establish that point. He had established the other point—that in many instances the Imperial Government had thought it proper and wise to recall Governors, or revoke their commissions, because their course had been unwise or antagonistic to the colonial majorities. He might cite the recall of Sir Charles Dalling in 1866, and in a

despatch signed Cardwell, in which he spoke of the good relations which should exist between the Government and both parties in the House, he said: "I regret to say, in the first instance, you have rendered this impossible. It must be evident to yourself that you occupy a position of personal antagonism towards all those whose antecedents pointed them out as likely to be available to you in the event of any change of Ministry." In this instance, as in that of Lord Metcalfe, and that of Mr. Letellier, it had been the misfortune of the Governor to put himself in direct antagonism to the majority of the Assembly. The only effect of this antagonism was to render peace impossible, so the Imperial authorities thought proper to recal the offending Governors. What had they got here? As soon as Mr. Letellier was appointed, he undertook to play the part of the bitterest opponent of the Conservative party; not only did he bind himself to be the mere tool of the late Federal Administration, but, in order to help them in their Federal elections, he set himself to put down the Conservative Administration in Quebec. He began his operations in December, 1877, or January, 1878, when the election in Kamouraska took place; he hired a box-car in order to conceal himself in his expedition to that county to carry out his object, which was to canvass for the election of Mr. Pelletier, his successor. He (Mr. Mousseau) would pass over the famous occurrences indicated in his letters to Mr. DeBoucherville, on the face of which appeared the grossest partisanship, and the fact that all was arranged to take advantage of the good faith of his advisers, and oust them from office. The member for Lambton had spoken of the April elections in Quebec. He (Mr. Mousseau) had spent thirty or or thirty-five days in the campaign, and never knew or read of elections being carried by such means as were employed by the supporters of the Joly Government. Those means consisted of lies, misrepresentations and calumnies, and nothing else. There was no discussing the constitutional question of Mr. Letellier's dismissal of his Ministers. The Conservatives found it impossible to speak of that question, being stifled at all times with the cry of taxation by their opponents, who incessantly denounced them

as the party of taxation, as if they themselves did not belong to the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had imposed millions of taxation on the country. That was the cry used and course pursued in all the counties in Quebec, except a few. Sometimes that mode of canvassing took the character of perfect demagoguism, with exaggeration of the tax-paying obligations of the people in every way. That was the way the Joly Cabinet carried the elections. The member for Lambton said the whole management of the Letellier matter was bungled. He thought they ought to have proceeded by impeachment. He (Mr. Mousseau) also was half of that opinion. He did not say that the Government had mismanaged the affair, but they might have done better. His opinion would have been in favour of impeachment; but, through a feeling of delicacy towards Mr. Letellier, and pride and patriotism as regarded his race, he (Mr. Mousseau) had not taken that course. Hon. members had spoken of the June Session in Quebec, and it had been said that the verdict of the Province had entirely cleansed that personification of all the virtues of a Lieutenant-Governor. He was about to make some very serious charges; he might be reproached for bringing them late, but it was not his fault. He would have spoken in reply, in the debate on this question, some weeks ago, had he not been anxious to save time. In the June Session of the Local Legislature, the Joly Government thought proper to purchase a Speaker from their ranks. They did so at the urgent request, at the demand of Mr. Letellier. The bargain was passed in his own presence at Spencer Wood. At the beginning of the Session they were met by a vote of censure on the constitutional question. Any decent Cabinet would have resigned after that, and any decent Lieutenant-Governor would have dismissed such a Cabinet. He was sure, if the hon. gentleman from Lambton had known that, he would not have ventured to defend Mr. Letellier, because he was too upright, and had done too much to raise the standard of public morality to have ventured to speak in favour of Mr. Letellier. They went on, and Mr. Letellier was always afraid that his purchased vote

might escape him, and so he tried to purchase somebody else. He installed himself in the room of the Speaker of the Legislative Council, and in the room of the Speaker of the other House. He was there every day the House sat, not only a few minutes, but the whole length of the sitting, and he sent for Conservative members, offered them drinks, and tried to induce them to vote for his Government. But that was not sufficient, they wanted new blood. There was in the hands of Mr. Letellier a letter, signed by the late Minister of Justice, offering a Judgeship to advocates who would consent to go over to the other side. He knew that every word he uttered was true. He (Mr. Mousseau) spoke in all seriousness. It was too late now to appoint a Committee, but, next Session, if his hon. friends on the other side were ready, he would move for a Committee, and, if he did not prove any of those charges, he would leave the House in disgrace. He agreed with the hon. member for Lambton that they ought to have proceeded by impeachment, for, if they had done so, he was sure that Mr. Letellier would already have been dismissed and disgraced for ever. Mr. Joly's majority was so strong that, when Mr. Bachand died in October last, he was not replaced. The necessary formalities were filed, the proper documents were sent to the Speaker, but they had never seen the writ. At last, however, Mr. Mercier was appointed Solicitor-General, and, curiously enough, his appointment coincided exactly with a remarkable judgment of Judge Sicotte, of St. Hyacinthe, who was, at the same time, a brother-in-law of one of those Ministers. He did not want to speak disrespectfully of a Judge, but he was bound to do his duty, and to say that the appointment of Mr. Mercier coincided with a most wonderful judgment of Judge Sicotte. He had already given two judgments on the electoral list of that county, one last year, and one a few months ago. In these cases an appeal was refused—he did not know why. The judgments were rendered against the Conservatives, but they made no complaint. He gave another judgment last week, when Mr. Mercier was sworn in. By that judgment he struck off the list of St. Denis

eighty-two names of those presumed to be Conservative electors. He (Mr. Mousseau) was bound to say this was a most scandalous judgment, and by this judgment Mr. Joly's friend expected to carry St. Hyacinthe. It might be well to recal the historical fact that Judge Sicotte, in 1863, did what Mr. Turcotte did in 1878, so that we had now, in the political dictionary, two more words, Sicottage and Turcottage. Judge Sicotte hoped to send, by his judgment, a new member to Quebec to support a Ministry of which his brother-in-law was a member. So much for that famous Joly Government which the hon. member for Lambton had very modestly eulogised this afternoon.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had pronounced no eulogy on anyone; he dealt simply with the constitutional question, without touching the Ministry in any shape.

MR. MOUSSEAU said he considered Mr. Mackenzie had pronounced upon the Joly Government what they called in French, their *oraison funèbre*. He was sure that Government would not live long, and that it would be beaten early in the next Session. He was sure that, if the people of Quebec could have another chance of expressing their opinion, the Liberal party would be beaten by a majority of at least 48 out of 65. The Liberals first wanted to obtain power in Quebec in order to help the Mackenzie Administration in the last election. They now wanted to retain office through greed of the spoils, but they saw their power escaping, and they resorted to other schemes. Mr. Mercier was hardly sworn in when he telegraphed to Montreal, to the Prothonotary's office, ordering the suspension of one of the employés, one of the best and most trustworthy employés. This employé happened to be in his parish during the election contest in April, 1878, and was suspected of having been there as a politician. It was true that he was not, but the Joly Government wanted places for their friends before they went out of office.

MR. HOLTON said he was sorry his hon. friend had not felt it due to himself to explain rather more fully the course

he had taken during the present Session, and especially since the announcement made by the Government a few weeks ago. It was that which they had to do with to-night, rather than with the events in Quebec last year, and certainly a good deal more than with the recital of events, by the hon. gentleman, which had not been placed on record at all in the dispute between the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec and his former advisers. They might be true, or they might not, but they had no relevancy whatever to the subject-matter in dispute. The hon. gentleman and his friends did not include any new charges whatever as the basis of their motion of censure this year, they limited themselves to the events of last year, events which had gone into history and had been passed upon by the people of Quebec. A general election had taken place in the Province of Quebec, the result of which was to enable the new Government to pass through the fiery ordeal of a Session of Parliament, and to hold the reins of Government down to the present day. What had they to do with these petty stories of election manoeuvres? Were they never heard of before? What bearing had they upon the great issue as to the constitutional conduct of the Governor-General? That Mr. Joly, or his Ministers, should make efforts to sustain themselves by dealing with the electors, or by proclaiming, as the issue, something that the hon. gentleman denied to be such—it was trifling with the House to bring up stories of that kind as having any bearing upon the question. The hon. gentleman had not explained his own conduct during this Session, but it was that they were waiting to hear about with great anxiety. He tried now to soften that angry mood of his which he displayed five or six weeks ago; he meant only to praise the Governor-General, not to abuse him, in comparing him with Lord Metcalfe, the great and good Lord Metcalfe of the East Indian Administration, and not at all the tyrant that he had been called in a great controversy respecting responsible government in this country. But to-day Lord Metcalfe was a fine character, and there could be no offence in comparing the Governor-General to Lord Metcalfe. The hon. gentleman had changed his mood; he had not then been

told that the Government were going to send an embassy to London, he had not then heard the good news he had since heard, and that induced him to allow his motion to stand. That being the case, why did he not withdraw his motion, and give his reasons to the House? But they had just been told by the head of the Government that he had no news whatever that he could communicate to Parliament. Could he have communicated privately to the hon. gentleman, who had given him notice of attack upon him, and induced him to allow the notice to stand? Could the head of the Government have given information to the hon. gentleman privately and secretly, which he now declared he could not give to the House, having, in fact, no information to give. Really his hon. friend must see that, in the line he had taken to-night, instead of vindicating his sincerity, and explaining to his friends outside and inside of the House how it was that this motion had been so misconstrued, and himself misrepresented during the last few weeks, it now turned out that the hon. gentleman had been perfectly satisfied with the conduct of his leaders during all this time. He (Mr. Holton) regretted exceedingly that the hon. gentleman had not explained his conduct, because he regarded him as one of the rising men of the Province of Quebec, on whichever side of the House he happened to sit. He was not going to follow the hon. gentleman through his references to the current politics of the Province of Quebec, which had no relevance whatever to the matter now before the House. He felt that the conduct of Mr. Letellier in Quebec last year was of infinitely little concern to the House now. It was not Mr. Letellier who was on his trial; he might be dismissed by the means taken to bring about the result, or he might not. He (Mr. Holton) was not going to speculate upon that result. But the party they were now trying was not the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. It was another public functionary, who was directly responsible to this House—he meant the First Minister. This debate ought to have reference, and had reference, so far as the members of the Opposition were concerned, not to the merits or the demerits of Mr. Letellier, but to the conduct of the First Minister, in reference

Mr. HOLTON.

to this transaction. The charge the Opposition made against that hon. gentleman was, substantially, that he gave improper advice to the Governor-General with respect to this matter; that he gave advice, which was probably illegal, or, to say the least, of doubtful legality; but there was no doubt as to the unwisdom of that advice, unwise and improper, because it proposed to invade and destroy, so far as his action could bear upon that result, the right of self-government in the Province of Quebec. It was of doubtful legality, because the hon. gentleman did not give, as the ground of his advice, that the Lieutenant-Governor should be dismissed for some such alleged course as was in the contemplation in the Union Act. No Lieutenant-Governor could be dismissed during his period of office—five years—except for cause, and no hon. gentleman had maintained or shown, in this debate, that any such cause had been alleged as these words conveyed to any lawyer. He (Mr. Holton) was not a lawyer, still he had read some treatises on law and logic, and he asked his hon. friend the Minister of Justice whether he would say or maintain that there was any allegation of cause in the sense which this Act contemplated to convey. He contended there was not. Therefore, the advice was of doubtful legality. Even if the Governor-General were in perfect harmony with all his Ministers, he had no right to dismiss the Lieutenant-Governor, except for cause. There might be some allegations, of course, concealed in the archives of the Administration, but accompanying the statement of the advice given to the Governor-General, there had been no such specification of cause as met the requirement of the case. These were his two points: First, it was an unwise act to tender that advice to the Governor-General, because it was a direct invasion upon the right of self-government in the Province of Quebec, and, secondly, it was of, at least, doubtful legality. Then what followed? The extraordinary procedure of bringing down to the House, and making public, a divergency of opinion between the Representative of the Crown and his advisers. That was entirely at variance with the theory and practice of responsible government. The House

had no right to know, neither had the world, that the Governor-General and his constitutional advisers were at variance, for one instant of time, upon any possible subject. The moment an irreconcilable difference arose between the advisers of the Crown and the Crown itself, there must be a resignation, or there must be an acquiescence on the part of the advisers in the views of the Governor-General. Never should it go out to the world that there was, or had ever been, any difference of opinion between the Representative of the Crown and the advisers of the Crown, until it had reached the point at which the two must separate, when the cause of difference must be explained to Parliament, and the responsibility assumed by the retiring Ministry. This was an important invasion, on the part of the First Minister, on the whole system of responsible government. It was an Act utterly subversive of the principles of responsible government and sound constitutional usage. But what followed upon that? It was the creation of suspicion, at all events, that the Governor-General himself was hostile to the wishes of those among the supporters of the Government who most desired the decapitation of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, and language had been used in reference to that distinguished nobleman which he (Mr. Holton) was sure his hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) sincerely regretted to-day, and which every man of right feeling must regret. But there was no doubt that the effect produced by this improper act on the part of the head of the Government was to submit the Governor-General to unjust suspicion, amounting, in many instances, to positive odium. It was very important, in order to avoid results of such a regrettable character, that they should adhere strictly to those nice provisions, usages and distinctions which had grown up under their constitutional system. In the next place—to proceed a little further in his (Mr. Holton's) indictment against the First Minister—the right hon. gentleman denied to the House information which it was entitled to have. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) considered it to be his duty to bring down this information inopportunistically, he (Mr. Holton) thought, improperly,

and submit it to the House. His hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) said he had heard good news as to the progress of this prosecution of the Lieutenant-Governor on behalf of the Government of this Dominion before the Court of St. James. Now, he (Mr. Holton) thought the House had before it now a series of admitted facts which placed not Lieutenant-Governor Letellier upon his trial, but the head of this Government. The House must hold the head of this Government, and the whole of the Government to the strictest account for their management of this business. It was of little consequence to the House what might become of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, or whether he were right or wrong in the course he pursued; but it was of infinite consequence to them that the gentleman placed at the head of a great party and controlling the Government of this country, supported by an overwhelming majority for the moment, should not be allowed to subvert in Parliament those institutions they had striven so long to obtain, and which it was the duty of the House, beyond any other duty they had to fulfil, to do all in their power to maintain in their integrity. His (Mr. Holton's) chief purpose in addressing the House was to express his profound regret at the position which his hon. friend (Mr. Mousseau) had assumed to-night.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I thank you very much for your sympathy.

MR. HOLTON: In view of the line of conduct which he had followed during the last five or six weeks.

MR. OUMET said that he had no authority to speak on the part of his hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau); but, as he had something to do with this question, on which he had been *d'accord* with that hon. gentleman, he thought it would be but just to himself and to that hon. gentleman that he should give some explanation respecting this matter, and that he should respond to the sympathy sent across the floor of the House by their Nestor from the Province of Quebec—the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton). That hon. gentleman seemed to be very much surprised at what had been

termed the row they had raised in this House, on account of the reference of this question to England. It was not because they had changed their opinions. As for himself, he was still of the same opinion as he was when the question was first raised. He disapproved then, and still disapproved, of the reference to England of a question which seemed to him to be purely a local matter. He had disapproved of the conduct of His Excellency the Governor-General, who deemed it proper to refer the question to England. He disapproved, at the same time, of the course followed by the Government in acquiescing in, and assuming the responsibility of that reference. He was still of the same opinion, and the members from the Province of Quebec) had availed themselves of every opportunity given them to protest against that course. They had made their protest, notwithstanding that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had characterised their proceedings in the House as noisy. After having entered their protest, after having filed their exception—and their protest and exception were still on record—and as steps had been taken to have the question brought to an issue, they were waiting patiently and quietly, as became respectable citizens, as became members of this House, until an answer could be received from England, and, if the question was decided against them, their protest would be there on record. They would still be in the same position as a pleader who had filed his exception to the jurisdiction of the tribunal. They had not abandoned the hope that, at some future day, if justice were not done to them, they would do what they thought was their duty to do. They would not only protest, but, when the question was discussed again in the House, they would certainly put a motion or proposition before this House, which, though it might be voted down by the Opposition, would most certainly be upheld by the great majority of the Conservative party. On the other hand, he still hoped that the question would be solved in their favour. He still hoped that the Secretary for the Colonies, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, would give the same answer to this question, as was given on the 28th February,

MR. HOLTON.

1878, to the then Governor of the Colony of Victoria, in a despatch, in which it was laid down that it was the duty of any Governor to follow the advice of his Ministers—his constitutional advisers. In this despatch it was stated: "The main question at issue appears to be one connected with the internal affairs of the colony, and to lie altogether within the jurisdiction of your Government, and for these reasons I cannot give any opinion, but the Governor must solve the question and his legal advisers must take the responsibility of the solution." Well, he (Mr. Ouimet) hoped that the right hon. gentleman who had written these instructions in this despatch to the Governor of the Colony of Victoria would give the same opinion in the Letellier matter. If he did not, for one reason or the other, it would be their duty then to affirm the principle which was affirmed in the motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), and which, unfortunately, he, in common with many hon. gentlemen on his side of the House—not on the other side—had not an opportunity of supporting. But what was the use of bringing up this question? How could the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) claim that he regretted so much that the question had not come up?

MR. HOLTON: It is on the hon. gentlemen's account, and more particularly on account of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), whose reputation in the county required absolutely that he should put that motion that I regret it was not put.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I am most thankful to the hon. member, who regrets keenly that I did not play his game.

MR. OUIMET said there was another interest in this question. He, for one, had great respect for the hon. member for Bagot, quite as much friendship for him as had the hon. member for Chateauguay, but there was something else in that motion than the personality of the hon. member for Bagot. There was a great constitutional principle to be upheld, and, under the circumstances, the hon. member for Bagot could not expose his motion to the possibility of being voted down, and a principle affirmed

which the hon. member for Chateauguay would have regretted should be affirmed, even by his own vote. But he might now ask what was the object of the hon. member in bringing up this question? And what was the object of the hon. member for Lambton? It was certainly not brought up for the sake of the Constitution, or for the sake of the Government, of whose course, in this matter, they complained so much. He (Mr. Ouimet) might characterise the action of those hon. members as what the French called *un petit bout de cour*, to court the favour of a very important personage outside this House. But the supporters of the motion had not the same interest. They had not courted that distinguished personage. They had freely expressed their opinion before this House—not to consult this distinguished personage, but to vindicate what they thought were the rights of the people; not for party purposes, not to gain a personal triumph; but only to vindicate what they thought was the proper course to be followed. And, when they saw that they were quite alone, even abandoned by their Nestor, by one who claimed to be a father of the Constitution, they said to themselves it would be just as well to stick to their friends, who might be of some use to them in the future, and to the very cause they were now upholding. They had stuck to their friends, and this might be one of the causes of the deep regret expressed by the hon. member for Chateauguay. He again asked what was the object of this discussion? They could not discuss the proposition, the principle that had been opposed by so large a majority in this House on the 23rd of March last because it was a *chose jugée*. It could not be discussed again without reflecting on the decision of the great majority of this House, although the hon. member for Lambton and his *confreere*, the hon. member for Bothwell, thought fit to pronounce strong orations against that judgment given by this House, that the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was unwise and subversive of the principles of responsible government. Could they now discuss the advice that had been tendered by the Government? Not at all. The advice of the Government had been

given on the very verdict of this House. They were bound to give that advice after the House had pronounced. The House had declared itself, and the Government had to act upon that declaration, and they had rightly done so in advising the Governor-General that, Lieutenant-Governor Letellier having been condemned by a great majority of this House, his usefulness was gone, and he ought to be removed. The Government could not be blamed because they had chosen to make that announcement to the House. The House had a right to know what they had done in the matter, and they were authorised by His Excellency to make the announcement. Now, when the dismissal came, if it did come, and the hon. members claimed that it could not take place except for cause, the papers would be put before them, and then the cause would appear, and, if there was no cause, the hon. member or his leader would have to censure the Government for having given an unwise, a wrong and illogical advice, as the hon. member for Chateauguay said had been given. The reference to England, as he had said, might be discussed, but, if this question was to be discussed, the supporters of the motion would be alone to blame the Government, as he had already stated. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not blame His Excellency for having referred the question to England, but they said: Your friends are not satisfied with that, and you are therefore to be blamed. Whom could they blame? He had just mentioned that the advice was wrongly given. The Government had said, in a very cool way: "We shall accept the judgment of an arbitrator, and the arbitrator will be Her Majesty's Government. He (Mr. Ouimet) believed the Government were wrong. It might happen that in the end they would see that they were right, because, if the very solution arrived which they expected from the other side, that the Governor-General must submit to the advice of his Ministers, that England had given to Canada responsible government, and the very essence of responsible government was that, in all matters of internal administration, they were their own masters, they would then be satisfied, and could, without being ashamed, say that, after all, the Government were

MR. OUIMET.

right, though, constitutionally, they were right at the time, and were still right, as it would be proclaimed by the Government. The question would be settled for ever to the satisfaction of all lovers of their country and responsible government. Let the consequences be what they might, they could say at the end that they had done their duty, and might still reproach their hon. Nestor from the Province of Quebec for not having led them in that constitutional way which he boasted having followed so closely and so faithfully.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was afraid the Province of Quebec would be somewhat disheartened by the capitulation which had been made by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), of whom he (Mr. Huntington) would not have felt it his duty to speak so much had they not been neighbours.

MR. MOUSSEAU: But we do not visit often.

MR. HUNTINGTON said they did not bother each other. When he returned home he would be asked by a lot of Conservatives in his county how it was that Mr. Mousseau did not go on with his motion, and he would be obliged to tell them that he was afraid the right hon. the leader of the Government had a power over him which he (Mr. Huntington) could not explain, any more than he could explain those unseen mysterious influences by which the spirit land conveyed its views to certain peculiarly constituted temperaments. The hon. member for Bagot had led the House to suppose he would fight a great battle for the Province of Quebec. He had not fought it. He must take the consequences of having placed himself in a position to fight a great battle for a certain interest in the Province of Quebec and of not having fought it, because he had been overawed or overcome, or for some other reason had been influenced by the old power. For years they had heard that there was to spring up a certain influence in this country, headed by the young men of the country, which was to discard the old party influences and to bring good influences and true doctrines to the front, by the fervour and devotion with which the young men were to display their powers

in this sense. His hon. friend was a young man compared to himself (Mr. Huntington); the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) was a young man. This House listened, and thought it heard the first boom of the cannon—the young men were to fire. The hon. gentleman's speech was something alarming. Nothing was ever heard in this country like the fervour with which the hon. gentleman assailed the Crown, but it all ended in mild deprecation of the course taken. He remembered the days when the Trent affair occurred; there was a very impressive cartoon upon it, representing Britain looking across the waters for the release of the Trent prisoners, with an expression which indicated the title given to the cartoon: "Britain waits an answer;" and the poem went on to say: Britain awaits an answer, stern and sad. And so he could have told his people that Mr. Mousseau awaited an answer, stern and sad, but the capitulation had been made beforehand, and it was understood that, whatever might be the answer, the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) and the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), would still be pliant supporters of the right hon. gentleman, whom they should have denounced instead of denouncing the Governor-General.

Bill read the third time and passed.

PACIFIC RAILWAY ROUTE IN MANITOBA.

REMARKS.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said he was pleased to hear the Government had determined to have the Pacific Railway pass to the south of Lake Manitoba instead of the north, but the other conditions were not equally satisfactory. It was a great mistake to lop off such a very large quantity of land from settlement. It would be more in the interest of the North-West were the same policy pursued there as was pursued by the Americans. At this moment, in the States, it was allowable for any settler to take up a homestead as well on the lands reserved as on those not reserved for railways. If 100,000,000 acres in the North-West were to be shut out, for settlements were not to be had

except for \$2 per acre, a great portion of those settlers who would otherwise come here would go to the American States, where there was a large quantity of lands more accessible than those of the Dominion. The present tariff would also operate against the settlement of the North-West. It would not only be a graceful act, but an act of justice on the part of this Government, to exempt the people of the North-West from this tariff, until they had thorough communication with the country by Lake Superior. With a tariff so high as this, they could not say to those who desired to go into the North-West: You are going into a very cheap country. The article of tea, for instance, which was the most refreshing beverage the working man could possibly have, should be admitted free of duty, as was done on the American side. He trusted the Government would see proper to relieve the wants of that country by excluding it from the operation of the present tariff.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) said he was happy to hear the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Smith) was at last of the same opinion as himself (Mr. Ryan), and that he now thought the Government did right in locating the main line of the Canada Pacific Railway south of Lake Manitoba. He could not help regretting, however, that this change had occurred so late.

MR. SMITH: I was always of that opinion.

MR. RYAN said if it was his opinion, it was plainly his duty, as a representative of Manitoba, to take the same ground on the floor of the House as the hon. member for Lisgar and himself had last year. The hon. gentleman regretted that the policy of the Government would require the locking up of such an enormous quantity of land. If he (Mr. Ryan) was correctly informed, the present Government policy did not require the locking up of any greater quantity of land than was intended from the first. Under the original Pacific Railway scheme, 50,000,000 acres were to be given to a company, and an equal quantity was to be retained by the Government. The resolution now propounded reserved the same quantity. Outside these 100,000,000 acres, the homestead

system would obtain, as it had always done in the past. The hon. gentleman chose to draw the attention of the House to the large quantity of good lands which the Americans had in the markets to the south of us. No doubt the hon. gentleman was a good authority as to their value, as he was one of the proprietors of those lands himself. The hon. gentleman referred to the number of Canadians in the United States. Had he followed the debates for the past two or three years, he would have known that gentlemen who had taken an active interest in the affairs of the country had constantly deplored the exodus of Canadians to the United States, and, to remedy that, the great change was introduced in our fiscal policy. If there were so many Canadians settled in Dakota, it was not because their lands were superior to ours, but because the railway policy of the late Administration did not confer that ready access to our lands which the Americans gave to their people. Of course, in this matter they were competing with the Americans for settlers, and must be prepared to do as they did, or they would not attract any considerable amount of immigration. They must not only have lands as good as the Americans, but afford the settlers nearly equal railway facilities. Anyone who considered the railway policy of the late Government, the last four or five years, must have reached the conclusion of four-fifths of the people of Manitoba, that, till they had some change of Government or policy, they could not hope for a railway through the prairies, to compete with the Americans, and must submit to see the bulk of the emigration pouring to the south of them. He was happy to see that, with the new Administration, this policy had been changed for what they, in Manitoba, always believed the railway policy ought to be, a vigorous one. He heartily approved of it, and knew he was thus expressing the sentiments of the settlers generally in Manitoba. This policy had produced great benefit to it, and he doubted not that, before many years, it would accomplish magnificent results. The sympathy shown for Manitoba by hon. gentlemen opposite, in discussing the tariff, in saying it would double her taxation, did not characterise

them in dealing with the railway question. They spoke as if they considered the present Government were doing too much for that country. Therefore, he was inclined to doubt their sincerity, their sentiment, or affection on the tariff question. Quite true, as they had, in Manitoba, no manufactures, they might prefer a Free-trade tariff; but they preferred even Protection, and higher duties, with a vigorous railway policy, to the late tariff and railway policy, or want of policy of the last Government.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 74].

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

SENATE AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill be agreed to.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said there was a very serious objection to the time of the sitting of that Court. He would ask that the House should not concur in the amendment of the Senate, fixing the days of its terms. The second term in the year had been changed from June to May, and the practitioners and public generally felt that there was not a proper interval between the February session of the Court and the May session. As to the February term, it would be the end of March before the business would be concluded, leaving only a month for the preparation of the cases for the coming Court, which was an insufficient period, by the practice of the Court. There would be no time for the Court to prepare their judgments, or the practitioners their cases, and one term would be, in the end, lost to the people who attended the Court. The June term was fixed by common consent, and should be restored.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) simply demonstrated the difficulty of pleasing everybody. The Judges had recommended that the term should be fixed as at present. When the Bill went to the Senate, the term had been fixed as he (Mr. McDonald) desired, in May. The Judges had considered the whole matter, their time at

present and requirements. There were many interests to serve, including those of solicitors, barristers, and suitors; but he thought the greatest was the interest of the Court. He thought the Judges were the parties best qualified to determine in what manner they could most efficiently perform their duties, and the fixing of the terms at the times which would best enable them to perform their work was what the House ought to aim at. He had laboured to meet the views of all, solicitors or suitors, and thought that the dates now fixed were those which, in the opinion of the Court, were most suitable, and which the House ought to sustain.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he was inclined to think that, so far as the profession in Ontario was concerned, the fixing of the first week in May would prove extremely inconvenient. There was a great deal of force in the observation of the member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) as to the too great nearness of the February and May terms. There was also much force in the remark of the Minister of Justice that the wish of the Court ought to be consulted; but he (Mr. Cameron) was not prepared to agree with him that that was the primary consideration, which was the convenience and wants of the suitors. Both the Bench and Bar ought to sink all their private considerations before the good of the suitors. There had been an amendment made in the Senate of very much greater importance than that, however,—he meant the addition to the clause in reference to the right of appeal in preliminary objections to election petitions. As he understood that added clause, it would prevent any appeal in those cases in which, within the last few days, judgment had been given by the Courts in New Brunswick, possibly in view of the effect of the contemplated legislation as to the right of appeal in preliminary objections in the cases now proceeding. The Senate had added a clause that practically prohibited an appeal on a great and leading question that had been raised on a preliminary objection as to the constitutionality of the Court to try election petitions. He totally dissented from that alteration or

addition by the Senate. He thought that an appeal ought to be allowed to the Supreme Court, and that that question of the constitutionality of the Court created by the Controverted Elections Act, ought to be tested—an opportunity ought to be given to test it before the Supreme Court. Within the last few days, judgments had been given in two or three cases in New Brunswick, which, under the Bill, as amended by the Senate, would become final and unappealable. It seemed to him the right of appeal ought to be allowed, but, since, by these judgments, the petitions had been dismissed and appeal could not be entered, the right of the petitioners to have the election scrutinised was at an end. It was proposed, as he understood, to dissent from these amendments in the Senate, and he regretted the late period of the Session would prohibit that. If it were at all possible to take the sense of the House as to whether that important point of the constitutionality of the Controverted Elections Act would be appealed to the Supreme Court to have it judicially settled, he thought it was their duty to allow it. And if, without any injury to the Bill as a whole, that amendment could be dissented from, this House ought to dissent from it.

MR. PLUMB said the Election Act of 1874 thoroughly proved the lack of constitutional knowledge on the part of the hon. gentlemen who now sat on the Opposition benches. They had left the important question open as to whether Parliament had the right to decide on the manner in which it should try the election cases of its own members. The 101st section of the British North America Act, provided that Parliament might establish a General Court of Appeal for the settlement of constitutional questions. It provided, also, that it could establish any additional Courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada. The Controverted Elections Act of 1874, failing to declare that it established a Court under the provision of the 101st section of the British North America Act, although it doubtless intended to do so, had left open the question of jurisdiction for the decision of any Judge, before whom an election

trial was brought. He saw that in Ontario, upon a preliminary objection, upon his (Mr. Plumb's) petition, which had also been made in other cases in Ontario, the Courts of Queen's Bench, Chancery, and Common Pleas, had decided that they had jurisdiction. In the Province of Quebec, Judge Mondelet, when the law was first put on the Statute-book, refused to try a case under it, on the ground that it was not in the power of the Parliament of Canada to compel Judges having other particular functions and jurisdiction in the Provincial Courts to try election cases, and that a separate Court was not created by it under the Elections Act. That was warning enough for the hon. gentlemen then controlling legislation, but they had not heeded it. He did not hesitate to say that the wholesome force of the Election Law had been relaxed in almost every provision by the amendments which had been made to it since the beginning of the Parliament of 1874 until this time. It seemed as if everything that had been done by the gentlemen on the opposite side, in respect to election trials, had been done with some secret knowledge, and with a view to the corruption of the electorate. The trial of election petitions had been left in such a way that at this moment the Judges of the several higher Courts in Canada were not agreed as to the powers conferred upon them by Parliament. In Ontario they had said that they had jurisdiction, and a right to try these cases. They said that Parliament, having a right to pronounce on the qualification of its own members, had a consequent right to relegate that power to any person, whom it might, in its own wisdom, select. In New Brunswick there had been a decision, apparently hurried on by the impending passage of the Bill now under discussion, the effect of which decision would be to confirm certain prominent gentlemen of the Opposition in their seats, and to quash the petitions against them. That decision was against the constitutionality of the Court, which the Act of 1874 attempted to create. There was a difference of opinion among the Judges of the Courts of Quebec, in regard to it, and he (Mr. Plumb) believed that there was also doubt as to the constitutionality among the learned Judges

of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentlemen opposite must have known that the question would arise, for Sir John A. Macdonald, whose Act of 1873 made the necessary declaration, warned the Ministry, in 1874, of the omission in the Act passed by them which repealed his Act except as to trials relating to the elections of January, 1874. No such disturbing question was mooted in those trials, in which an enormous amount of bribery among the Government candidates was disclosed, and it seemed as if it was intended by legislation to relax the wholesome stringency of the law, and to make corruption easy and unpunishable, and Ontario was disgraced by even worse legislation in the same foul direction, in the desire to relieve the Barbers and the Neelons. They had seen public contractors sitting in this House and controlling legislation, and not only were they sitting there with impunity, but they were protected by virtue of legislation which prevented the trial of a petition while Parliament was in Session, and forbade Judges from sitting during term, and by virtue of legislation which whitewashed them of pain and penalties when their misdeeds were disclosed.

MR. HOLTON: Order.

MR. PLUMB said he contended that he was speaking to the question, and that his argument was perfectly logical and in order, and that his hon. friend from Chateaugay (Mr. Holton) knew he was telling the truth. It was a sad day for Canada, when the corporal's guard, the baker's dozen, the gentlemen shrinking—according to the eloquent words of the ex-member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake)—shrinking behind the member for Kingston, were not able to prevent, although they strongly opposed, the kind of legislation which had brought about the corruption he (Mr. Plumb) was speaking of. And he referred to it in unmistakable language of condemnation, because it was pertinent to the discussion of a special clause of the Bill before them, and because he knew that the destinies of Canada depended upon the purity of this Legislature, upon whether the members who sat in this House were independent of, or servile to, the Government of the day. He thanked God that the hon. gentlemen on the

MR. PLUMB.

Government side of the House were a body who could not be corrupted, and that we had a Senate which the hon. member for Bothwell had not abolished. He had heard a good deal of bribing manufacturers, of corrupting farmers in respect to the National Policy, which its enemies asserted falsely promised to give everybody everything. But he maintained that no legislation ever passed in this House had been so productive of corruption as the legislation which made it possible for any man to sit in the House of Commons of Canada with a contract in his pocket; even to sit—though he did not say any man had done so—whilst it was certainly possible that he could—in the Speaker's chair. They might imagine the humiliation of the late Government, upon hearing one of the foremost lawyers of Canada, the late member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake), rise in his place and say there was no harm in a member of Parliament taking a contract with the Government, because, the very instant he entered into such a contract, he ceased to be a member of Parliament. Consequently, a Speaker, who was the arbiter between the two great contending parties in the House, the man who held the scales of justice, who sat in his robes of State, giving decisions which might affect the destinies and the liberties of this country, who was supposed to see neither side, but to be blind to the fact as to whether his decisions would affect one side or the other, might sit in the Speaker's chair for four years deriving emolument from a contract which he might have been proved to have corruptly enjoyed, might escape punishment through a Bill passed by a vote of the party which elected him, and might be adjudged to have been neither a duly qualified Speaker entitled to give decisions, nor, in fact, a member of Parliament at all, certainly not in any sense entitled to hold the honourable position of Speaker of this House, for, according to Mr. Blake, the Speaker from 1874 to 1878 was not a member of Parliament. But he resigned—he was re-elected to the House after a thorough whitewashing, and was re-elected Speaker by his friends. The legislation of the late Government, with reference to the qualification of members, which was, he (Mr. Plumb) believed, corrupt, must have been initiated for the

purpose of allowing a man to sit and vote in this House who never had a right to do so. It was tainted throughout by the same wicked design. He (Mr. Plumb) had no desire to bring up these matters before the House, but he was compelled now to do so by the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, who had, within the last two days, the temerity to bring an exploded charge against the leader of the Government, an insult to whom was received by every man who sat behind that hon. gentleman as a threat and insult to himself. When they looked back at the disclosures affecting Walker, Cook, M. C. Cameron, Laflamme, Jodoin, Morris, the McLeods, the Anglins, and other purists, whose name was legion—when they looked back at the men who lately held the reins of Government, they might well question the character and intention of any legislation enacted by those gentlemen. He had heard a great deal from the gentlemen opposite, and from their leading newspapers of the corruption and jobbery of their predecessors in office, and of the purity of the party now in the minority. It had been claimed by the leader of that party, in the House, that no money had been spent to secure the return of his friends to Parliament in 1872, or in 1874. Such brazen assertions, and the hypocritical, pharasaical pretension to be holier in party warfare than their opponents, had disgusted him and many others who had been constant readers of the great party organ. If it had required anything to make him (Mr. Plumb) a strong Conservative—his opponents might say, perhaps, a Tory—it would have been the sham morality preached by men who knew that the corruptions they had to hide were rank and smelt to heaven. The party of the hon. gentlemen opposite, which professed to be so pure, was really the party of corruption. Why had they started the cry of the Pacific scandal in 1874, and why did they repeat it whenever they were pinned to the wall? It was to cover up their own offences; it was because they had bought elections, and because, in 1874, they intended to spend large sums of money on the elections. The hon. member for Centre Huron said that it was an old dodge, when men were guilty of offences to charge offences of a similar

kind against those who had detected them. He pointed to the disclosures of the corrupt appeal of the Big Push Purists, to the North Simcoe election trial, respecting the immaculate standard elevator H. H. Cook, and to the Chambly election trial, where it was proved that the firm of Huntington, Laflamme & Huntington subscribed \$9,000 towards the election of Mr. Jodoin, who was, after all, unseated and disqualified, and gave place to a good Conservative (Mr. Benoit), who was re-elected in September last. Look at the shining, the lustrous example of Mr. Walker, whose friend, John Madiver, came along to put down corruption, and at whose election bribery of the foulest kind flooded the slums of London. \$25,000, it was said, the elevation cost in that lovely instance, and the disqualified Walker sat in a place of honour at picnic gatherings, beside the leader of his party, and was the nominee of that party at the last election.

MR. MILLS: There was a case in Niagara in which it was proved that more *per capita* was spent than in London.

MR. PLUMB said he spent no money at all, and Judge Hagarty was in great doubt as to whether or not he would unseat him. The learned Judge himself said that decision turned upon a very severe interpretation of the law of agency in election cases as defined up to that time, by which he (Mr. Plumb) must be unseated. The case of agency was one three times removed. \$120 only was proved to have been improperly spent. His (Mr. Plumb's) counsel refused to throw up the sponge, notwithstanding the suggestions of the counsel for the petitioner. He insisted that the case against him (Mr. Plumb) should be exhausted. There were many witnesses for the petitioner in Court; but the petitioner did not call them, and went no further, after proving bribery to the extent named, notwithstanding the challenge. The learned Judge, in his report, fully acquitted him (Mr. Plumb) of any consent to or knowledge of the bribery. The learned Judge administered the law in its full severity, although there had been but few election trials, and the English decisions upon

which his judgment was based were not generally known in this country, nor had candidates the warning they now had. Another learned Judge, in the Province of Quebec, tempered his judgment in the election case of a respondent, who was at the time Minister of Justice in the Government of his standard-elevating friend from Lambton, with greater mercy, and did not even unseat the man who many persons thought owed more to mercy than to justice for his escape. The St. Ann's sideboard, alas, showed that lessons were lost on some people. But there was another election trial in Niagara, which had lately terminated, to which the attention of members had been called by the member for Bothwell. An irrepressible gentleman came from Toronto, last summer, to contest the constituency with him (Mr. Plumb). He stated that he was specially commissioned to run in the Grit interest by the hon. member for Lambton, and by the great Panjandrum himself, the Hon. Mr. Brown, the leader's leader. The last named hon. gentleman, it was said, was heard to assert that a man had been found to beat him (Mr. Plumb), and that he (Mr. Plumb) was doomed. The resident Grits had offered the nomination to three or four of the most available men in the constituency, but they had exhibited the better part of valour, and one and all had declined the honour. Mr. Hughes came upon the stage, and appealed to his co-religionists for support. The influential Catholics advised him to go back to Toronto, and assured him he could not win by fair means. He was egged on, however, by designing men, to whom he foolishly bragged of the depth of his purse, and he was returned by a majority of two. His agents in the work of a corruption which was unparalleled in the history of elections in Canada, were two brothers-in-law from Rochester, two of their American friends, and a few notorious men in the constituency whose hands were against every man, or in every man's pocket who appeared there as a candidate, and would permit himself to be robbed by them. Some of the money that was openly paid for the purchase of votes was handed over to the other side by the recipients when the poll closed, and within a few hours overwhelming evidence was in their hands, under which the

emissary and chosen candidate of Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Brown could not escape unseating and disqualification. Proceedings were taken immediately upon the return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the Niagara petition was the first one filed. Owing to the defect in the Controverted Election Act, which was affected by the section of the Supreme Court Act under discussion, the counsel for the respondent obtained a hearing upon a preliminary objection as to the constitutionality of the Court for election trials. Delays were consequent. The decision was against the objection. The trial was held late in January—four months after the filing of the petition. Several cases of bribery were proved; the respondent's election was set aside; he was disqualified, but, before the scrutiny of votes which would seat him (Mr. Plumb) could be gone into, the learned Judge was compelled, under a clause in the Election Act, to which he (Mr. Plumb) had already referred, to adjourn the Court until the 11th of March, in order, meanwhile, to sit in term and give judgment. The respondent desired to prevent a further prosecution of the case, which had scarcely begun, except as to bribery by the respondent personally. The Court met at Niagara on the 11th March. A sufficient number of votes were struck off from the respondent's list to give him (Mr. Plumb) a majority. His counsel stated to the Court that, having obtained all he petitioned for, namely, the unseating and disqualifying of the respondent, with all costs, and the seating of the petitioner, he thought it unnecessary to proceed further. The respondent's counsel withdrew all charges against him (Mr. Plumb), and stated that the case on his side would not be proceeded with. Mr. John Currie, a former opponent of his (Mr. Plumb), made an attempt to substitute one Bissell for Mr. Hughes. His (Mr. Plumb's) counsel offered him every facility, and proposed to wait till Mr. Hughes' consent could be obtained, which the Judge thought necessary, but Bissell did not appear, and the matter was dropped. He (Mr. Plumb) had heard that his opponent acknowledged that he spent \$10,000 in the election. Of course, but a small part of this enormous sum ever went out of the possession of the professional election jobbers and

hungry buzzards, who had extracted it from him by playing upon his ignorance and his vanity, both of which were egregious. It was also stated that Mr. Hughes admitted having paid the large sum of \$14,000 to prevent the attendance of witnesses at the Court, and for other purposes, which it would not be proper to name. One man asserted that he had been paid \$700 to go across the Niagara River and stay there till the case was over. He was found in good quarters at a first-class hotel with two other suspected persons, who also modestly shrunk from the publicity of the witness box. Thus ended the case which might justly be called a *cause celebre*. There was no further resistance to the seating of the petitioner, and no appeal.

MR. MILLS: Why?

MR. PLUMB: Because there were no grounds upon which to attack him, or upon which to appeal, the constitutional objection having been disposed of by the Ontario Judges almost unanimously. He would suggest to his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, two cartoons, to be hung up in the halls of the party of Reform, or to be exhibited in their party processions as symbolisms of the purity of their principles. The one should represent the Walker election of 1874, as the illustration of their advent to power, and the companion picture should be that of the triumph of the party, in the person of the hon. gentleman's chosen candidate, Mr. Hughes, in Niagara, in September, 1878, which as emphatically and truly illustrated that they, of the party of purity, still clung to the same human devices which had purchased their rise, and which precipitated their downfall. There could not be found canvas enough on which to depict all the frightful warnings of their career, but these would suffice as hints, and serve as a useful lesson for the rising generation. And these were the men who dared to talk about the sale of a railway charter. The right hon. the leader of the Government had challenged the Opposition to discussion, and dared them to the proof of that foul, stale, evil-smelling slander which some of the hon. members opposite had lately referred to, in a manner characteristic of each. The hon. member for Centre Huron had truculently introduced

it into an argument against certain propositions for procuring aid from the home Government for a Pacific Railway scheme. It had been reiterated in a still more offensive way by the purist of Shefford, who had been hoist with his own petard, and upon whom an inquest ought properly to have been held immediately afterwards. With a meanness of insinuation, peculiar to certain persons who durst not say openly what they sought to convey covertly—stabbers in the dark—it was hinted furtively by the member for Bothwell, who had especially distinguished himself by the style of his attack, and the disingenuousness of his postulates during the present Session. The whole scandal had been fabricated for the purpose of leading off on a false scent—for the purpose of drawing public attention from the iniquity of the party of purity, who, from the grand old Reformer down to—he would not call names—were double-dyed in electoral and Parliamentary corruption, either by their own deeds, or by shielding others. A salutary lesson had been taught the country by the career of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and, as the discussion was going on, it was perfectly legitimate, and strictly in order, to refer to matters bearing upon the effect of a change in the Supreme Court Act, by which appeal could be taken to that Court upon preliminary objections in election trials, an appeal which was shut off by the repeal of certain clauses in the Controverted Elections Act of 1874, and the substitution therefor, of a clause in the Supreme Court Act of 1875. The clause of the Act now under discussion seriously affected the position of parties to an election trial, and that position was rendered most uncertain by the different views taken by Judges, in respect to the constitutionality of the Controverted Elections Act. He (Mr. Plumb) held that, for this complication, as well as others, gentlemen opposite were entirely responsible. A stringent Election Law, and swift and certain punishment for its violation, was most desirable in the interest of all those who desired to see the halls of State purged of the shame which humiliated all who witnessed it in 1877, and no better note of the honesty and purity of a party could be found than in its legislation on that paramount subject. He (Mr. Plumb) had

been called to order by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), who had brought himself down and attenuated his naturally vigorous mind, until he was nothing broader than a point of order, who could never address this House on anything larger or more worthy a statesman than a point of order. He (Mr. Plumb) was in order when he asserted that it was made very difficult by the legislation of the Reform Government since 1874, to unseat any member, however unworthy he might be, and that was the legacy which was left the present Parliament by the great so-called Party of Purity.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said the first amendment to this Bill affected existing cases, and took away the right of appeal. Respecting the election in Montmorenci, there were two appeals, at this moment, pending in the Supreme Court against the decisions of Judges on preliminary objections, and it was a question whether that right of appeal existed or not. In order to remove any doubt, this Act provided that henceforth there should be such appeals, and there could be no question but that there should, because an election petition well founded, complaining of an undue election, might be disposed of upon a preliminary point by a Judge on a very arbitrary, and, he might be allowed to say, perhaps an ill-founded decision. To get the right of appeal against such decisions, this clause was inserted in the Bill. Now, this amendment provided that following should be inserted "Provided also that no appeals shall be allowed under this section in cases of litigation now pending." There were cases now pending in which that question was yet to be decided by the Supreme Court, and this amendment would take away the right of appeal, and those cases would be turned out of Court by this legislation which, he thought, had been proposed without due consideration by the other Chamber. The responsibility would rest on the Government, and he felt it his duty to warn the Minister of Justice as to the effect of this amendment.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said no person could deprecate more strongly than himself the amendment proposed by

MR. PLUMB.

the Senate. He thought it was uncalled for, and, instead of promoting the interests of justice, would tend directly in the contrary direction. But, inasmuch as the Bill gave appeal on questions where there was no appeal before, or where it was doubtful that there was any appeal, he thought it more desirable to retain the Bill than to send it back to the Senate, at the risk of losing the whole Bill, leaving election cases just where they were before this Act was proposed, and losing the benefit derivable from it on other questions of great importance.

MR. COCKBURN said if, under the proposed amendments, the election cases were left as they were under the old Act, he would not say another word ; but, unfortunately, the particular amendment to which he referred went much further. It made a law which cut out those appeals altogether.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he was not aware of any cases pending ; but his hon. friend would see that it only raised the question that would probably be raised in some incidental election before another general election. The old Supreme Court of New Brunswick and the Court of the Province of Quebec had held that the Election Court, as established under the present Election Law, was *ultra vires*, and the result was that petitions in those Provinces had been dismissed, while the Supreme Courts of Ontario and Nova Scotia had held directly the contrary ; so that they had the judicial power of the Dominion divided on this all-important question. If he (Mr. McDonald) thought that injustice could possibly be done by the clause as it stood, and he was not aware that any questions were pending in the Court that could possibly be affected by it, he would almost sacrifice the Bill rather than be a party to doing injustice to anyone on either side. The Bill was a very important one. There were clauses in it that it was desirable should become law, and he did not think he could accede to the request and imperil the Bill by rejecting the amendment.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said that clause was prepared with a good deal of care, by himself with the assistance of another gentleman in the House, and

was submitted to a very learned Judge of the Supreme Court. The very wording of it was most carefully considered, and, unfortunately, the amendment made by the Senate certainly deprived the clause of its chief value. The object of it was to allow an appeal to the Supreme Court on that general question of constitutionality, under the Controverted Elections Act. It was thought there should be an appeal upon it, and that the rights of any petitioner should not be entirely jeopardised by a judgment on that particular point. The effect of a petition on that ground was the petitioner was drawn before the Court, had no right to appeal, and, on the judgment of a single Judge, the right of a member to sit was decided. It was only on those preliminary objections where the decision involved the entire fate of the petition, or the right of the hon. member to sit in this House that any appeal was allowed. It was not proposed to allow an appeal on a preliminary objection of a technical character, but only on one dismissing the petition, only on a preliminary objection going to the merits of the whole case. If the petition was dismissed, the petitioner was out of Court for ever, and the member petitioned against was confirmed in his seat ; and an hon. member might sit in this House who had obtained his seat by improper means. A great wrong would be done if the appeal were departed from. They ought not, by any legislation, determine that the right of a member to sit in this House should not be subject to the scrutiny of a higher Court, and that any member who happened to obtain a favourable judgment on this particular point should be confirmed in his seat without any possibility of appeal.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved, in amendment to insert after the words, " And provided also that no appeals shall be allowed under this section in cases in litigation and now pending " the following words : " Except cases where the appeal has been allowed, and duly filed."

Amendment agreed to.

House adjourned at
Half-past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 15th May, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at fifteen minutes before Two o'clock.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE.

REMARKS.

Order for Mr. John A. Macdonell to attend at the Bar of the House read.

MR. SPEAKER read the following letter :—

“TORONTO, 14th May, 1879.

“A. PATRICK, Esq.,

“Clerk,

“House of Commons,

“Ottawa.

“SIR,—

“*Re* Macdonell.

“On enquiry at the office of Mr. Macdonell, I was informed by a clerk that he had not returned to the office from Ottawa, and that it was probable he had remained over at his home (Glengarry) on the way up.

“On his arrival I will serve him, and notify you to that effect.

“Yours truly,

“H. VINCENT GREENE.”

MR. McLENNAN said the young gentleman whose name was before the House in this unpleasant position happened to be one of his constituents, and he felt it his duty to say a word for him here. He was very sorry he was not here to speak for himself. He was sure that no one could regret more than he would, and more than he did, the unpleasant scene which occurred on Saturday night. He thought that gentlemen in this House who had come to years of discretion, and whose blood was cool, and whose heads were sobered, must sympathise with younger men, under circumstances of great excitement, and he (Mr. McLennan) ventured to say that no man possessed a higher sense of honour than Mr. Macdonell. He (Mr. McLennan) regretted exceedingly to have heard that young gentleman's name mentioned in this House under circumstances which, on the face of them, appeared to be very much against him. He was sure no man would be more ready than he would be to apologise to this House, and to Mr. Speaker, for the indiscretion he committed under circumstances of great excitement. Of course, it was

MR. McDONALD.

an open question as to the offence. He believed Mr. Macdonell was sitting beside the Speaker in a seat to which he had been introduced by Mr. Speaker's permission, and, if he made a remark which appeared to be offensive to a member of this House, he thought hon. members might extend to him a feeling of charity. What Mr. Macdonell believed to be strong language was applied to a right hon. gentleman upon whom he looked with the veneration which he properly felt towards the gentleman who had been his protector and friend, and to whom he felt the strong fidelity of his ardent nature. He (Mr. McLennan) had not the least hesitation in saying that Mr. Macdonell was indiscreet. He would, however, have no opportunity of clearing himself for a long interval, in fact, not until the next Session. His appointments had made it necessary that he should leave for the county of Glengarry on Monday, but he (Mr. McLennan) was willing to pledge all the weight of any responsibility that he might have that Mr. Macdonell would be the first, if he were here, to apologise for the indiscretion he had committed in very hot blood. Allusion had been made to Mr. Macdonell having sent a paper into this House, and he thought it was very unfairly stated that that was sent in cold blood. A young gentleman, in that state of excitement, who simply crossed the corridor, was not in cold blood, and his sending that in writing could not be regarded as a repetition of his offence in cold blood. He made this explanation as one which he owed to a young gentleman of whom he had the very highest opinion, and to whose indiscretion he was inclined to extend an amount of charity, in which he believed the Speaker and every member of the House would agree with him.

MR. HOLTON said he was very sorry, indeed, to hear the excuse made by his hon. friend from Glengarry for a perfectly inexcusable offence against the dignity and privileges of the House. That the young gentleman referred to should have been led by circumstances to the committal of the great indiscretion of which he was guilty was very much to be regretted, but it could only

be atoned for by an apology, not only to the House, but to the hon. gentleman against whom the offence was committed. This hon. gentleman was a representative of the people, and as such, should be respected by all who came within the precincts of the House. This gentleman was introduced as a matter of privilege on the floor of the House, and had no right to accept that compliment, that favour, to become, as it were, the guest of the hon. member for Shefford, unless he was prepared to treat him with the decorum and respect to which the hon. gentleman's position as a member of the House entitled him. The hon. member for Glengarry had stated that the young gentleman had too hot blood. Why should he have hot blood? Had he anything to do with the debates of the House? Had he any right to interfere in the discussions taking place in the House? His hon. friend took a position which was not creditable to himself in apologising for such an outrage. This young gentleman must have known—he did know as a fact—that the initial steps had been taken to call him to the Bar of the House.

MR. McLENNAN: No, he did not.

MR. HOLTON said he left with a full knowledge of what was to be done. He had not responded to the order, and his hon. friend now put in a plea in extenuation. It was not becoming in his hon. friend, and it was not what his duty to the dignity of this House required at his hands. This young gentleman—he desired to speak of him as a young gentleman; he knew him; he had known his lamented father very well; he did not believe that he was accustomed to perform acts unworthy of a gentleman—had fallen into a grievous error, to say the least of it, in this case, and it was due to the House, to himself, to his position, and to the hon. member for Shefford that he should tender to the House, and to the hon. member for Shefford, a complete and comprehensive apology for the error, if error it were, into which he had fallen; and yet that young gentleman allowed this Session of the House to close with the stigma fastened upon him for the next nine months of having insulted this House, of having insulted a member of this House,

personally, when availing himself of the kindness and courtesy of Mr. Speaker to obtain a seat on the floor. If he had consulted his own personal dignity, if he had reflected on the flagrancy of the offence he had committed, he would have appeared in spite of every obstacle in response to the order of the House, and would have tendered such an apology as would have been called for by the occasion, which, he was sure, the whole House, including the hon. member for Shefford, would gladly have accepted, and would thus have relieved himself of a stigma that must stand fixed to him during his whole future career. He (Mr. Holton), during his twenty-five years' service in Parliament, had never known so flagrant an offence against the dignity and privileges of the House as the young gentleman referred to had confessedly been guilty of on this occasion. Of course, the time remaining to them forbade any ulterior proceedings being taken. Obviously, advantage had been taken of the advanced stage of the Session, and the impossibility of Parliament taking any steps to vindicate its privileges during the Session; but he did say that this young gentleman had placed himself in a position that his friends ought to mourn over, instead of excusing, and which rendered it the duty of the leaders of the House at the next Session to call him to a rigorous account for. It was not by stopping out of the way, and by evading the issue this Session, that Mr. Macdonell would clear himself of the contempt of Parliament under which he now sat, and the leaders of the House would utterly fail to do their duty if they failed to take next Session such steps as would assert the dignity and privileges of Parliament in respect to this matter. This young gentleman had committed a most flagrant assault, not merely on the privileges of the House, but on the proprieties of life. A more disgraceful exhibition was never made within the precincts of Parliament than was made by this young gentleman on the night of Saturday last. He would not have expressed himself thus warmly, he would probably not have said anything at all, if his hon. friend from Glengarry had not conceived it consistent with his duty, because of his personal relations to this young gentleman, to lay

down doctrines which could not be entertained, to enter pleas of extenuation or justification which could not for one moment be entertained, and which were utterly repugnant to any doctrine that had ever before been proclaimed with regard to what was right and proper under the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Macdonell came to me the other day to apologise. Of course I did not mention it to the House, because I considered the offence of such a grave and public character that I thought his apology ought to have been publicly.

MR. HOLTON said he thought Mr. Speaker was quite right. No doubt, his conception of the gravity of the offence committed was the correct one. Mr. Macdonell was not only bound to apologise publicly to the House, but he was bound to apologise publicly to the hon. member for Shefford.

MR. McLENNAN said his young friend left at three o'clock on Monday, before the meeting of the House. He would have been an intruder to come and apologise without being called here.

MR. HOLTON: He knew he had committed a flagrant offence.

MR. McLENNAN: He did not know he was to be called to the Bar of the House.

MR. HOLTON: He did not leave at three o'clock. He left at night, so I am informed. But there can be no doubt the apology was due to the individual member whom he had outraged, within hearing, within less than two yards of his seat.

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

“**MR. SPEAKER:**—

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to attend His Excellency.

MR. HOLTON.

In the Senate Chamber.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to amend and consolidate as amended the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.

An Act to reduce the capital stock of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.

An Act to extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Company and to further amend the Act incorporating the said Company.

An Act to amend the Act 41 Victoria, chapter 21, intituled “An Act to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company.”

An Act respecting the International Bridge Company.

An Act to authorise the Welland Railway Company to convert their 6 per cent. mortgage bonds into 5 per cent. debenture stock, and for other purposes.

An Act to incorporate the Gazette Printing Company.

An Act further to amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (limited).

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.

An Act to amend an Act respecting the Police of Canada.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Napanee, Tamworth, and Quebec Railway Company

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Canada Life Assurance Company.

An Act to authorise the construction of a bridge over the Ottawa River, for the use of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, and Occidental Railway, and for other purposes.

An Act respecting the “Andrew Mercer Ontario Reformatory for Females.”

An Act respecting La Banque Jacques Cartier.

An Act to incorporate the North American Mutual Life Insurance Company.

An Act respecting tonnage dues levied in Canadian ports under Canadian law.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act of 1875.

An Act to incorporate the Geographical Society of Quebec.

An Act respecting Census and Statistics.

An Act to amend the Penitentiary Act of 1875.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa Loan and Investment Company, and to change the same to “The Manitoba and North-West Loan Company (limited).”

An Act to amend and consolidate the laws respecting duties imposed on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange.

An Act respecting the offices of Receiver-General and Minister of Public Works.

An Act to incorporate the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.

An Act to make the first day of July a public holiday by the name of Dominion Day.

An Act to amend an Act for the more speedy trial in certain cases of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanours in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and the Act respecting summary convictions before Justices of the Peace.

An Act to amend an Act to provide for more effectual enquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at elections of members of the House of Commons.

An Act to amend the Act of Incorporation of the Confederation Life Association.

An Act to authorise and confirm an indenture of sale by the Trustees of the Toronto Savings Bank to the Home Savings and Loan Company (Limited).

An Act to amend an Act intituled "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.

An Act respecting certain Ordnance and Admiralty Lands in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

An Act to explain and amend the Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion lands in Manitoba.

An Act to amend the Truro and Pictou Railway Transfer Act, 1877.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Isolated Risk and Farmers' Fire Insurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to "The Sovereign Fire Insurance Company of Canada."

An Act to provide against infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.

An Act to amend the Pilotage Act, 1873.

An Act to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.

An Act to remove doubts as to the true intent and meaning of certain provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and to make certain amendments thereto, in so far as the said Act relates to Manitoba.

An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Detroit River Tunnel Company.

An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Canada and Detroit River Bridge Company.

An Act for granting an annual subsidy towards the construction and maintenance of telegraphic communication to and upon Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands.

An Act to provide for the payment of an additional temporary grant to the Province of Manitoba.

An Act respecting the salaries of the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island.

An Act to grant certain powers to La Société Permanente de Construction du District d'Iberville.

An Act to make further provisions respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.

An Act relating to the protest of Inland Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes in Nova Scotia.

An Act to amend the Maritime Jurisdiction Act, 1877.

An Act respecting Building Societies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.

An Act to amend the Seamen's Act, 1873.

An Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.

An Act to provide for the inspection, safe-keeping, and storage of petroleum and the products thereof.

An Act to amend the Acts incorporating the Coteau and Province Line Railway and Bridge Company, and the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company and amending Acts, and to amalgamate the said companies.

An Act to continue in force for a limited time the Better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878.

An Act respecting the safe-keeping of dangerous lunatics in the North-West Territories.

An Act respecting the Official Arbitrators.

An Act to amend so much of the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 46, as relates to the imposition and collection of dues and tolls upon logs, timber, pine, cedar, and railway ties passing down the River Moira through the port of Belleville.

An Act further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874.

An Act to provide for the salary of one additional Judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, and for the salary of any future Judge in Equity of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

An Act to amend and consolidate the laws relating to Weights and Measures.

An Act to incorporate the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act of the present Session, intituled "An Act to provide for the inspection, safe keeping, and storage of petroleum and the products thereof."

An Act to extend an Act respecting certificates to Masters and Mates of ships.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act respecting trade marks and industrial designs.

An Act to amend the Act relating to Banks and Banking and the Acts amending the same.

An Act to provide for the liquidation of the affairs of Building Societies in the Province of Quebec.

An Act to amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

An Act to alter the duties of Customs and Excise.

An Act for the acquisition by the Dominion of a certain portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, to be made part of the Intercolonial Railway.

An Act to amend the Indian Act, 1876.

An Act for the relief of Eliza Maria Campbell.

An Act further to amend the Acts therein mentioned respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Railway Act, 1868, and the Acts amending it.

An Act further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act.

The Speaker of the House of Commons then said :—

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

"In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency a Bill intituled 'An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1879, and the 30th June, 1880, and for other purposes relating to the public service,' to which I humbly request Your Excellency's assent."

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words :—

"In Her Majesty's name His Excellency the Governor-General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill."

His Excellency the Governor-General was then pleased to address the two Houses in the following speech :—

"Hon. Gentlemen of the Senate :

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

"I desire to thank you for the diligence and care with which you have discharged your duties during this laborious and protracted Session.

"The reorganisation of the important Department of Public Works and the division of its duties, will, I doubt not, greatly add to the efficiency of the public service.

"The consolidation and amendment of the Statutes relating to the lands of the Dominion will present to the large number of settlers now wending their way to the North-West Territories a compendious and well-considered system.

"I hope that the Bill relating to Weights and Measures, while it relaxes the stringency of previous legislation, will not

decrease the efficiency of that important measure.

"The provision made for telegraphy by cable between the mainland, Anticosti, and the Magdalen Islands, will facilitate and aid our commerce and navigation, and especially the development of our fisheries.

"The measures adopted for the vigorous prosecution of the Canadian Pacific Railway hold out a prospect of the early completion of that great undertaking; and the proposed purchase from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of the line from Rivière du Loup to Quebec, when concluded, will at last complete the engagement entered into at the time of Confederation, to connect, by an Intercolonial Railway, the St. Lawrence with the Atlantic ocean at Halifax.

"I congratulate you on the other measures affecting the public interests which have been passed.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

"In Her Majesty's name I thank you for the supplies you have so readily granted. They will be expended with all due regard to economy.

"Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

"The readjustment of the tariff which had been effected by the legislation of this Session will, I trust, by increasing the revenue, restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, while it will, at the same time, aid in the development of our various industries, and tend to remove the long continued financial and commercial depression which has so greatly retarded the progress of Canada.

"I bid you, now, farewell; and desire to express my earnest hope when Parliament again assembles, that we shall find the country enjoying the state of peace which now happily exists within its borders, together with a great addition to the national prosperity."

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to Tuesday, the 24th June next.

INDEX.

SESSION 1879.

1. In the *general* sections of the Index, the *names* in italics and parenthesis, after the subject, denote the *movers*.

2. In the *personal* sections, the *motions*, etc., under any member's name, which are in italics and parenthesis, are those which emanate from that member. Where the word "on" is used, without italics or parenthesis, it denotes a speech upon another's motion.

3. Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used, as the following:—Adj., Adjourn; Amt., Amendment; Ans., Answer; Appt., Appointment; Ass., Assurance; Asst., Assent; B., Bill; Cap., Capital; Civ. Serv., Civil Service; Clk., Clerk; Com., Committee; Conc., Concurrence; Cont., Contract; Controvd., Controverted; Cor., Correspondence; Dep., Deputy; Dischg'd., Discharged; Disml., Dismissal; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; H., House; H. E., His Excellency; H. M., Her Majesty; Incorp., Incorporation; Inc., Income; Ins., Insurance; Instrns., Instructions; M., Motion, Moved; Mess., Message; Neg., Negatived; Ord., Order; O. C., Order in Council; P. A., Public Accounts; Pap., Papers; Pet., Petition; Priv., Privilege; Proced., Procedure; Propd., Proposed; P. W., Public Works; Q., Ques., Question; R., River; Rep., Report; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sess., Sessional; Tend., Tenders; W., Whole House; Withdn., Withdrawn; W. & M., Ways and Means; Y., Yeas; N., Nays.

1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading.

*, Without discussion.

Accidents on Railways, 1878.

M. for Bets. (*Mr. Fleming*), 129.

Address in Answer to His Excellency's Speech.

M. (*Mr. Brecken*) 6; seconded (*Mr. Tassé*) 12; Debate, 16; agreed to, 24; H. E.'s reply, 88.

Admiralty Lands (Mr. McDonald's B.)

See "Ordnance Lands."

"Advertiser," London, statement.

Respecting vote, correction (*Mr. Coughlin*) 1754.

Alaska Boundary.

M. for Pap. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 230.

Albert Railway, N.B.

Postal car for, Ques. (*Mr. Rogers*) 489.

Alice, the Princess, death of.

Mess. from Sen., 48; Address concurred in, 59; Mess. H. M.'s reply, 1397.

Allan Mail Contract.

Halifax and Queenstown, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Daly*) 673.

ALLISON, Mr.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 163;

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 402.

ALLISON, Mr.—Con.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349-50; (Cheese), 1425.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights & Measures), 1725.

American Canals and Hudson River.

Canadian navigation of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Currier*), 185.

American Vessels, Canadian Registration of.

M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*), 180.

American Wrecking Tug.

Seizure of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*), 119; Resumed Debate, 680; M. agreed to, 684.

American Wrecking, etc., in Canadian Waters.

M. for Cor. since 1874 (*Mr. Stephenson*), 1405.

Amet Island Breakwater, N.S.

M. for all Pap. respecting (*Mr. McKay*) 657.

Andover, N.B., Bridge at.

M. for Pap. respecting (*Mr. Connell*) 653.

ANGLIN, Mr.

Dismissals, Officials of House (*M. for Pap.*), 29, 39, 40.

Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat, on Ques. Priv., 44.

ANGLIN, Mr.—*Con.*

- Debates, Reporting, Tenders, on Ret. of, 59; on M. to ratify cont., 94.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 150, 159.
 American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 182.
 Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 224.
 Election Petitions, N.B. on M. for Rets., 233.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 391, 406; on Vote (*Q. of Ord.*), 408; on Premier's Statements, 1028.
Courrier du Canada, on Mr. Huntington's Explanations, 616.
 Mitchell & Co., Supplies by, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Ord.*), 661.
 Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 63 (Mr. Fortin); on 2° (*Q. of Proceed.*), 825.
 Betting and Pool-selling B. 38 (Mr. Robertson); on M. into Com. of W., 845.
 Controvd. Elections Act. Amt. B. 4 (Mr. McCarthy); on 2°, 851.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey); on 2°, 940, 941.
 Census and Statistics B. 67 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 1234-6.
 B. C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald), on M. into Com. of W., 1289.
 Trade Marks B. 82 (Mr. Pope), in Com. of W., 1292.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1387.
 N. B. claims against Dom., on M. for Cor., 1401.
 B.C. Penitentiary, construction of, on M. for Pap., 1409.
 Memorial, Free Trade Assn., Eng., on Q. of Proceed., 1412.
 Truro and Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr. Tupper) on 3°, 1504-5-8.
Tariff.—W. & M., in Com., Res. passing *en bloc*, on Q. of Proceed., 474-5; on 2°, financial statement called for, 510; on Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1165, 1189-90; on Mr. Tilley's explan., 1304; on Ques., 1317. On Res. 11, on 2° (Books, etc.) 1341; (Bookbinders' materials) 1345; (Butter) 1416; (Carriages, etc.) 1420; (Cotton Sheetings, etc.) 1438; (Fruits) 1443; (Furniture) 1444; (India-rubber goods) 1446; (Tin plates) 1450. On Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1455. On Mr. Tilley's personal explan., 1457-9. On Res. 11, on 2°—(Opium) 1470-71; (Plaster of Paris) 1474; (Printing Presses) 1474-6; (Wines) 1478; (Sugars) 1487-8; (Vegetables) 1510.
 Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. into Com., 1574.
 Divorce in Ont., on Mr. Hooper's proposed B., 1696.
 Petroleum Inspection B. 104 (Mr. Baby) on Res., 1697.
 Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res., 1701.
 Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.
 Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr. Tilley), on Res., 1786.
 N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald), on Res., 1789-92.

ANGLIN, Mr.—*Con.*

- P. E. I. County Ct. Judges B. 110 (Mr. McDonald), on 2°, 1795.
 Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby), in Com., 1847.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper), on Res., 1946.
 Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper), Res., on Conc., 1997.
Supply—Estimates: Legislation (Commons, Speaker's Arrears, and Dep. Clk.), 1541; (Sess. Clks.), 1543; Immigration (Salaries), 1544-5; (Mennonites), 1549. Pub. Works, Cap. (Pacific Ry.), 1645; Pub. Works, Inc. (Buildings, N.B.), 1663; (Harbours, etc., N.B.), 1666-7; Ocean and R. Service (Subsidies, Campbellton and Gaspé), 1674-5; Collection of Revenues (Customs), 1691-4; (Weights & Measures), 1719-20. Supplementary Estimates, 1879-80: Indians, 1854; Legislation (Sess. Clerks), 1856.
 Conc.: (Intercolonial Ry.) 1867, 1873; (Mr. Piché's gratuity) 1873-5.
Animals, Diseases (Mr. Pope's B.) See "Contagious Diseases."
Anticosti and Magdalen Islands Telegraph Subsidy B. No. 111 (Mr. Tupper).
 Res. in Com. of W. and reported*, 1796; B. introduced, 1796; 1° and 2°, 1799; 3°, 1806. (42 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
Appointments.—See "Civ. Serv." and "House" for general questions, and the names or places referred to, for special cases.
Arbitration, Ontario Boundary.
 Cost of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Stephenson), 67.
Arbitrators' Awards, Pub. Works.
 Appeals from, Legislation, Ques. (Mr. Cockburn, *W. Northd.*) 66.
Arbitrators (Mr. Cockburn's B.) See "Official Arbitrators."
Arisaig Pier, N. S.
 Improvement of, Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 827.
ARKELL, Mr.
 Election Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey), on 2°, (Amt.) 6 months' "hoist," 853.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1127.
Arms, Carrying of (Mr. McDonald's B.)
 See "Crime, etc., Act."
Assignees, Official, Quebec.
 Moneys paid by, M. for Ret. (Mr. Valin) 919.
Assiniboine River, Land Claims.
 Of Prof. O'Donoghue, M. for Ret. (Mr. McCarthy) 1763.
Assomption River, Bridge over.
 Construction of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Hurteau) 844.
Assomption River, Deepening of.
 Intention, Ques. (Mr. Hurteau) 563; M. for Cor., 671.

- Atlantic & N. W. Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 56** (*Mr. Colby*).
1°*, 562; 2°*, 629; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 924. (42 Vic., c. 65)
- Australian Exhibition.**
Moore, S. J., claim of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Hooper*), 240.
- Average Adjusters at Shipping Ports.**
Intention to Appoint, Ques. (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*), 491.
- BABY, Mr.**
Inland Revenue Reports and appendices, (*presented*) 26.
Weights and Measures Inspectors (*Ans.*) 71.
Tobacco, Canadian, duties on (*Ans.*) 74.
Saw-logs, Measurement (*Ans.*) 111.
Bills of Exchange, etc., Acts Consolidation (*B. 31, 1°**) 189; in Com. of W., 1237.
Weights and Measures Acts Consolidation (*B. 87, Res. in Com. and 1°*) 1500: in Com., 1841-2-3-6-7-8.
Petroleum Inspection (*B. 104, Res in Com. and 1°*) 1696-7; (*B. 117, 1°, 2° and 3°**) 1980.
Supply—Estimates: Legislation (Commons, Dep. Clk.) 1541; Collection of Revenue (Excise, culling) 1717-18; (Weights and Meas.) 1718, 1725.
- BAIN, Mr.**
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1045; Res. 11, on 2°—(Corn) 1349; (Sugars) 1489.
P.E.I. claim, Fishery Award, (*Ques.*) 1756.
Supply—Estimates: Immigration, 1546.
- BAKER, Mr.**
Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*), on 2°, 165.
Quebec Judges' Salaries (*Ques.*) 562.
- Baker & Co., Fort Benton, payments to.**
Mounted Police Service, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*), 837.
- Bank, Consolidated** (*Mr. Gault's and Mr. Tilley's Bs.*) See "Consolidated Bank."
- Bankruptcy Bills**—See "Insolvency."
- Banks, Building Societies, &c.**
Affairs of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gill*) 671.
- Banks, Inspection of.**
Measures for, Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 223.
- Banks and Banking Acts Amt. B. No. 71** (*Mr. Tilley*).
1°*, 1003; 2° and referred to Sel. Com. on Banking, etc., *, 1535; Com. of W., reported and 3°*, 1804. (42 Vic., c. 75.)
- BANNERMAN, Mr.**
Tariff—Res. of Com. W. & M, on 2°, 641.
- Banque Jacques Cartier** (*Mr. Girouard's B.*) See "Jacques Cartier."
- Bark, Hemlock**—See "Hemlock."
- Barnaby River, Miramichi.**
Salmon Fry for, Ques. (*Mr. Snowball*) 826.
- Battleford and Selkirk Telegraph.**
Contracts, etc., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Schultz*) 830.
- Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater.**
Completion of, Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 1559.
- Bay St. Paul, Wharf.**
Continuation of Work, Ques. (*Mr. Perreault*) 490.
- Beaubien, Thomas, St. Flavie.**
Land claims of, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 491.
- Beauharnois Canal.**
Employés, appointments, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 63; Enlargement, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 140; Site and building, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 188.
- BÉCHARD, Mr.**
Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 80.
Tariff—W. & M. Res. on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1095.
Indemnitie Reduction (*B. 95, 1°**), 1533.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 219.
Insolvency Laws Repeal (*B. 15, 1°**) 107; on 2°, 1575-7: in Com., 1775: 3° M., 1783.
Insolvency Laws Repeal *B. 85* (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2°, 1609; (*Amt.*) Res. for unconditional Repeal, 1610, 1621.
Weights and Meas. Laws Consol. *B. 87* (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1842.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1634.
- Beet-root Sugar, Excise duty on.**
Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Skinner*) 1397.
- Bellechasse Controverted Election.**
Judge's Report, 1784.
- Belleville, Timber Tolls at (33 Vic., c. 46)**
Repeal B. No. 49 (*Mr. McCuaig*).
1°*, 488; Com. of W. and reported, 1885; 3°*, 1885; Fees remitted, 1982. (42 Vic., c. 51.)
- Belvath P. O., Melbourne Township.**
Suspension of, Ques. (*Mr. Huntington*) 489.
- BENOIT, Mr.**
Chambly Canal, widening (*Ques.*) 48.
- BERGERON, Mr.**
Beauharnois Canal Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 63.
" " Enlargement (*Ques.*) 140.
" " Site, etc. (*M. for Pap., by Mr. Mousseau*) 188.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1413.
Palace Car fares (*B. 96, 1°**) 1533.
- BERGIN, Mr.**
Public Works Contracts, 1873-79 (*M. for Pap.*) 236.
Cornwall Canal, hydraulic leases (*M. for Ret.*) 239.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. 576-7, 608-9.
Contagious Diseases, Animals, *B. 55* (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1248.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 12, Free List, on 2°—(Wool) 1511-14.
Factories Regulation Act (*B. 103**) 1696.
Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights and Meas.) 1720.
- Berthier Wharf, Repairs.**
Since 1874, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 246.

Betting, Act against, Amt. B. No. 38
(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)

1^o*, 222; 2^o*, 562; M. into Com., 845; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) agreed to, 847.

Bic, Old, Harbour.

Improvements, M. for Pets. (*Mr. Fiset*) 657.

Bic, Seigniory, Fishing Rights.

To whom belonging, Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 111; M. for Pap., 137.

BILLS.

Bill (No. 1) *Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

1^o*, 4.

Bill (No. 2) *Relating to Bankruptcy.*—(*Mr. Colby.*)

1^o*, 41; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Bill (No. 3) *To amend "The Insolvent Act of 1875," and the Acts amending the same.*—(*Mr. Bourassa.*)

1^o*, 48; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Bill (No. 4) *To make better provision for the trial of Controverted Elections of Members of the House of Commons, by amending and consolidating the Acts now in force on that subject.*—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)

1^o*, 59; 2^o propd., 164; resumed debate, 847; 2^o and referred to Sel. Com., 853.

Bill (No. 5) *To declare the rule of decision in the Courts of the North-West Territories.*—(*Mr. Mills.*)

1^o, 65; 2^o m., 675; neg., 680.

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

1^o*, 71; 2^o, 107; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1706.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

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

1^o*, 71; 2^o, 108; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3^o*, 924.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

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

1^o*, 71; 2^o m., 1266; B. withdn., 1273.

Bill (No. 9) *To incorporate the Selkirk and South Saskatchewan Railway Company.*—(*Mr. Rykert.*)

1^o, 71; 2^o, 109; B. withdn., 1213.

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

1^o*, 71; 2^o, 111; Senate amts. agreed to*, 798.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

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

1^o*, 71; 2^o*, 111; 3^o*, 628.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

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

1^o*, 88; 2^o*, 111; Com. of W. and reported*, 629; 3^o*, 650.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 60.)

BILLS.—Con.

Bill (No. 13) *To amend and consolidate as amended the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

1^o, 88; 2^o*, 125; Com., 126, 221; 3^o*, 221.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

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

1^o*, 88; 2^o*, 111; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 798.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

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

1^o*, 107; order for 2^o, 1575; postponed, 1578; resumed, 1622; 2^o carried (Y. 117, N. 60), 1627; Com. of W., 1769; Amts. (*Mr. Girouard, J. Cartier*), 1769, withdn., 1782; Amt., operations of B. deferred (*Mr. MacDonnell*), negatived, 1783; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) negatived (Y. 55, N. 107), 1783; B. 3^o, 1784.

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

1^o*, 107; 2^o, 924; referred to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 926; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1765.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

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

1^o*, 107; order for 2^o, 1578; order dischgd. and B. withdn., 1578.

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

1^o*, 107; 2^o*, 156; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3^o*, 924.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

Bill (No. 19) *To amend the Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.* (37 *Victoria*, Chap. 9.)—(*Mr. Casey.*)

1^o*, 107; 2^o m., 853; resumed debate, 927; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Arkell*), 857; resumed debate, 927; Amt. agreed to on a division, 943.

Bill (No. 20) *To amend the Act 41 Victoria, Chap 29, intituled: "An Act to revise and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company."*—(*Mr. Scriver*)

1^o*, 107; 2^o*, 156; Com. of W. and reported*, 629; 3^o*, 651.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 59)

Bill (No. 21) *To amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

1^o*, 125; order for 2^o discharged and B. withdrawn, 1534.

Bill (No. 22) *To repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and to make provision in lieu thereof.* (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.*)

1^o*, 126; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Bill (No. 23) *To incorporate the "Gazette" Printing Company.*—(*Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre.*)

1^o*, 126; 2^o*, 208; Com. of W. and reported, 651; 3^o*, 705.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill, *To empower Robert G. Dalton, Clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench, Ontario, to pay to John Stewart, of the City of Kingston, surgeon, one thousand dollars.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Introduction M., 139; over-ruled and B. withdrawn, 140.

Bill (No. 24) *To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and to extend the time for the completion of the said Railway.*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

1^o*, 140; 2^o*, 208; Com. of W., Amd. and reported, 629; 3^o*, 651; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 1123.—(42 Vic., c. 61.)

Bill (No. 25) *To abolish the use of French Weights in the Province of Quebec.*—(Mr. Casgrain.)

1^o*, 140.

Bill (No. 26) *To authorise the Trustees of the Toronto Savings Bank to sell and convey to the Home Savings and Loan Company (limited).*—(Mr. Cameron, North Victoria.)

1^o*, 140; 2^o*, 825; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1470.—(42 Vic. c. 55.)

Bill (No. 27) *To amend the Act to Incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company of Canada.*—(Mr. Williams.)

1^o*, 140; 2^o*, 208; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3^o*, 798; Senate Amts. agreed to, 1290.—(42 Vic., c. 58.)

Bill (No. 28) *To amend an Act intitled "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the 39th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.*—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

Introduction M., 138; objected to and withdrawn, 139; introduced and 1^o, 156; 2^o*, 562; Com. and reported*, 1266; 3^o on a division, 1572.—(42 Vic. c. 10.)

Bill (No. 29) *To amend the "Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Act," and the Act amending the same.*—(Mr. McLennan.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o*, 488.

Bill (No. 30) *To amend the "Coteau and Province Lane Railway and Bridge Act," and the Act amending the same.*—(Mr. McLennan.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o*, 488; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1643.—(42 Vic., c. 57.)

Bill (No. 31) *To amend and consolidate the laws respecting the duties on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange.*—(Mr. Baby.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o*, 562; Com. of W., 1237; reported, 1238; 3^o*, 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 17.)

Bill (No. 32) *To amend "An Act to provide for more effectual inquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at Elections of Members of the House of Commons."*—(Mr. Ives.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o, 1274; Com. of W. and reported*, and 3^o*, 1575.—(42 Vic., c. 6.)

Bill (No. 33) *To amend "An Act to extend certain provisions of 'The Seaman's Act, 1873,' to vessels employed in navigating the Inland Waters of Canada."*—(Mr. Rykert.)

1^o*, 221.

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 34) *To repeal the Act, 40 Vict., chap. 21, to establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.*—(Mr. McCuaig.)

1^o*, 221; order for 2^o, 684; dischgd. and B. withdrawn, 688.

Bill (No. 35) *Fixing the Rate of Interest in Canada and prohibiting Usury.*—(Mr. Méthot.)

1^o*, 221; 2^o m., 1582; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (Mr. Plumb) carried. (Y. 97, N. 68), 1585.

Bill (No. 36) *To revive and amend the Acts relating to the Union Assurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the "Crown Assurance Company of Canada."*—(Mr. Kilvert.)

1^o*, 221; 2^o*, 312.

Bill (No. 37) *To provide against Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.*—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

1^o*, 221; order for 2^o dischgd. and B. withdrawn, 562.

Bill (No. 38) *To amend the "Act for the repression of Betting and Pool Selling."* (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

1^o*, 222; 2^o*, 562; m. into Com., 845; Amt., 6 months' "hoist"—(Mr. Cameron, S. Huron); agreed to, 847.

Bill (No. 39) *To amend "The Post Office Act, 1875."*—(Mr. Langevin.)

1^o*, 222; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported*, and 3^o*, 1249.—(42 Vic., c. 20.)

Bill (No. 40) *To incorporate the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.*—(Mr. Hooper.)

1^o*, 251; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3^o*, 798.—(42 Vic., c. 67.)

Bill (No. 41) *To incorporate the British American Mutual Life Insurance Company.*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

1^o*, 251; Com. of W. and reported*, 1003; 3^o*, 1003.—(42 Vic., c. 73.)

Bill (No. 42) *To amend the Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.*—(Mr. Gigault.)

1^o*, 251.

Bill (No. 43) *To provide for the transfer of lands, and estates and interests in lands, and for other matters relating to Real Property in the Territories of Canada.*—(Mr. Mills.)

1^o*, 293.

Bill (No. 44) *To repeal the Act passed in the thirty-eighth year of Her Majesty's reign, intitled "An Act to regulate the construction and maintenance of Marine Electric Telegraphs."*—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1^o*, 293; 2^o m., 1278; carried (Y. 54, N. 28), 1284; referred to Com. of W., 1285; ordered into Com. of W., 1572; Com. and reported*, 1575; 3^o* on a division, 1575.

Bill (No. 45) *To authorise the construction of a bridge over the Ottawa River for the use of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and for other purposes.*—(Mr. Holton.)

1^o*, 338; 3^o*, 1141.—(42 Vic., c. 56.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Bill (No. 46) *To incorporate the Farnmouth Dyking Company, of Farnmouth, Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. Killam.)
1° 338; m. into Com. of W., 921; order dischgd. and B. withdn., 924.
- Bill (No. 47) *To extend the corporate character and powers of the Direct United States Cable Company to the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1° 338; B. withdn., 1636.
- Bill (No. 48) *To change the name of "The Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company" to that of "The Metropolitan Insurance Company," to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.*—(Mr. Rochester.)
1° 338; B. withdn., 1453.
- Bill (No. 49) *To repeal so much of the Act thirty-third Victoria, Chapter forty-six, as relates to the collection of dues and tolls upon logs, timber, cedar, pine and railway ties, passing down the Moira River through the port of Belleville.*—(Mr. McCuaig.)
1° 488; Com. of W. and reported, 1885; 3° 1885; Fees remitted, 1982.—(42 Vic., c. 51.)
- Bill (No. 50) *Respecting "La Banque Jacques Cartier."*—(Mr. Grouard, Jacques Cartier.)
1° 409; 2° 489; Com. and reported*, 1266; 3° 1346.—(42 Vic., c. 54.)
- Bill (No. 51) *To amend "The Penitentiaries Act, 1875."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1° 409; 2° 1298; Com. of W. and reported, and 3° 1533.—(42 Vic., c. 42.)
- Bill (No. 52) *Respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.*—(Mr. Gault.)
1° 488; 2° 562; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3° 924.—(42 Vic., c. 52.)
- Bill (No. 53) *To amend the Act of Incorporation of the Confederation Life Association.*—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)
1° 488; 2° 562; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3° 924.—(42 Vic., c. 72.)
- Bill (No. 54) *To amend "An Act respecting Police of Canada."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1° 506; 2° 562; Com. of W. and reported*, 1293; 3° 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 37.)
- Bill (No. 55) *To provide against Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.*—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)
Res. in Com. of W., 506; 1° 507; 2° 1246; Com. of W., 1246; reported, 1249; re-com., amd., reported, and 3° 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 23.)
- Bill (No. 56) *To incorporate the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.*—(Mr. Colby.)
1° 562; 2° 629; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3° 924.—(42 Vic., c. 65.)
- Bill (No. 57) *To make further provision in relation to Statutory Holidays.*—(Mr. Domville.)
1° 562; 2° 1285; Com. of W. and reported, 1765; Amt. to 3°, 3 months' "hoist" (Mr. Holton), negatived (Y. 54, N. 100); Amt., re-com. to exempt Quebec (Mr. Brooks), 1767; agreed to on a Division, 1769; re-com. and reported*, 1769; 3° 1805.

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Bill (No. 58) *To amend the "Truro and Pictou Railway Transfer Act, 1877."*—(Mr. Tupper.)
1° 610; 2° 1238; Com. of W. and reported*, 1241; 3° m., 1504; Amt. to refer back to Com. of W. ("r. Brecken) 1505-7; negatived on a Division, 1508; 3° 1508.—(42 Vic., c. 12.)
- Bill (No. 59) *To amend "The Railway Act, 1868," as respects Bridges over Railways and Railway Bridges over Canals and Rivers.*—(Mr. Tupper.)
1° 611; order for 2° dischgd. and B. withdn., 1587.
- Bill (No. 60) *To amend "The Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874."*—(Mr. Tupper.)
1° 611; 2° Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3° 1702.—(42 Vic., c. 13.)
- Bill (No. 61) *To regulate Stock-Brokers and suppress Gambling in Stocks.*—(Mr. Grouard, Jacques Cartier.)
1° 612; 2° 1285.
- Bill, *Respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton.)
Introduction m., 649; over-ruled and withdn., 649.—(See No. 89.)
- Bill (No. 62) *To repeal "An Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included or which may hereafter be included within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada."*—(Mr. Ouimet.)
1° 649.
- Bill (No. 63) *To grant certain powers to "La Société Permanente de Construction du District d'Iberville."*—(Mr. Mousseau.)
1° 738; 2° 825; Com. of W. and reported, and 3° 1885.—(42 Vic., c. 76.)
- Bill (No. 64) *To amend the Act fortieth Victoria, chapter fifty-seven, respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.*—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1° 738; 2° 1391; B. withdn., 1730.
- Bill (No. 65) *To incorporate the Geographical Society of Quebec.*—(Mr. Fortin.)
1° 740; 2° 825; 3° 1141.—(42 Vic., c. 77.)
- Bill (No. 66) *Respecting the offices of Receiver General and Minister of Public Works.*—(Mr. Tupper.)
Res. in Com. of W. agreed to*, 741; 1° 741, 2° 1241; Com. of W., 1241; reported; 1246; 3° 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 7.)
- Bill (No. 67) *Respecting Census and Statistics.*—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)
Res. in Com. of W., agreed to, 742; 1° 742; 2° 1233; Com. of W., 1233; amd. and reported, 1236; re-com. and reported, and 3° 1533.—(42 Vic., c. 21.)
- Bill (No. 68) *To incorporate "The Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company."*—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.)
1° 782; 2° 1141; B. withdrawn, 1730.
- Bill (No. 69) *Further to amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited).*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

- 2^o, 825; Com. of W. and reported*, 1003; 3^o, 1003.—(42 Vic., c. 75.)
- Bill (No. 70) *To remove doubts as to the true intent and meaning of certain provisions of the "Canada Temperance Act, 1878."*—(Mr. McCuaig.)
- 1^o, 904; 2^o, 1285; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1575.—(42 Vic., c. 50.)
- Bill (No. 71) *To amend the Act relating to Banks and Banking, and the Acts amending the same.*—(Mr. Tilley.)
- 1^o, 1003; 2^o, and referred to Sel. S. Com. on Banking, &c., 1535; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1804.—(42 Vic., c. 75.)
- Bill (No. 72) *To explain and amend the Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion Lands in Manitoba.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
- 1^o, 1003; 2^o, 1296; Com. of W., 1296; reported*, 1534; 3^o, 1702.—(42 Vic., c. 32.)
- Bill (No. 73) *To amend the Act 40 Vict., chap. 21, to establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.*—(Mr. McCuaig.)
- 1^o, 1026, 2^o, 1804; Com. of W. and reported, 1804; 3^o, 1805.—(42 Vic., c. 40.)
- Bill, *To provide for the peaceful separation of British Columbia.*—(Mr. DeCosmos.)
- Introduction m., 1079 (Vol. ii); there being no seconder, dropped, 1080.
- Bill (No. 74) *Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Court Act."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1^o, 1080; 2^o, 1587; Com. of W., 1801; amd. and reported, 1803; 3^o m., 1803; postpd. 1804; 3^o, 1806; Senate Amts. propd. 2036; Amts. respecting Appeals (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) agreed to, 2043.—(42 Vic., c. 39.)
- Bill (No. 75) *To amend "An Act for the more speedy trial in certain cases of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1^o, 1080; 2^o, 1294; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1533.—(42 Vic., c. 44.)
- Bill (No. 76) *Respecting "The Andrew Mercer Ontario Reformatory for Females."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1^o, 1080; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported*, and 3^o, 1296.—(42 Vic., c. 43.)
- Bill (No. 77) *To make the first day of July a Public Holiday by the name of Dominion Day.*—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)
- 1^o, 1123; 2^o, 1286; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1575.—(42 Vic., c. 47.)
- Bill (No. 78) *To amend the Act incorporating "The Ottawa Loan and Investment Company," and to change the name to "The Manitoba and North-West Loan Company (Limited)."*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
- 1^o, 1123; 2^o, 1141; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1540.—(42 Vic., c. 74.)
- Bill (No. 79) *Respecting Building Societies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
- 1^o, 1213; 2^o, 1287; 3^o, 1805. (42 Vic., c. 49.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Bill (No. 80) *Respecting tonnage dues levied in Canadian ports under Canadian law.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1287; 1^o, 1288; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1535.—(42 Vic., c. 24.)
- Bill (No. 81) *Respecting the Official Arbitrators.*—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)
- 1^o, 1291; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o, 1865.—(42 Vic., c. 8.)
- Bill (No. 82) *Respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs.*—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1292; 1^o, 1293; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1594.—(42 Vic., c. 22.)
- Bill (No. 83) *To amend the Act known as "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878," so far as the same may become applicable to the Province of Manitoba.*
- Incorp. with B. No. 70.—(42 Vic., c. 50.)
- Bill (No. 84) *To repeal "The Supreme and Exchequer Court Act," and the Acts amending the same.*—(Mr. Keeler.)
- 1^o, 1373; 2^o m. for to-morrow, 1375; 3 months' "hoist" m. (Mr. Mackenzie), neg. (Y. 44, N. 129), 1375; Debate on Proceed., 1376-91.
- Bill (No. 85) *To repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and the Acts amending it, and to make provision for the liquidation of the estates of Insolvents.*—(Mr. Colby.)
- 1^o, 1412; 2^o m., 1594; Amt. Res. for unconditional repeal (Mr. Béchard), 1610; m. to adj. debate (Mr. Coursol), 1616, withdn., 1621; Amt. carried (Y. 99, N. 75), 1621.
- Bill (No. 86) *To amend an Act further securing the Independence of Parliament.*—(Mr. Rykert.)
- 1^o, 1453.
- Bill (No. 87) *To amend and consolidate the laws relating to Weights and Measures.*—(Mr. Baby.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1^o, 1501; 2^o, 1841; Com. of W., 1841, reported, 1848; 3^o, 1848.—(42 Vic., c. 16.)
- Bill (No. 88) *To amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1^o, 1502; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3^o, 1702.—(42 Vic., c. 28.)
- Bill (No. 89) *Respecting the Harbour of North Sydney in Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1502; 1^o, 1503; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1669.—(42 Vic., c. 30.)
- Bill (No. 90) *To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou in Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., amd., 1503; 1^o, 1503; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1669.—(42 Vic., c. 29.)
- Bill (No. 91) *To amend "The Pilotage Act, 1873."*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 1°, 1503; 2°, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3°, 1702.—(42 Vic., c. 25.)
- Bill (No. 92) *To amend "The Seamen's Act, 1873."*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 1°, 1504; 2°, Com. of W. and reported, and 3°, 1669.—(42 Vic., c. 27.)
- Bill (No. 93) *To alter the duties of Customs and Excise.*—(Mr. Tilley.)
- For Res. in Com. of W. & M., see "Tariff." 1°, 1533; order for 2°, 1806, debate; 3° carried on a Division, 1830.—(42 Vic., c. 15.)
- Bill (No. 94) *To amend "The Indian Act, 1876."*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
- 1°, 1533; 2°, 1669; Com. of W. and reported*, 1702; Senate Amts. agreed to, 2003-4.—(42 Vic., c. 34.)
- Bill (No. 95) *To reduce the salaries and allowances of certain public functionaries and officers, and the indemnity to members of the Senate and House of Commons.*—(Mr. Béchard.)
- 1°, 1533.
- Bill (No. 96) *To regulate charges on Railway Palace and Sleeping Cars.*—(Mr. Bergeron.)
- 1°, 1533.
- Bill (No. 97) *To provide for the salaries of two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- M. of H. into Com. of W., 1288; agreed to, 1290; Res. in Com., 1534, reported 1535; 1°, 1535; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669.
- Bill (No. 98) *To amend and consolidate "The Railway Act, 1868," and the Acts amending it.*—(Mr. Tupper.)
- 1°, 1550; 2°, 1702; Com. of W., 1705, 1711; reported 1715; 3°, on a Division, 1716.—(42 Vic., c. 9.)
- Bill (No. 99) *For the Relief of Eliza Maria Campbell.*—(Mr. Macdougall.)
- 1°, 1572; 2°, 1706; Com. of W. and reported*, 1878; 3° m., 1878; Amt., 3 months' "hoist" (Mr. Mills) 1879; Resumed debate, 2004; Amt., to re-com. (Mr. Farrow) negated, 2010; Mr. Mills's Amt. negated (Y. 38, N. 56) 2010; 3°, on same division reversed, 2011.—(42 Vic., c. 79.)
- Bill (No. 100) *To amend an Act to Incorporate the Detroit River Tunnel Company.*—(Mr. Kilvert.)
- 1° and 2°, 1585; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1706.—(42 Vic., c. 62.)
- Bill (No. 101) *To amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Detroit River Bridge Company.*—(Mr. Kilvert.)
- 1°, 1585; 2°, 1585; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1755.—(42 Vic., c. 64.)
- Bill (No. 102) *Respecting certain Ordnance and Admiralty Lands in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1°. 1628; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669.—(42 Vic., c. 33.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Bill (No. 103) *To regulate the employment of children and young persons in the Mills and Factories of the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. Bergin.)
- 1°, 1696.
- Bill, *To enable the Court of Chancery in Ontario to dissolve the contract of marriage in certain cases.*—(Mr. Hooper.)
- Introduction m., 1696; negated on a division, 1696.
- Bill (No. 104) *To provide for the inspection, safe-keeping and storage of Petroleum and the products thereof.*—(Mr. Baby.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1696; 1°, 1697; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1805.—(42 Vic., c. 18.)
- Bill (No. 105) *To further amend the Acts therein mentioned respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. Bowell.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1697; 1°, 1702; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1848.—(42 Vic., c. 35.)
- Bill (No. 106) *Respecting the safe keeping of Dangerous Lunatics in the North-West Territories.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1°, 1730; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1848.—(42 Vic., c. 38.)
- Bill (No. 107) *To amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.*—(Mr. Tupper.)
- 1°, 1765; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1805.—(42 Vic., c. 31.)
- Bill (No. 108) *To provide for the payment of an additional temporary grant to the Province of Manitoba.*—(Mr. Tilley.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1784, reported, 1786; 1°, 1786; 2°, 1786; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 2.)
- Bill (No. 109) *To provide for the salary of one additional Judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1787; 1° and 2°, 1793; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 3.)
- Bill (No. 110) *Respecting the salaries of the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1793; 1° and 2°, 1795; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 4.)
- Bill (No. 111) *For granting an annual subsidy towards the construction and maintenance of Telegraphic Communication to and upon Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands.*—(Mr. Tupper.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1796; B. introduced, 1796; 1° and 2°, 1799; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 5.)
- Bill (No. 112) *To extend "An Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships."*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1799; 1° and 2°, 1800; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 26.)
- Bill (No. 113) *To provide for the Liquidation of the affairs of Building Societies in the Province of Quebec.*—(Mr. Desjardins.)
- 1° and 2°, 1800; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1865.—(42 Vic., c. 48.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 114) *Respecting "The Consolidated Bank of Canada."*—(Mr. Tilley.)

1^o and 2^o, 1805; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1885.—(42 Vic., c. 53.)

Bill (No. 115) *To continue in force for a limited time "The better prevention of Crime Act, 1878."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1841.—(42 Vic., c. 41.)

Bill (No. 116) *To further amend "The Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874."*—(Mr. Tupper.)

Res. m., 1886; Resumed debate, 1944; H. in Com. of W., 1960; Res. reported, 1^o and 2^o*, 1965; conc. in Res. 1 m., 1965; Amt. to re-com. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1970; negatived (Y. 37, N. 115), 1978. On Res. 12, Amt., route (Mr. Mackenzie), neg. same division, 1979; Res. 13 and 14 agreed to, on a division, 1979; B. 1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1980.—(42 Vic., c. 14.)

Bill (No. 117) *To amend the Act of the present Session, intituled "An Act to provide for the inspection, safe-keeping and storage of Petroleum, and the products thereof."*—(Mr. Baby.)

1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1980.—(42 Vic., c. 19.)

Bill (No. 118) *For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1879, and the 30th June, 1880, and for other purposes relating to the public service.*—(Mr. Tilley.)

Res. in Com. of W. and M. agreed to, and reported*, 2001; B. 1^o and 2^o*, 2011; 3^o m., 2011, debate; 3^o, 2035.—(42 Vic., c. 1.)

Bill (No. 119) *For the acquisition by the Dominion of a certain portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, to be made part of the Intercolonial Railway.*—(Mr. Tupper.)

Res. in Com. of W. and reported*, 1982; Res. considered, 1992; agreed to, on a division, 1999; B. 1^o*, 1999; 2^o, 1999; 3^o*, 2001.—(42 Vic., c. 11.)

Bill, *To further amend the Insolvent Act of 1875.*—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Introduction m., 1885; M. withdn., 1886.

Bills of Exchange Acts Amt. and Consolid., B. No. 31 (Mr. Baby).

1^o*, 189; 2^o* 562; Com. of W., 1237; reported, 1238; 3^o*, 1293. (42 Vic., c. 17.)

Bills of Exchange, Inland, Protest of, B. No. 16 (Mr. Doull).

1^o*, 107; 2^o, 294; referred to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 926; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1765. (42 Vic., c. 46.)

Bills, Private, reception of.

Extensions of time for, 65, 71, 126, 221, 562, 688.

Blake (Vice-Chancellor), complaint against, For objectionable language, Remarks (Mr. Costigan), 1083; remarks and discussion (Mr. McCuaig and others), 1983 to 1992.

BLANCHET, Mr.

. See "SPEAKER, Mr.

BOLDUC, Mr.

Drummond and Arthabaska Mail Service (M. for Ret.) 70.

Penny coin, withdrawal of (Ques.), 223.

Supreme and Exchequer Courts, working of (M. for Ret.) 496.

Weights and Measures Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1844.

Bond, Merchandise in,

Recently, M. for Ret. (Mr. Burpee, St. John) 185.

BORDEN, Mr.

Windsor Branch Ry. settlement (Ques.) 73.

Tariff.—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1350.

Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon Station Master.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Fiset) 1265.

BOULTBEE, Mr.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 134. Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 196. Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 290.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 924.

Supreme Court Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler), on 2^o and Q. of Proceed., 1382.

Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 537; on Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1169; Res. 11, on 2^o (Books, &c.) 1344; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1528.

National Currency, on Mr. Wallace's Res., 1571.

Weights and Measures Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1846.

Pacific Ry. Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Tupper) Res 1, on Conc. and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1970.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (Remarks) 1988.

Supply.—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1641.

BOURASSA, Mr.

Insolvency Acts Amt. (B. 3, 1^o*), 48; B. referred to Sel. Com. on Insolvency, 293.

Tariff.—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Pig iron) (Amt., free, &c.) 1447.

BOURBEAU, Mr.

Drummond and Arthabaska, Inspector of Weights, &c. (M. for Cor.) 549.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 589.

Tariff.—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Shovels, Tools, &c.) 1482; (Tobacco) 1509.

Weights and Measures Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby), in Com. 1843-7.

Bourdeau, J., Ste. Flavie.

Engine House Supt., removal of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Fiset) 1398; M. withdn. 1398.

BOWELL, Mr.

Trade and Navigation Tables (presented) 26. Debates, Reporting (M. for Sel. Com.—postpd.) 58; Contract, Ratification (Moved)

89, 102; Sel. Com. appointed, 104.

Tin, rebate on, B.C. (Ans.) 73.

Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 121.

BOWELL, Mr.—Con.

- Newfield*, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 159, 160.
- Iron imports, N.S. & N.B., M. for Ret., (*Amt.*) 180.
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 592, 597-8, 600.
- Custom-Houses, expenses, regulation of, (*Ans.*) 651.
- Caspian*, duties on goods ex. (*Ans.*), 652.
- Mitchell & Co., supplies by, on M. for Pap., and Q. of Ord., 662.
- Emerson, Custom-house for (*Ans.*) 827.
- Saugeen R., Lighthouse for, on M. for Cor., 836.
- Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 911.
- Tariff*.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's *Amt. (Q. of Ord.)* 1163; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) 1331-3; Res. 11, on 2° (Books, &c.) 1344; (Carriages, &c.), 1419; (Cheese) 1424. On Mr. Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1456. (Screws, iron) 1462; (Printing Presses) 1476.
- Militia Act *Amt. (B. 105, Res. in Com. and 1°)* 1698, 1702.
- Supply*.—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1630; Militia (Brigade-Majors) 1632-3-4; (Drill instruction) 1635-6-9, 1640-2; (Ammunition and Stores) 1642; (Annual Drill) 1642; (Drill in Colleges) 1643; Collection of Revenue (Customs), 1693-4.
- Supplementary Estimates, 1878-79: Miscellaneous (Trade Mission to France), 1839; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1839-40.
- Concurrence: (Pacific Ry., Wallace's claim) 1877.
- Brandy-Pots, Lighthouse-keeper*.
- Richard, resignation of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 844.
- Brazil, Steamship line to*.
- Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 1249.
- Supply,—discussion in, 1853.
- BRECKEN, Mr.**
- The Address (*moved*) 6.
- Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 225.
- Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 389.
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 553.
- Truro & Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (*Mr. Tupper*) 1505.
- Tariff*.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's *Amt.*, 1165; Res. 11, on 2°—(Coal) 1437.
- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's *Amt.*, 1613; B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2° and Mr. Girouard's *Amt.*, 1780.
- N.B. Supreme Court Judge B. 109 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Res., 1792; in Com., 1794.
- Bridge, International (Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.)* See "International."
- Brighton and Prince Edward Mail Route*.
- Reason of change, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 547.

Brit. Amer. Life Ins. Co. (Mr. Mackenzie's B.) See "North Amer."

British Columbia, Boundary.

Alaska, M. for Pap. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 230.

British Columbia, Chinese Labour in.

M. to refer Petition to Sel. Com. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 1251.

British Columbia, Chinese Tax Bill.

Intentions of Government, Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 66.

British Columbia, Fisheries.

M. for Sess. Pap. 42, 1877. &c. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 178, 684.

British Columbia, Graving Dock.

Construction, M. for Cor. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 69.

Advances made, Pap. (*Message*) 1623.

Res. propd., withdn. (*Mr. Tilley*) 1787.

British Columbia, Imports and Exports.

M. for Ret., 1878 (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 137.

British Columbia, Indians.

Supply,—discussion in, 1684.

British Columbia, Machinery for.

Securities for duty, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Thompson, Cariboo*) 655.

British Columbia, Mail Service.

Vancouver Island, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Lunster*) 87.

British Columbia, Penitentiary.

Site, Construction, &c, M. for Pap. (*Mr. McInnes*) 1406.

Supply,—discussion in, 1540.

British Columbia, Rebate on Tin.

Intention of Government, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 73.

British Columbia, Ry. expenditure.

Supply,—discussion in, 1648; carried on div., 1992.

British Columbia, Ry. Reserve Lands.

Rights of Settlers, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 827.

British Columbia, Salmon Hatchery.

Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.

British Columbia Secession B. (Mr. DeCosmos).

Introduction m., 1079 (Vol. ii); there being no seconder, dropped, 1080.

British Columbia Supreme Court Judges' Salaries B. No. 97 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou).

M. of H. into Com. of W., 1288, agreed to, 1290; Res. in Com., 1534, reported, 1535; B. 1°, 1535; 2° Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669.

British Columbia, Tariff, Special, for.

Application for, Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 491.

British Columbia, Vancouver Island.

Canal on E. Coast, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1250.

Brodie's, Inverness, Megantic.

P. O. for. Ques., (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.

BROOKS, Mr.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Bechard) on M. for 2°, 1623.
Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3° (*Amt. m.*), to re-com., to exempt Quebec, 1767.

BROWN, Mr.

Trent B. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 909.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Coal) 1430; (Pig iron) 1449.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1631; (Drill Instruction) 1636, 1642; Pub. Works, Inc. (Buildings, Ont.) 1662; (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665.

Bruce, N.R., Mail Service.

Extension to Paisley, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 223.
Extension to Lion's Head, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 651.

Bryant, Tug. See "*Sarah E. Bryant.*"**BUDGET, THE.**

Speech of Finance Minister, 409.
For Debate thereon, See "*TARIFF.*"

Building Societies, Ont. (Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.) See "Ontario."**Building Societies, Que. (Mr. Desjardin's B.)** See "Quebec."**BUNSTER, Mr.**

Rails, removed to Frazer River (*M. for Pap.*) 27.
Vancouver I. Mail Service (*M. for Pap.*) 87.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 220.
Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 244.
War with Russia, volunteers for (*M. for Ret.*) 665-6.
Nanaimo Customs Officer, salary (*M. for Cor.*) 667.
Rails, removal from Vancouver I. (*M. to refer Instrns. to P. A. Com.*) 837.
Controv'd. Elections Act *Amt. B. 4* (Mr. McCarthy), on M. for reference to Com., 853.
Canal, East coast of Vancouver I. (*Ques.*) 1250.
Chinese in B.C., M. for Sel. Com. (*seconded*) 1260.
Supreme Court Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1387.
Kootenay R., clearing of (*Ques.*) 1397.
N. r. claims against Dom., on M. for Cor., 1404.
C. Beale, Light-keeper, (*M. for Pap. respecting*) 1404-5.
Penitentiary, B. C., construction of, on M. for Pap., 1410.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 541, 820, 1019; Res. 11, on 2° (Barley) 1346; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1526.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874. *Amt. B. 116* (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1930.

BUNSTER, Mr.—Con.

Supply.—Estimates: Legislation (Sess. Clks., &c.) 1543; Immigration, 1544; Pub. Works, cap. (Pacif. Ry.) 1646-8; Collection of Revenues (Weights & Measures) 1719.

BUNTING, Mr.

Welland Canal, old, supplies for (*M. for Ret.*) 185.
Yarwood, C. St. G., superannuation (*M. for Pap.*, by *Mr. Stephenson*) 675.
Wrecking and Coasting (*M. for Cor.*, for *Mr. Stephenson*) 1405.
Tariff.—Res. 2 (Drawbacks) on 2°, 1325; Res. 11, on 2° (Sugars) 1492.
Welland Canal Solicitors, payments to (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

Burlington Bay Canal.

Piers, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 74.

BURNHAM, Mr.

Trent B. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 906.

BURPEE, Mr. (St. John).

Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 122.
Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O. C., 133.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal (*M. for Cor.*) 141.
Imports and Exports, recent (*M. for Ret.*) 185.
Bonded Merchandise, recent (*M. for Ret.*) 185.
Spirits, tobacco, &c., manufactured (*M. for Ret.*) 185.
Navigation of U. S. Canals, on M. for Cor., 187-8.
Ketchum, Mr., case of, on M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 492; (*M. for further Pap.*, by *Mr. Mackenzie*) 667.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 581-2, 592-9, 602.
Quartz Machinery, B. C., duties, on M. for Pap., 656-7.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 989; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2°, 1330-31; Res. 11, on 2° (Cotton sheetings, &c.) 1439; (Screws, iron) 1462.
Supply.—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (St. John Passenger Station) 1645; Collection of Revenue (Customs) 1693-5.
Suppl. Estimates, 1878-'79: Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1839.

BURPEE, Mr. (Sunbury).

Eastern Extension Ry., N.B. claims (*Ques.*) 547.
Calais & St. Stephen Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. (B. 68, 1°) 782; B. withdn., 1730.
N. B. claims against Dom. (*M. for Cor.*) 1399, 1401.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1060.

Cable Co., U. S. Direct (Mr. McCarthy's B.) See "U. S."**Calais and St. Stephen Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury)** 1°, 782; 2°, 1141; B. withdn., 1730.

CAMERON, Mr. (North Victoria).
 Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 83.
 Stewart, John, Deposit, on propd. B., 140.
 Toronto Savings' Bank, powers (*B. 26, 10**)
 140.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for
 Res., 372.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, M. for Com
 (*seconded*), 904, 915.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler)
 on 2°, 1383.
 Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White)
 on 2°, 1391, 1394.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (Mr. Colby)
 on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1612;
 (*Q. of Ord.*) 1620; B. 15 (Mr. Béchard)
 on 2°, 1624.
 Selkirk Election (*M. for Pap.*) 1764.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*)
 1988.
Supply.—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (*Cana-
 nals, Welland*) 1661.
 Conduct of stranger (Macdonell) on Q. of
 Priv. and Summons; (*Amt.*) to refer mat-
 ter to Com. on Priv. & Elections, 1980-81.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdou-
 gall) on 3°, 2005.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald)
 on Senate Amt., 2037, 2043.

CAMERON, Mr. (South Huron).
 Dismissals, Appointments, &c., recent (*Ms.
 for Rets.*) 27, 28.
 Hamilton, appointments, &c., in, on M. for
 Ret., 112.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for
 Res., 376.
 Maritime Court, Ont., Repeal B. 34 (Mr. Mc-
 Cuaig) on M. for 2°, 685-6.
 Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Robertson) on
 M. into Com. of W. (*6 months' "hoist"*)
 847.
 Controvd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr.
 McCarthy) on 2°, 167, 851.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam)
 on M. into Com., 922.
 Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on 2°
 924.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on
 2°, 942.
 Bills of Ex. B. 31 (Mr. Baby) in Com. of W.,
 1237.
 Elections, Corrupt Practices, B. 32 (Mr.
 Ives) on 2°, 1274.
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Mc-
 Donald) on 2°, 1294.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler)
 on 2°, 1384.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 743, 754;
 Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat flour) 1361; (Salt)
 1476; (Sugars) 1486.
 Defendants' costs in Crown suits B. 17 (Mr.
 MacDonnell) on 2°, 1580.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr.
 Béchard) on 2°, 1576-7; B. 85 (Mr. Colby)
 on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's Amt.,
 1616; B. 15, in Com., on Mr. Girouard's
 Amts., 1769, 1775.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Mc-
 Donald) on 2°, 1588.

CAMERON, Mr. (South Huron.)—Con.
 Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) on 2°
 1705-6.
 N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. Mc-
 Donald) on Res., 1788.
Supply.—Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Pub.
 Works, Cap. (*Intercol. Ry., Murray's
 claim*) 1835.

Campbell, Eliza Maria, Relief B. No. 99
 (*Mr. Macdougall*).
 10*, 1572; 2°, 1706; Com. of W. and re-
 ported*, 1878; 3° m., 1878; Amt., 3
 months' "hoist," (*Mr. Mills*) 1879; Re-
 sumed debate, 2004; Amt., to re-com.
 (*Mr. Farrow*) negatived, 2010; Mr. Mills's
 Amt. negatived (*Y. 38, N. 56*) 2010; B. 3°,
 on same division reversed, 2011. (42 Vic.,
 c. 79).

Campbell's Cove, Breakwater, P.E.I.
 Completion of, Ques. (*Mr. Mutari*) 1397.

Campbell, W. D., Fishing Rights—See
 "Bic."

Camps of Military Instruction.
 Intention this year, Ques. (*Mr. Thompson,
 Haldimand*) 112.

Canada and Detroit Bridge (*Mr. Kilvert's
 B.*) See "Detroit."

Canada Central Ry. Extension.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1645.

Canada, Consolidated Bank (*Mr. Gault's
 and Mr. Tilley's Bs.*) See "Consolidated
 Bank."

Canada Life Ass. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 7
 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)
 10*, 71; 2°, 108; Com. of W. and reported*,
 924; 3°, 924. (42 Vic., c. 71.)

Canada Police Act Amt. B. No. 54 (*Mr. Mc-
 Donald, Pictou.*)
 10*, 506; 2°, 562; Com. of W. and reported*
 and 3°, 1293. (42 Vic., c. 37.)

Canada Temperance Act (*Mr. McCuaig's
 B.*) See "Temperance."

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.
 See "PACIFIC RAILWAY."

*Canadian Registration of American Ves-
 sels.*
 M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*) 180.

Canadian Vessels entering L. Michigan.
 Reporting at Sheboygan, M. for Cor. (*Mr.
 Kilvert*) 663.

"Canadian," article in.
 Q. of Priv. and explan. (*Mr. Huntington*) 488.

Canals, expenditure on, 1873-79.
 Details of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bergin*) 236.
 Supply,—discussion in: Lachine and Corn-
 wall, 1649; Welland, 1649, 1726.

Canals, U.S., Navigation of.
 By Canadian Vessels, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cur-
 rier*) 185.

Cans (Fish) American, duty on.
 M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ogden*) 667.

Cape Beale, B.C., Lighthouse-keeper.

Cox, appointment and conduct of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1404.

Cape Sable Island, Customs District.

M. for Pets. and Reps. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 70.

Capes Tormentine and Traverse.

Branch Rys. to, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 1550.

Cardinal, Régis, Paymaster, Lachine Canal.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington*) 550; Resumed debate, 563; M. agreed to, 610; Explanation of remarks in debate (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) 1373.

Carillon Dam and Works.

Completion, Ques. (*Mr. Christie*) 42; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Christie*) 44.

CARON, Mr.

Intercol. Ry., refuse lumber (*M. for Pap.*) 87.

Intercol. Ry., on M. for Ret. (*Adj. debate*) 137.

Pacific Ry., Conts. 13, 14, 15, 25 (*M. for Ret.*) 235.

Ketchum, Mr., case of, investigation (*M. for Rep. for Mr. Domville*) 492.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 569.

Mr. Ryland's award claim (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Coursol*) 652.

Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1085.

Assiniboine, Land, Prof. O'Donoghue's claim (*M. for Pap.*) 1763.

Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1767.

Caron, Mr., Fishery Overseer, Kamouraska.

Complaint against, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 920.

Carriers, Responsibilities of.

Legislation upon, Ques. (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre*) 491.

Cartier, Sir George, Monument to.

Intention of Government, Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 1250.

CARTWRIGHT, Mr.

Dismls., Appts., &c., recent, on M. for Ret., 28.

Rys. and Canals, certain, Exp. on (*M. for Ret.*) 47.

Revenue, Feb., 1879 (*M. for Ret.*) 54.

Imports and Exports, 1878 (*M. for Ret.*) 54.

Receipts and Expenditure, 1878 (*M. for Ret.*) 54.

Loan of 1878 (*M. for Ret.*) 106.

Customs and Excise, Feb., 1879 (*M. for Ret.*) 119.

Mounted Police B. 13, in Com. of W., 127.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 135.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 191.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, M. for Pap., on Q. of Ord., 598; on main Ques. (*for Mr. Mackenzie*) 599.

Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 2° and Q. of Proceed.—Examiner of Priv. B's. suggested 826.

CARTWRIGHT, Mr.—Con.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 914.

Lougheed, Samuel, disml. of (*M. for Pap.*) 920.

Census and Statistics B. 67 (*Mr. Pope, Compton*) in Com. of W., 1233-4-5-6.

Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 858.

Trade Marks B. 82 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 1292.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2°, 1705; in Com., 1712-14.

Reciprocity negotiations, on Sir A. J. Smith's expenses, 1754.

Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) on M. for 3° and Mr. Holton's Amt.

("hoist"), 1766.

Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (*Mr. Tilley*), on Res., 1782.

Dynamite Explosion, Stratford (*Remarks*) 1801.

Pacific Ry. Act Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on proposed Res., 1913, 1959; on Q. of Ord., 1908; Res. 1 on M. for Conc. and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1977-8.

Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2°, 2001.

Tariff—Budget Speech (*Reply to*), 430; comments in reply to Mr. Tupper, 458-9, 470. W. & M. Res., on 2°, financial statement called for, 509, 618; on Mr. Tilley's speech, comments, 713-16, 722-3;

on Ques., 726; Res. amd., on 2°, 1321; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2°, 1333; Res. 11, on 2°, (Muriatic Acid) 1334; (Agricultural Implements) 1334;

(Ale) 1339; (Animals) 1339; (Artificial Flowers) 1339; (Books, &c.) 1344; (Brass) 1346; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1355; (Wheat Flour) 1359-60; (Butter) 1417; (Carriages, &c.) 1417-19; (Cheese) 1425; (Clocks) 1426;

(Cotton Sheetings, &c.) 1437-8; (Cotton Jeans, &c.) 1439; (Earthenware) 1441; (Fruits) 1443; (Furniture) 1443-4-5;

(India-rubber goods) 1446; (Pig Iron) 1448-9; (Screws, iron) 1461-3 5-9;

(Paintings, &c.) 1473; (Printing Presses) 1475; (Quinine) 1476; (Wines) 1480-1;

(Sugars) 1485-8-9, 14 91-7; Res. 12, Free List, on 2°, (Wool) 1529; Res. 14 (Excise duty, Spirits), on 2°, 1531-2-3;

B. No. 93, on 2°, 1806; on Mr. Tilley's speech, 1813-15.

Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul), 1537; Legislation (Sess. Clerks), 1543; Immigration (Salaries), 1544;

Ocean and R. Service (Mail Subsidy, Campbellton and Gaspé), 1673; Fisheries (Breeding), 1679; Indians (Ont.), 1684;

(B. C. and N. W.), 1684-9.

Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Ocean and R. Service (Canada and Brazil Subsidy), 1853-4; Collection of Revenue (Customs, exports), 1854-5; Legislation (Sess. Clerks), 1855.

Conc: (Intercol. Ry., nut-locks) 1860; (Intercol. Ry.) 1870-2.

Cascumpec Harbour, Improvement.

M. for Reps. and Cor. (*Mr. Hackett*), 87.

CASEY, Mr.

- Public Service, qualifications, &c. (*B. 8, 1^o**) 71; 2^o *m.*, 1267; (*B. withdrawn.*), 1273.
 Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 96.
 Election Act Amt. (*B. 19, 1^o**), 197; (2^o *m.*) 853; 927, 935, 941.
 Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4. on 2^o, 172.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 387.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. 554-5, 577; on Q. of Ord., 597.
 Port Stanley Revenue (*M. for Pap.*) 655.
 Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. Robertson*); on M. into Com. of W., 846.
Tariff—Res. 2, (drawbacks), on 2^o, 1327; Res. 11, on 2^o (Books, &c.) 1343-5; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1358; (Carriages, &c.) 1419; (Furniture) 1444; (Plants) 1474; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1524.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt. 1619.
 Insolvent Act. Amt. B. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on M. to introduce, 1886.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1639; (Annual Drill) 1642.

CASGRAIN, Mr.

- Plague, Precautions, on M. for Address. 55, 57.
 G. T. R., Riv. du Loup Br. (*Ques.*) 73.
 French Weights, abolition (*B. 25, 1^o**) 140.
 Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2^o, 172.
 Criminal Laws, codification (*Ques.*) 223.
 Commercial Laws, codification (*Ques.*) 223.
 Banks, inspection, measures for (*Ques.*) 223.
 Quebec Constitutional Question (*Ques.*) 294; on M. for Res., 385.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Ord.*) 553.
 Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 1^o, 740.
 Supreme Ct. Act. Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o, 1383.
Tariff—Copies, in French, insufficient (*Remarks*) 824, 1405. W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1179; Res. 11, on 2^o (Coal) 1432; (Pig Iron) on Mr. Bourassa's Amt., 1447; (Sugars) 1492.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., Que.) 1666.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 3^o, 1803.
 "Caspian," Goods *ex*, duties on.
 Clearances allowed, *Ques.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 652.

Census and Statistics, B. Respecting, No. 67 (*Mr. Pope, Compton*).

Res. in Com. of W., agreed to, 742; 1^o, 742; 2^o, 1233; Com. of W., 1233; amd. and reported, 1236; re-com. and reported and 3^o, 1533. (42 *Vic.*, c. 21.)

Centennial Exhibition, Canadian Commission.

Expenses of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 837.

Certificates, Masters', &c. (*Mr. Pope's B.*)

See "Masters and Mates."

Chambly Canal, Bridge Over.

Langelier, Mr., payments to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Houde*) 844.

Chambly Canal, Widening of.

Intention of Government, *Ques.* (*Mr. Benoit*) 48.

Charlevoix Election.

Mr. Perreault's seat, *Ques. Priv.* (*Mr. Mousseau*) 42; Mr. Perreault introduced, 73.

CHARLTON, Mr.

- Elections, general (*M. for Ret.*) 46.
 Plague, Precautions (*M. for Address*) 55, 56, (*withdn.*) 57.
 Lord's Day observance, Res. (*seconded*) 77.
 Caspian, duties on goods *ex* (*Ques.*) 652.
 House, employes of (*M. for Ret.*) 667.
 Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on M. into Com. of W., 845.
 Ventilation of Chamber (*Remarks*) 858.
 Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) on re-com. and Amt., 1293.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 527; Res. 11, on 2^o (Corn) 1348; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt. (*Amt. m.*), Wheat, Coal and Pig Iron, free, 1354; (Butter) 1416; (Cheese) 1421; (Coal) 1432; (Pig Iron) 1447; (Plaster of Paris) 1471; (Shovels, Tools, &c.) 1481; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1510.
 National Currency, on Mr. Wallace's Res., 1550.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1634.
 Cheticamp Harbour, Inverness.
 Dredging of, *Ques.* (*Mr. MacDonnell*) 1249.
 Chicoutimi Indians.
 Vaccination of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Cimon*) 241.
 Children in Factories (*Mr. Bergin's B.*)
 See "Factories."
 Chinese Labour in B.C.
 M. to refer Pet. to Sel. Com. (*Mr. De Cosmos*) 1251.
 Chinese Tax Bill, B.C.
 Intentions of Govt., *Ques.* (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 66.

Chippewa, Landing Waiter.

Yarwood, superannuation of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunting*) 675.

CHRISTIE, Mr.

- Carillon Dam (*Ques.*) 42, (*M. for Ret.*) 44.
 Lord's Day observance (*Res.*) 75, 84.
 North River Dredging (*M. for Pap.*) 664.
 Mails, Montreal and Ottawa (*Ques.*) 826.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1348; (Wheat flour) 1361; Res. 12, Free list, on 2^o (Wool) 1521.

CIMON, Mr.

- Railways, Loans to, on M. for Ret., 64.
 Indians, Chicoutimi, vaccination (*M. for Pap.*) 241.
 Indians, Saguenay, vaccination (*M. for Pap.*) 241.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 386.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1186.

Civil Service.

[For particular branches and places refer to such.]

Dismissals and appointments, Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) 27, 28.

Examination Boards and Candidates, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson*) 113.

Money due from officers of, recovery, Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 140.

Dismissals, &c., 1873 and 1878, M. for Cabinet Cor. (*Mr. Williams*) 491.

Superannuations, 1873-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, W. Middx.*) 496.

Dismissals &c., a very general discussion,—see "Cardinal, dismissal."

Superannuation, M. for Sel. Com. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 741.

Civil Service Efficiency B. No. 8 (*Mr. Casey*).

1^o, 17; 2^o m., 1266; B. withdn., 1273.

Clarke, Henry, Truro, damages claim.

Intercol. Ry., M. for Pap. (*Mr. McKay*) 838.

Clark, W. R., payment to.

For Fishery Com. Services, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 113.

Coal Oil, St. Lawrence Lighthouses.

M. for Tends., Conts., &c., (*Mr. Methot*) 836.

Coal on Maritime Prov. Govt. Rys.

Shipment at false rates, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 489.

Cars over-weighted; sale of coal to officials; M. for Pap. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 654.

Coal, transport on Eastern Extension Ry.

Amount of Rolling Stock, Ques. (*Mr. Doull*) 652.

Coasting, American, in Canadian Waters.

M. for Cor. since 1874 (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1405.

COCKBURN, Mr. (Muskoka).

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 674. On Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1456. Res. 11, on 2^o (Shovels, tools, &c.) 1482.

Supply—Estimates: Light-houses, &c. (Construction), 1875.

COCKBURN, Mr. (West Northumberland).

Dismissals, &c., officials of House, on M. for Pap., 36.

Supreme Court Act, Amt. (*Ques.*) 66.

Arbitrators' Awards, Appeal (*Ques.*) 66.

Stewart, John, Deposit, on propd. B., 140.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 162.

Intercol. Ry. Act, Amt. (*Ques.*) 66; Bill (*propd., withdn.*) 138-9; (*B.* 28, 1^o) 156.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 200.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on Premier's statements, 984.

Confederation Life Association Act Amt. (*B.* 53, 1^o) 488.

Betting Act Amt. B., 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on M. into Com. of W, 847.

Controv. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2^o, 849-51.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 907.

COCKBURN, Mr. (W. Northumb'd).—Con.

Dominion Day, Holiday (*B.* 77, 1^o*) 1123; on 2^o & Q. of Proceed., 1286.

Bills of Ex. B. 31 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com. of W., 1237.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*) reference to Com. of W., on Q. of Proceed., 1285.

Official Arbitrators (*B.* 81, 1^o) 1291.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o, and Q. of Proceed., 1379.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 757; Res. 11, on 2^o (Screws, iron) 1463.

Pacific Ry. Debate (*Q. of Ord.*) 1938, 1941

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Senate Amts., 2036, 2042-3.

*Codification of Laws.—See "Laws."**Coins, Copper, Pennies and Halfpennies.*

Withdrawal of, Ques. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 223.

COLBY, Mr.

Bankruptcy, relating to (*B.* 2, 1^o*) 41; B. referred to Sel. Com. on Insolvency, 293.

Bankruptcy (*M. to refer all Pets. to Sel. Com.*) 293.

Atlantic and N. W. Ry. (*B.* 56, 1^o*) 562.

Mounted Police, Expenditure for (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*) 837.

Centennial Commission, Expenses, &c. (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*), 837.

Legal Services for Govt. (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Oak Conts. for Canals (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Insolvency Laws, Repeal, etc. (*B.* 85, 1^o*) 1412; *B.* 15 (*Mr. Béchar*) on M. for 2^o, 1577; *B.* 85, 2^o m., 1594; *B.* 15, on 2^o, 1623.

*Colleges, Drill in. See "Militia."**Collingwood Harbour.*

Expenditure, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 82.

Supply—discussion in, 1665.

*Committees, Select Standing. See "Sel. Stand. Com."***COMMONS.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."*Confederation Campaign, N.B.*

Personal explanations (*Mr. Tilley and others*), 1456-9.

Confederation Life Association Act Amt. B. No. 53 (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*).

1^o, 488; 2^o, 562; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o, 924. (42 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

CONNELL, Mr.

N. B. Ry., Postal Car for (*Ques.*) 652.

Woodstock, Bridge at (*M. for Pap.*) 653. (Also see "Addenda," Vol. i.)

Canada Gazette, Officials supplied (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

Consolidated Bank of Canada B. No. 52 (*Mr. Gault*).

1^o, 488; 2^o, 562; Com. of W. and reported * and 3^o, 924. (42 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

Consolidated Bank of Canada B. No. 114*(Mr. Tilley).*1° and 2°, 1805; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1885. (42 *Vic.*, c. 53.)*Consolidated Railway Act (Mr. Tupper's B.)* See "Railway."*Constitutional Question.* See "Quebec."**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Prevention Bs. Nos. 37 & 55** *(Mr. Pope, Compton).*

B. No. 37, 1°, 221; Order for 2° dischd. and B. withdn., 562.

Res. in Com. of W., 506; B. No. 55, 1°, 507; 2°, 1246; Com. of W., 1246; reported, 1249; re-com. and reported and 3°, 1293. (42 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

Supply,—discussion in, 1548.

*Controverted Elections.*Generally, see "Elections;"—Special cases, see the respective *Districts*.*Cornwall Canal.*Hydraulic Leases, M. for Ret. *(Mr. Bergin)* 239.

Supply—discussion in, 1649.

COSTIGAN, Mr.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 397.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 575.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat Flour), on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1372.Mr. Coughlin's vote on Usury B. *(Remarks)*, 1754.Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of *(Remarks)* 1083, 1984; *(M. to Adj. H.)* 1985; *(M. for Pap.)* 1986, 1991-2.*Costs in Crown Suits (Mr. MacDonnell's B.)* See "Defendants."**Coteau & Province Line Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 30** *(Mr. McLennan).*1°, 189; 2°, 488; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1643. (42 *Vic.*, c. 57.)

COUGHLIN, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1118.Usury B., Vote on *(Explanation)* 1754.Blake, Vice-Chancellor, language of *(Remarks and M. to Adj. H.)* 1986.*County Judges' Criminal Court (Mr. McDonald's B.)* See "Speedy Trials Act."*County Judges' Salaries, P. E. I. (Mr. McDonald's B.)* See "P. E. I."*"Courrier du Canada," Article in.*Ques. of Priv. and explanation *(Mr. Huntington)* 613.

COURSOL, Mr.

Montreal Custom-house appts. *(M. for Ret.)* 26.Ryland, Mr., claim of *(M. for Pap.)* 550, 653.Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 *(Mr. Keeler)* on 2°, 1388.*Tariff*—W. and M. Res., on 2°, 995.Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 *(Mr. McCarthy)* on res. into Com. of W., 1575.COURSOL, Mr.—*Con.*Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 *(Mr. Colby)* on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1616, 1621.Militia Act Amt. B. 105 *(Mr. Bowell)* on Res., 1702.Statutory Holidays B. 57 *(Mr. Domville)* on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 *(Mr. McDougall)*, on M. for 3°, and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist," 2009.*Supply*—*Estimates*: Penitentiaries *(St. V. de Paul)* 1539; Militia *(Brigade-Majors)* 1633; Geological Surveys, 1681.*Courts.* See "Exchequer C," "Supreme C," &c.*Cow Bay Breakwater.*

Supply,—discussion in, 1667.

*Cox, Mr., Cape Beale, B.C.*Lighthouse-keeper, conduct of, M. for Pap. *(Mr. Bunster)* 1404.**Crime, Prevention of, Act, 1878, Continuance in force B. No. 115** *(Mr. McDonald, Pictou).*1°, 2° and 3°, 1841. (42 *Vic.* c. 41.)*Crown Ass. Co. (Mr. Kilvert's B.)* See "Union Ass. Co."*Culling Timber, Expenditure for.*

Supply,—discussion in, 1716.

*Currie, Messrs., Solicitors.*Welland Canal, payments to, M. for Ret. *(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton)* 1763.

CURRIER, Mr.

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 100.

Navigation of U. S. Canals *(M. for Cor. by Mr. Rochester)* 185.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 558-9.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 911.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Screws, iron) 1465.*Supply*—*Estimates*: Immigration, 1546; Collection of Revenue (Excise, culling) 1717-18; (Weights and Measures) 1719.Suppl. *Estimates*, 1878-79: Pub. Works, Cap. (Ottawa, Central Block) 1836.*Customs Act (Mr. Tilley's B.)* See "TARIFF."*Customs, Bonded Warehouses.*Merchandise in, M. for Ret. *(Mr. Burpee, St. John)* 185.*Customs Clearances, ex "Caspian."*At former rates, Ques. *(Mr. Charlton)* 652.*Customs, Expenditure for.*

Supply,—discussion in, 1691, 1834, 1854.

*Customs Offices, expenses of.*Proportion to duties, Ques. *(Mr. Kranz)* 651.

DALY, Mr.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 147.

DALY, Mr.—Con.

- Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 247.
Allan Mail Cont. (*M. for Cont. and Cor.*) 673.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Sugars) 1497.

DAWSON, Mr.

- Ontario Boundaries (*M. for Reports*) 50.
Indians, Treaties with (*M. for Pap.*) 180.
Kaministiquia, Harbour at, M. for Pap. (*seconded*) 831.
Prince Arthur's Landing, Harbour at, M. for Pap. (*seconded*) 834.
Indians, enfranchisement of (*M. for Ret.*) 844.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B 74 (Mr. McDonald) on 2°, 1593.
St. Joseph's Island, Land Sales (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on proposed Res., 1919; in Com., 1961-5.
Supply—Estimates: Immigration (Menonites) 1549; Pub. Works, Cap. (Georgian Bay Br. Ry.) 1648; Geolog. Survey, 1681; Indians (Ont.) 1684; (N. W.) 1689.
Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Pub. Works, Cap. (Pacific Ry., W. of Red R.) 1851.

Debates, Official Reporting of.

- Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 6; M. for Tenders (*Mr. Ross, W. Midd.*) 27; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Bowell*) 58, 104; Report (*Mr. Speaker*) 58; Contract ratified (*Mr. Bowell*) 89, 104; Com. of Supply,—discussion in, 1832.

DECOSMOS, Mr.

- Pacific Ry. route (*M. for Ret.*) 57.
Chinese Tax Bill, B. C. (*Ques.*) 66.
Esquimalt Graving Dock (*M. for Cor.*) 69.
Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 120.
Imports and Exports, B. C. (*M. for Ret.*) 137.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141.
Fisheries, B. C. (*M. for Sess. Pap., etc.*) 178; agreed to, 684.
American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 181, 182.
Pacific Ry., Engineer's Rep. (*Ques.*) 222.
Alaska Boundary (*M. for Cor.*) 230, 232.
Tariff, special, for B. C. (*Ques.*) 491.
Separation of B. C. (*M. to introduce B.*) 1079 (Vol. ii.) (*withdn.*) 1080.
Chinese in B. C. (*M. for Sel. Com.*) 1251-60-63.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on propd. Res., 1897, 1903; in Com., 1961-3-5.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Pacific Ry.) 1645.

Defendants' Costs in Crown Suits B. No. 17 (*Mr. MacDonnell.*)

- 1°, 107; order for 2°, 1578; order dischgd. and B. withdn., 1581,

Deschamps, Antoine, St. Anne's.

- Lighthouse Keeper, discharge of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Girouard) 675.

DESJARDINS, Mr.

- Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 99.
Lachine Canal Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 125.
Red River Timber Leases on (*M. for Ret.*) 189.
Quebec Constitutional Ques., on Premier's statements, 985, 1027.
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary employés (*M. for Ret.*) 497.
Sir Geo. Cartier, monument to (*Ques.*) 1250.
Supreme Court Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 1°, 1375.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Stone, building) 1485; (Sugars) 1487.
Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res., 1697.
Building Societies, Que. (*B.* 113, 1° and 2°) 1800.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1944.

Detroit, Canada and, Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert.*)

- 1°, 1585; 2°, 1585; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1755. (42 Vic., c. 62.)

Detroit R. Tunnel Co. Incorp. B. No. 100 (*Mr. Kilvert.*)

- 1°, 1585; 2°, 1585; Com. of W. and reported, and 3°, 1706. (42 Vic., c. 62.)

DEWDNEY, Mr.

- Race Rocks, Fog Bell (*Ques.*) 67.
Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway (*M. for Reps.*) 87.
Quartz Machinery, B. C., duties, on M. for Pap., 657.
B. C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on Res. in Com., 1534.

Digby, N.S., Pier, repairs.

- Supply,—discussion in, 1667.

Direct U.S. Cable Co. (Mr. McCarthy's B.)
See "U. S."**Diseases, Animals (Mr. Pope's B.)** See "Contagious Diseases."**Dismissals.** See "Civil Service" and "HOUSE" for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.**DIVISIONS.****Campbell, Eliza Maria, Relief B. No. 99.**—(*Mr. Macdougall.*)

- On M. for 3°; Amt., 3 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Mills*) 1878; Amt. to re-com. B. (*Mr. Farrow*) negatived, 2010; *Mr. Mills's* Amt. negatived (*F.* 38, N. 56) 2010; B. 3° (*on same division reversed*) 2011.

Insolvent Acts Repeal, and provision for liquidation B. No. 85 (*Mr. Colby.*)

- On M. for 2°; Amt. Res. for unconditional Repeal (*Mr. Béchard*) carried (*F.* 99, N. 75) 1621.

DIVISIONS.—*Con.*

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. No. 15 (Mr. Béchard).

2° carried (*Y. 117, N. 60*) 1627; Amt. to 3°, 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) negatived (*Y. 55, N. 107*), 1783; B. 3°, 1784.

Marine Telegraphs Act, 1875, Repeal B. No. 44 (Mr. McCarthy).

2° carried (*Y. 54, N. 28*) 1284.

Pacific Railway B. No. 116 (Mr. Tupper).

Res. of Com. of W., on conc. in Res. 1, Amt., as to rate of construction, &c., (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1970; negatived (*Y. 37, N. 115*) 1978. On Res. 12, Amt., as to route (*Mr. Mackenzie*) negatived (*on same division*).

Quebec, Province, Constitutional Question.

Res. condemning Lt. Gov's action, m. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 251, 270. Previous ques. m. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 282; carried (*Y. 136, N. 51*) 407. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) carried (*on same division*) 409.

Statutory Holidays B. No. 57 (Mr. Domville).

On M. for 3°, Amt., three months' "hoist" (*Mr. Holtton*) negatived (*Y. 54, N. 100*) 1766; Amt., to re-com., to exempt Quebec (*Mr. Brooks*) 1767; agreed to, on a division, re-com. and reported*, 1769.

Supply—Concurrence.

Intercolonial Ry., nut-locks, vote for, carried (*Y. 111, N. 42*) 1860.

Pacific Ry., Mr. Wallace's claim, vote for, carried (*Y. 114, N. 37*) 1884.

Supreme Court Acts Repeal B. No. 84 (Mr. Keeler).

On M. for 2°, Amt., 3 months "hoist" (*Mr. Mackenzie*) negatived (*Y. 44, N. 120*) 1375.

Telegraphs, Marine. See "Marine Telegraphs."

Usury Prohibition B. No. 35 (Mr. Méthot).

On M. for 2°, Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Plumb*) carried (*Y. 97, N. 68*) 1585.

Ways and Means Com., Resolutions.

2° m. (*Mr. Tilley*) 507.

Amt., condemning Govt. tariff, m. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1077-79; negatived (*Y. 53, N. 136*) 1201.

Amt., to place Wheat on free list (*Mr. Fiset*) negatived (*Y. 61, N. 109*) 1353.

Amt., Wheat, Coal and Pig iron free (*Mr. Charlton*) negatived (*Y. 53, N. 116*) 1354.

Amt., Corn-meal free (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) negatived (*Y. 57, N. 112*), 1354.

Amt., flour free (*Mr. Vallée*) negatived (*Y. 61, N. 121*), 1415.

Divorce Court, New Brunswick.

Judge's salary, provision for, Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 827.

Divorce in Ontario, B. to provide for (*Mr. Hooper*).

Introduction m., 1696; neg. on a div., 1696.

Divorce.—See "Campbell."

Dominion Day Holiday B. No. 77 (Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland).

1°, 1123; 2°, 1286; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1575. (42 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

Dominion Lands Act Amt. B. No. 21 (Sir John A. Macdonald).

1°, 125; order for 2° dischgd. and B. withdrawn., 1534.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolid. B. No. 107 (Mr. Tupper).

1°, 1765; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1805. (42 *Vic.*, c. 31.)

Dominion Lands, Manitoba, Act Amt. B. No. 72 (Sir John A. Macdonald).

1°, 1003; 2°, 1296; Com. of W., 1296; reported*, 1534; 3°, 1702. (42 *Vic.*, c. 32.)

Dominion Police (Mr. McDonald's B.)
See "Canada Police."

Dominion Steamers.

Supply,—discussion in, 1669.

Dominion Telegraph Co. Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

1°, 71; 2°, 111; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 798. (42 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

DOMVILLE, Mr.

Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on M. for Ret., 62.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 133. Public servants, money due from, recovery (*Ques.*) 140.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 143, 151.

Election trials, N.B. (*Ques.*) 156.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4, on 2°, 177.

Iron Imports, N.S. and N.B., (*M. for Ret.*) 180.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 200.

Election Petitions, N. B. (*M. for Ret.*) 233-4; (*M. withdrawn.*) 235.

Ketchum, Mr., case of, investigation (*M. for Rep.*) 492.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 554-5, 595-6-7-9.

Statutory Holidays (*B. 57, 1°*) 562; on 2°, 1285; on 3° and Mr. Holtton's Amt. for "hoist," 1766.

Courrier du Canada and Mr. Huntington's explanations, 617.

Woodstock, N.B., Bridge at, on M. for Pap., 653-4.

Mitchell & Co., supplies by, on M. for Pap., 660.

Intercol. Ry. damages (*M. for Ret.*) 663.

Stark, E. O., Station Agent, dismissal of (*M. for Pap.*) 918.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (*Mr. Killam*) on M. into Com., 924.

Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (*Mr. Doull*) on 2°, 926.

Waterley, D. H., damages due to (*Ques.*) 1249.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, on Mr. Weldon's speech, comments, 796; on Ques., 799; Res., amd., on 2°, 1319; Res. 11, on 2°—(Pig iron) 1448-9; (Tin plates) 1450. Personal explanations, 1450-2-4-5.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on 2°, 1625.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) in Com., 1712-14.

Glendon, purchase of (*M. for Pap.*) 1757.

On Sir A. J. Smith's expenses, Reciprocity negotiations, 1754.

Drawback on exports, 1877-8 (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

DOMVILLE, Mr.—*Con.*

Canada Gazette, Officials supplied (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

N. B. Supreme Court Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1792.

Riv. du Loup Br., G. T. R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res., on conc., 1997.

Supply—Estimates: Public Works, Inc. (Public Buildings, N.B.) 1663.

Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to deep water, St. John) 1856-8.

Dorchester Penitentiary, Clerk of Works.

Dismissal, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*), 492.

DOULL, Mr.

Bills of Exchange, Inland (*B. 16, 1^o**), 107; on 2^o, 925; refd. to Banking Com., 927.

Fisheries, B. C., on M. for Pap., 179.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 556; explanation, 557-8.

Eastern Extension Ry., coal rolling-stock for (*Ques.*) 652.

Judge Wilkins's Resignation, &c. (*M. for Cor.*) 842.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 515, 526. Vote, *Globe* Report (*Q. of Priv*) 1250. W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Coal) 1430.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper), in Com., 1715; on 3^o, 1716.

Pictou & Truro Ry. transfer (*M. for Pap.*), 1763.

Drawbacks. See "Duties, Rebate."

DREW, Mr.

Welland Ry. Co. Bonds (*B. 12, 1^o**) 88; (*2^o**) 111.

Insolvent Estates (*M. for Ret.*) 106.

Hillsburg P. O. (*M. for Pap.*) 107.

Postmasters' Salaries, increase (*Ques.*) 112.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2^o, 175.

Postmasters' Salaries (*M. to refer P. M. G's. Report to P. A. Com.*) 827.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1123.

Insolvent Act Amt. B. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton), introduction (*objected to*), 1886.

Drill. See "Militia."

Drummond and Arthabaska Election.

Judge's Report, 3.

Drummond and Arthabaska Mails.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 70.

Drummond and Arthabaska, Weights and Measures.

M. for Inspector's Cor. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 549.

Duncan City, Reporting of Vessels at.

M. for Cor. as to necessity of (*Mr. Kilvert*) 663.

Dual Representation Abolition Act Repeal B. No. 62 (*Mr. Ouimet*).

1^o*, 649.

DUBUC, Mr.

Manitoba, Transportation to, arrangements (*Ques.*) 74.

Manitoba, Emigrant Sheds (*Ques.*) 111.

DUBUC, Mr.—*Con.*

Manitoba, Immigrants to (*M. for Ret.*) 180.
Red River, Reservations on (*M. for O. Cs.*) 232.

Emerson, Custom-house for (*Ques.*) 827.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1519.

Manitoba, Settlers' Claims (*Ques.*) 1755.

Red R., Squatters' Lands (*Ques.*) 1755.

Sitting Bull's nationality (*Ques.*) 1756.

DUGAS, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat Flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1370.

Dusseault, J. B., L'Islet.

Payments to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 675.

Duties charged in Newfoundland.

M. for Cor. respecting (*Mr. Fortin*) 1410.

Duties paid in Feb., 1879.

Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 119.

Duties paid on Canadian Tobacco.

1873-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Vallée*) 119.

Duties, Rebate of.

1874-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jones*) 65.

On Tin, B. C., *Ques.* (*Mr. McInnes*) 73.

On goods exported, 1877-8; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 1763.

Duval, Utric, St. Nicholas.

Postmaster, complaints against, *Ques.* (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.

Dynamite explosion at Stratford.

Remarks (*Mr. Hesson and others*) 1800.

Eastern Extension, N.B. See "INTERCOL. Ry."*East Middlesex.* See "Middlesex, E.R."*Election, Eligibility* (*Mr. Ouimet's B.*)

See "Dual Representation."—(*Mr. Rykert's B.*) See "Independence of Parlt."

Election of Members Act Amt. B. No. 19 (*Mr. Casey*).

1^o, 107; 2^o m., 853; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Arkell*), 857; Resumed Debate, 927; Amt. agreed to on a div., 943.

Election of Members Act Amt. B. No. 42 (*Mr. Gigault*).

1^o*, 251.

Election Trials, N.B.

Intention of Govt., *Ques.* (*Mr. Domville*) 156; M. for Ret., 233; M. withdn., 235.

Elections, Controverted, Acts Amt. B. No. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1^o*, 59; 2^o propd., 164; Resumed debate, 847; 2^o and referred to Sel. Com., 853.

Elections, Corrupt Practices at, Act Amt. B. No. 32 (*Mr. Ives*).

1^o*, 189; 2^o, 1274; Com. of W. and reported * and 3^o*, 1575. (42 *Vic.*, c. 6).

Elections, General, the late.

Votes polled, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 46.

Expenses of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 65.

Elgin, E.R., Election.

Judge's Report, 41.

"*Ella G. McLean*," Schooner.

Purchase of, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 505.

ELLIOTT, Mr.

Tarif—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Agricult. Implements) 1336.

Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville), on M. for 3° and Mr. Holton's Amt. for "hoist," 1766.

Emerson, Custom House at.

Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 827.

Emerson, Emigrant Shed.

Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 111.

English Reciprocity and Free Trade Association.

Memorial from, Ques. of its reception (*Mr. Speaker*) 1412; ruled, reception irregular, 1453.

Esquimalt & Nanaimo Ry. See "PACIFIC RY."

Esquimalt Dock. See "British Columbia."

Estimates, the.

Submitted and referred to Com. of Supply (*Mr. Tilley*) 251. See "SUPPLY."

Exchequer Court (Mr. McDonald's B.)

See "Supreme Court." (*Mr. Cockburn's B.*) See "Official Arbitrators."

Exchequer Court, Work and Expense of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bolduc*), 496.

Excise Act (Mr. Tilley's B.) See "TARIFF."

Expenditure, General.

Recent, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54.

Explanations, Personal, of Members.

For cases raised as Ques. of Priv. see "Priv." For explanations introduced in course of general debate, reference must be made to the member's name.

Exports.

Recent, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54; (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.

British Columbia, M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 137.

Factories Regulation B. No. 103 (*Mr. Bergin*).

1°, 1696.

FARROW, Mr.

Saw-logs measurement (*Ques.*) 111.

Kincardine Harbour Works, expenditure (*M. for Ret.*) 240.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. 574.

Parliament, time of meeting (*Ques.*) 651.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdougall) on m. for 3°, and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist" (*Amt. m.*) to re-com. B., 2010.

Felonies, Trial (Mr. McDonald's B.) See "Speedy Trials."

Female Reformatory, Ont. (Mr. McDonald's B.) See "Ontario."

Fertilizers, Manufacture of, Fraud in.

M. for Sel. Com. of Enquiry (*Mr. Massue*) 498; M. withdn., 499.

FISSET, Mr.

Riel, Louis, pardon of (*Ques.*) 42, 66.

Riv. du Loup Branch, G.T.R. (*M. for Cor.*) 47.

Intercol. Ry., Dismissals, &c. (*M. for Pap.*) 57.

Rimouski, Statute Labour in, on M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 68.

St. Donat, Postmaster, conduct (*M. for Pap.*) 70.

Intercol. Ry., carriage of electors, on M. for Ret., 86.

St. Fabien, Mail Contract (*Ques.*) 111.

Rimouski Wharf Improvement (*Ques.*), 112; (*M. for Rep.*) 125.

Rimouski, work at Matane, &c., on M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 113-14-16.

Intercol. Ry., sleepers (*M. for Tend.*) 125.

Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 229.

St. Fabien, Mail Contract (*M. for Cor.*) 232.

Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for Cor., 248.

Intercol. Ry., St. Flavie land claims (*Ques.*) 491.

Cardinal, Régis, Dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 565.

Lavoie, Capt., employment of (*Ques.*) 563; (*M. for Orders to*) 920, 1581.

Old Bic Harbour Improvement (*M. for Pets.*) 657.

St. Anaclet, P.O., Location of (*Ques.*) 904.

Bouchard, J. O., Dismissal of (*M. for Statement*) 1265.

Bourdeau, J., Dism. of (*M. for Cor.*) 1398; M. withdn., 1398.

St. Fabien P.O., Removal of (*M. for Cor.*) 1399.

Tarif—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° and Mr. Houde's Amt. (*Amt.*) Wheat, free, 1353.

Fish-breeding, St. John River.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. King*) 1250.

Fish-cans, American Duty on.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ogden*) 667.

Fisheries, Expenditure for.

Supply,—discussion in: Breeding, 1676, 1837; Overseers, &c., 1837; P.E.I. claims, 1838.

Fisheries of British Columbia.

M. for Pap. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 178, 684.

Salmon Hatchery, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McInnes*) 104; Ques., 652.

Fishery Award, Washington Treaty.

P. E. I. claims, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 74; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Yeo*) 241; M. withdn., 251; Ques. (*Mr. Bain, for Mr. Yeo*) 1756; in Com. of Supply, Remarks (*Mr. Muttart*) 1838.

N. S. claims, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 490.

N.S., N.B., and P.E.I. claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658.

N.B. claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1399.

Fishery Award, Washington Treaty—Con.
Appropriation of, for restoring Fisheries,
Res.; M. into Com. of W. (*Mr. Fortin*)
1730; Debate, 1749-54. In Com. of Sup-
ply, Remarks (*Mr. Kaulback*) 1837.

Fishery, Salmon, Miramichi.
Barnaby River, Fry for, Ques. (*Mr. Snow-
ball*) 826.

Fishing with Seines, Practice of.
M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macdonald, Kings, P.E.I*)
224.

Fish of Newfoundland.
Admission of, Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 743.

FLEMING, Mr.
Railways, employés and accidents (*M. for
Rets.*) 129.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1020; *Res. 11*,
on 2°—(Corn) 1347; (Butter) 1417;
(Cheese) 1424; (Coal) 1432; *Res. 12*,
Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1517.

FLYNN, Mr.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 226.
Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for
Cor., 244-7.
Tariff—Res. of Com. W. & M., on 2°, 510.
Lobster cans, American duty, on M. for
Cor., 670.
*Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Mail
Subsidies, Halifax and St. John)* 1673.

Forsyth, Mr., P.O. Dept.
Appointment of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington,
by Mr. Mills*) 236.

Fort Frances Lock.
Expenses of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 70.

FORTIN, Mr.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for
Cor., 146.
American Vessels, Registration of, on M.
for Pap., 181, 183.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 224.
Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for
Cor., 243.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap.,
560-1.
Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. (*B. 65, 1°*)
740; on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 825.
Masters, extra certificates for (*M. for Pap.*)
842.
Newfoundland, duties levied by (*M. for Cor.*)
1410-12.
Tariff—W. & M., *Res. 11*, on 2° (Wheat
flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1371.
Fishery Award, disposal of (*Res. m.*) 1730.
Anticosti, &c., Telegraph Subsidy B. 111
(*Mr. Tupper*) on 1°, 1797.
Supply—Estimates: Fisheries (Breeding)
1630.

France, Trade Mission to, Expenses of.
Supply,—discussion in, 1839.

Fraser River, B.C.
Salmon Hatchery for, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mc-
Innes*) 104; Ques., 652.
Post-office for, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.

Fredericton, N.B., Barracks.
Transfer from Govt., M. for Pap. (*Mr.
Strange*) 664.

French Edition of Tariff.
Supply of, remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1405.

**French Weight Abolition, Quebec, B. No.
25** (*Mr. Casgrain*).
1°, 140.

GALBRAITH, Mr.
Tariff—W. & M., *Res. 2* (Drawbacks) on 2°,
1328; *Res. 12*, Free List, on 2° (Wool)
1515.

Gaspé & Campbellton Mail Subsidy.
Supply,—discussion in, 1673.

GAULT, Mr.
Consolidated Bank of Canada (*B. 52, 1°**)
488.
Tariff—W. & M., *Res. 11*, on 2°—(Coal)
1436; (Earthenware) 1441-2.

"*Gazette*," Canada, in N.B.
Officials supplied, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Connell*)
1763.

"*Gazette*" Printing Co. Incorp. B. No. 23
(*Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre*).
1°, 126; 2°, 208; Com. of W. and report-
ed, 651; 3°, 705. (42 *Vic.*, c. 78).

GEOFFRION, Mr.
Intercol. Ry., carriage of electors, on M. for
Ret., 87.
Quebec Constitutional Ques., on M. for Res.,
337.
Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdou-
gall*) on 3°, and *Mr. Mills's Amt.* for 3
months' "hoist," 2010.

Geographical Society (Mr. Fortin's B.)
See "Quebec."

Geological Survey, Expenditure.
Supply,—discussion in, 1681.

Georgetown and Pictou Ferry.
Continuance of, Ques. (*Mr. Macdonald,
King's*) 1756.

Georgian Bay Br. See "PACIFIC RY."

GIGAULT, Mr.
Insolv. Act, 1875, Amt. of (*Ques.*) 48.
Election Act Amt. (*B. 42, 1°**) 251.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 762; *Res. 11*,
on 2° (Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt.,
1364.

GILL, Mr.
Dredging, St. Francis and Yamaska (*Ques.*)
74.
Banks, affairs of (*M. for Ret., by Mr. Lantier*)
671; M. postpd. 672.

GILLIES, Mr.
Mail service extension in N. Bruce (*Ques.*)
223, 651.
Saugeen R., Lighthouse erection (*M. for
Cor.*) 836.
Port Elgin Harbour Improvement (*Ques.*)
1551.
Ont. School Fund, payment (*Ques.*) 1756.

GILLMOR, Mr.

Woodward's Cove, Appropriation for (*Ques.*) 223.

Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 228.

Divorce Court Judge for N. B. (*Ques.*) 827.

Steamship line, Halifax and Brazil (*Ques.*) 1249.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1013; Res. 11, on 2° (Corn) 1349.

Supply—Estimates: Fisheries (Breeding) 1679.

GIROUARD, Mr. (Jacques Cartier).

St. Anne's Lock, widening (*Ques.*) 141.

Banque Jacques Cartier (*B.* 50, 1°*) 409; (2°*) 489.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 550.

Stock-gambling suppression (*B.* 61, 1°) 612.

Deschamps, Antoine, discharge of (*M. for Pap., by Mr. Grandbois*) 675.

Rails, old, disposal of (*M. for Ret., for Mr. Vallée*) 837.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 950.

Insolvency Laws Repeal (*B.* 22, 1°*) 126;

B. referred to Sel. Com. on Insolvency, 293; B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 1602; B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2°, (Amts. m.) 1769, 1772, 1778; Amts. withdn., 1782.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdougall) on 3°, and Mr. Mills's Amt. for 3 months' "hoist" 2007.

"Glendon," Government Steamer.

Purchase, repairs, &c., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville, for Mr. Plumb*) 1757.

Supply,—discussion in, 1669-73.

Gold Mining Machinery for B.C.

Securities for duty, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Thompson, Cariboo*) 655.

Government Business, Precedence.

M. for (Sir John A. Macdonald) 738, 1290, 1533, 1668, 1841, 1885.

Government, Constitutional Ques. See "Quebec."**Government, Legal Services to, 1873-78.**

Particulars of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Government Life Insurance.

Res. respecting (*Mr. Tilley*) withdn., 1669.

Government, Salaries of, Rates of.

Since 1841, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.

Government, Salaries, Reduction (Mr. Béchard's B.) See "Indemnity."**Governor-General.**

Royal Instructions, Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 26; copies of (*H. E.*) 42; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mills*) 124.

GRANDBOIS, Mr.

Isle Blanche, Floating Light (*Ques.*)

Riv. du Loup Pier, work on (*M. for Ret.*) 84.

Intercol. Ry. Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 137; M. agreed to, 178.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 581.

GRANDBOIS, Mr.—Con.

Deschamps, Antoine, discharge of (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Girouard*) 675.

Riv. du Loup Wharf, light for (*Ques.*) 826.

Richard, Mr., Light-keeper, resignation (*M. for Cor.*) 844.

Grand Manan, Woodward's Cove.

Re-vote, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 223.

Grand Trunk Railway.

Riv. du Loup Br., M. for Cor. with Co. (*Mr. Fiset*) 47; Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 73.

G. T. R., Riv. du Loup Br., purchase of (Mr. Tupper's B., etc.) See "INTERCOL. RY."**Green Island, St. Lawrence.**

M. for Cor. with Indian Agent (*Mr. McCarthy*) 674.

Grenville, S.R., Election.

M. for Pet. and for Enquiry (*Mr. McCarthy*) 236-7.

Grosse Isle and Quebec Transport.

Contract, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 67.

Grosse Isle, Dismissals at.

Jolicœur and Hurst, Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 563.

Grosse Isle, Government Land.

Settlement of, Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 651.

Grosse Isle, Public Works on.

M. for Conts. (*Mr. Valin*) 70.

Grosse Isle, Sheds, Rebuilding.

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 546.

Grosse Isle, Works at.

Since 1874, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 241.

GUNN, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mac-

kenzie's Amt., 1120; Res. 2 (Drawbacks)

on 2°, 1327; Res. 11, on 2° (Sugars)

1490-1.

GUTHRIE, Mr.

Controv'd. Elections Act Amt. B 4 (Mr.

McCarthy) on 2°, 172.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 195.

Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White)

on 1°, 740.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com.,

915.

Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on 2°,

925.

Elections, Corrupt Practices, B. 32 (Mr. Ives)

on 2°, 1277.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 998, 1003; Res.

11, on 2°—(Agric. Implem'ts.) 1335;

(Barley) 1347; (Corn) 1349; (Wheat

Flour) 1360; Res. 12, Free List, on 2°

(Wool) 1531; Res. 14 (Excise Duty,

Spirits) on 2°, 1532.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard)

in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1782.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper)

in Com., 1711-15.

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald)

in Com., 1801.

HACKETT, Mr.

- Cascumpec Harbour, improvement (*M. for Repts.*) 87.
 Mackerel, seining for, on *M. for Cor.*, 227.
 Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on *M. for Cor.*, 250.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 584.
 Fishery Award, disposal, on *Mr. Fortin's Res.*, 1753.
Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1671; (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton and Gaspé) 1674.

HADDOW, Mr.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 561.
 Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on *M. for Cor.*, 669.
Tariff—*W. & M.*, Res. 11, on 2° (Tin plates) 1450.

HAGGART, Mr.

- Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 214.
 Pacific Railway Expenditure, to March, 1879 (*M. for Ret.*) 235.
Courrier du Canada and *Mr. Huntington's* explanations, 617.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 1°, 1374.
Supply—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans) 1629.

Haldimand, Land Damages.

- Welland Canal, *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCallum*) 106.

Half-Breed Reservations.

- Manitoba, *M. for O.C., &c.* (*Mr. Merner*) 674.

Halifax and Brazil, Steamship Line.

- Establishment of, *Ques.* (*Mr. Gillmor*) 1249.
Supply,—discussion in, 1853.

Halifax and Queenstown Mail Contract.

- Termination of, *M. for Pap.* (*Mr. Daly*) 673.

Halifax and St. John Mail Subsidy.

- Supply*,—discussion in, 1673.

Halifax as a Winter Port.

- M. for Cor.* with *Ry. Compy.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 70.

Halifax, Intercol. Ry. Terminus.

- Intentions of *Govt.*, *Ques.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 66.

- Private Property Rights, *Ques.* (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*) 66.

- (*Mr. Cockburn's B.*) See "INTERCOL. RY."

Hamilton, Appointments in.

- 1873-78, *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Robertson*) 112.

Hamilton, Emigrants at.

- Aided by *Govt.*, *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Robertson*) 124.

Hamilton, Public Buildings.

- Intention of purchasing, *Q.* (*Mr. Robertson*) 74.

Harbours, generally, of Dominion.

- Expenditure on, &c., *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Mills*) 499.

HAY, Mr.

- Toronto Postmastership (*Ques.*) 111; (*M. for O. C.*) 130.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 210.
Tariff—*W. & M.*, Res. 11, on 2° (Screws, iron) 1463.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

Hemlock Bark, Export duty on.

- Intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Vallée*) 651.

HESSON, Mr.

- Lord's Day Observance, on *Res.* for, 79.
 Welland Canal, Damages (*M. for Ret., for Mr. McCallum*) 179.
 American Vessels, Registration of, on *M. for Pap.*, 184.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 202.
 Stratford, *Govt. Offices*, erection (*Ques.*) 222.
 Cardinal, Régis, Dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 609.
 Inland Revenue Refunds (*M. for Ret.*) 665.
 Molesworth Postmastership (*M. for Pap.*) 830.
 Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on *M. into Com. of W.*, 847.
 Ventilation of Chamber (*Remarks*) 859.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2°, 943.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2°, 899; *Res.* 2 (Drawbacks) on 2°, 1328; *Res.* 11, on 2° —(Corn) 1351; (Cheese) 1422; (Coal) 1433; (Furniture) 1444; (Screws, iron) 1463; (Stone, building) 1484.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on 2°, 1578.
 Dynamite explosion, Stratford (*Remarks*) 1800.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Bands) 1642.
 Conc.: (Post-Office) 1862.

HILLIARD, Mr.

- Tariff*—*W. & M.*, Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat flour) 1362.

Hillsburg Post-Office.

- M. for Pap.* respecting (*Mr. Drew*) 107.

Holiday, Dominion Day (Mr. Cockburn's B.) See "Dominion Day."**Holidays, Statutory, further provision for, B. No. 57 (Mr. Domville).**

- 1°, 562; 2°, 1285; *Com. of W.* and reported, 1765; *Amt.* to 3°, three months' "hoist" (*Mr. Holton*) neg. (*Y. 54, N. 100*); *Amt.*, *Re-com.*, to exempt Quebec (*Mr. Brooks*) 1767; agreed to on a *div.*, 1769; *re-com.* and reported *, 1769; 3°, 1805.

HOLTON, Mr.

- Debates, Reporting, *Cont.*, on *M.* to ratify, 91, 93.
 Stewart, John, deposit, on *propd. B.*, 140.
 Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on *M. for Cor. (Q. of Ord.)*, 162.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 191.
 Northern Light, on *M. for Ret.* respecting (*m. to adj. debate*) 236.
 S. Grenville Election, Enquiry, on *M. for Address (Amt. to refer Pet. to Sel. S. Com. on Priv. and Elections)* 237-8; *M.*, as *amd.*, agreed to, 238.

HOLTON, Mr.—*Con.*

- Q.M.O. & O. Ry., Ottawa Bridge (*B.* 45, 1^o) 338.
- Quebec Constitutional Question: on Q. of Ord., respecting vote, 408; on Premier's statements, 1027; on Mr. Mousseau's M. for Res. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1762; on course of Govt. (*Remarks*) 1835; on M. of conc. in W. & M. Res., 2001-2-3; on 3^o of Supply B., 2029.
- Private Bills, extension of time (*protested against*) 562.
- B. C. Separation B. (Mr. DeCosmos) (*Q. of Ord.*) 1080.
- Pacif. Ry., on offer of Engrs'. Reports *confidentially* to Leader of Opp. (*Remarks*) 1080-81.
- Census and Statistics B. 67 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 1236.
- Receiver-Genl. and Min. of P. W. B. 66 (Mr. Tupper) in Com. of W., 1241-2.
- Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon, dismissal, on M. for Pap.; *reasons* for such Ms. (*Remarks*) 1266.
- Dominion Day B. 72 (Mr. Cockburn) on 2^o and Q. of Proceed., 1286.
- Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2^o and Q. of Proceed., 1376, 1386.
- Memorial, Free Trade Association, Eng., on Q. of Proceed., 1412.
- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. in Com., *en bloc* (*Q. of Proceed.*) 473-4; Res., on 2^o, Debate (*Q. of Proceed.*) 508; on Mr. Doull's Q. of Priv. (*Globe* report) 1251; Res., reading *seriatim* (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1324; Res 2 (Drawbacks) on 2^o, 1324-5-7; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2^o, 1332-3; Res. 7 (Appraisers) on 2^o, 1332; on Mr. King's explan. and Q. of Ord., 1454-5; B. No. 93, on 2^o, 1823-4.
- Marine Tj. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on Res. into Com. of W., 1572-3.
- Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (Mr. Kilvert) on 2^o, 1586.
- Insolvency Laws Repeal, B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^o, 1576; B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1620.
- Insolvent Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Robertson) on M. to introduce (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1886.
- Divorce in Ont., on Mr. Hooper's propd. B., 1696.
- Petroleum Inspection B. 104 (Mr. Baby) on Res. in Com., 1697.
- Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o (*Amt. m.*) 3 months "hoist," 1766; on Mr. Brooks's Amt., to re-com., 1768.
- Masters and Mates' Certs. Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Pope) on Res. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1799.
- Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald) in Com., 1802; on 3^o (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1803-4.
- Fees, remission of, Moira R. Toll B. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1983.
- Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on Mr. McCuaig's Remarks (*Q. of Ord.*) 1985; on Mr. Costigan's Remarks (*Q. of Ord.*) 1986.

HOLTON, Mr.—*Con.*

- Riv. du Loup Br. G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res. on conc., 1998; on 2^o, 1999, 2000.
- Supply*—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Pub. Works, maintenance,—Intercol Ry.) 1728.
- Conc.: (Mr. Piché's gratuity) (*Q. of Ord.*) 1874; (Library Catalogue) 1876.
- Stranger (Macdonell), misconduct of, on Q. of Proceed., 1981; on Mr. McLennan's remarks, 2044-6.
- Home Savings and Loan Co.* (Mr. Cameron's B.) See "Toronto Savings Bank."
- HOOPER, Mr.
- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 212.
- Moore, S. J., claim for losses (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Kilvert*) 240; M. withdn., 241.
- Napanee, Tamworth & Que. Ry. Co. Incorp. (*B.* 40, 1^o) 251.
- Ont. & Pacif. Junct. Ry. Co. B. 27 (Mr. Williams); Senate Amts. (*conc. m.*) 1290.
- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349; (Sugars) 1499.
- Divorce in Ont. (*M. to introduce B.*) 1696.
- Militiamen of 1837-38, Land Grant for (*Qués.*) 1757.
- Supply*—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights and Meas.) 1720.
- HOUDE, Mr.
- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 205.
- Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for Cor., 249.
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 578.
- Langélier, Chas., payments to (*M. for Ret.*) 844.
- Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 859; Res. 11, on 2^o—(*Amt.*) Wheat, proviso, 1352; (*Amt. withdn.*) 1355-9; (Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1365; (Tobacco) 1508.
- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^o, 1623; in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1774.
- Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1842.
- Supply*—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1539-40.
- HOUSE OF COMMONS.
- Appointments, Clerks Assistant (*Mr. Speaker*) 5.
- Account current (*Mr. Speaker*) 6.
- Dismissals, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Anglin*) 29.
- Internal Commission, Appointment (*H. E.*) 41.
- Employés, names, etc., M. for Ret. (*r. Charlton*) 667.
- Indemnities of Members, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.
- Ventilation of Chamber, Remarks (*Mr. Charlton*) 858.
- Stationery, quality of, Com. to rep. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 1213.
- French edition of Tariff, Remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 824, 1405.
- Elections, Indemnity, etc., (*Bs. r* See those subjects.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—*Con.*

Official Reporting of Debates. See "Debates."

Supply—Speaker's salary, arrears, 1540; Dep. Clk's. salary, 1541; Sess. Clks., etc., 1542, 1855; Library, Catalogue, 1832, 1875; Mr. Piché's gratuity, 1873.

HUNTINGTON, Mr.

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 96.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 131, 135.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 162.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 199. P.O.D., Messrs. Forsyth and LeSueur (*M. for Pap.*, by *Mr. Mills*) 236.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 308, 312; on 3^o of Supply B., 2034. *Canadien*, statements in (*Ques. Priv.*) 488. *Courrier du Canada*, statements in (*Ques. Priv.*) 613, 615.

St. Geneviève and Point Clair Mail Cont. (*Ques.*) 489.

Belrath P.O., closing of (*Ques.*) 489.

P.O.D., use of private letter on file, on M. for Cor., 547-9.

Cardinal Régis, dismissal of (*M. for Pap.*) 550-1-2, 572-3-4; M. agreed to, 610.

Postmasters' Salaries, on M. to refer P.M.G.'s Report to P.A. Com., 827.

Intercol. Ry., Murray & Co.'s claims, on M. for Pap., 918.

Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1263.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2^o, 1380.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Corn) 1348. Remarks on Mr. White's sp., 1344.

Supply—Estimates: Geological Survey, 1681; Collection of Revenue (Weights & Meas.) 1724.

Conc.: (Post Office) 1863.

Kamouraska and Paspebiac Mail Service (*Remarks*) 1729.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on propd. Res., and personal remarks, 1933-6-9, 1940-1-3.

Stranger's conduct, attention called to, 1940. Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res., on conc., 1999.

Hurst, Benjamin, Grosse Isle.

Dismissal of, *Ques.* (*Mr. Landry*) 563.

HURTEAU, Mr.

L'Assomption R., deepening of (*Ques.*) 563; (*M. for Cor.*, by *Mr. Robitaille*) 671.

L'Assomption R., Bridge over (*M. for Pap.*) 845.

Iberville, Société de Construction (Mr. Ouimet's B.) See "Société."

Immigration expenses.

Supply,—discussion in, 1544, 1549.

Immigration to Manitoba.

1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 180.

Immigration to Manitoba, arrangements.

With Mr. Prittie, etc., M. for Cor. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) 496.

Immigration to N. West, encouragement.

Grants of land for, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Oliver*) 106.

Imports.

Recent, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54; (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.

Brit. Columbia, M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 137.

Indemnities, Members', rates of.

Since 1841, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.

Indemnity of Members, reduction, B. No.

95 (*Mr. Béchard*).

1^o*, 1533.

Independence of Parlt. Act Amt. B. No.

86 (*Mr. Rykert*).

1^o*, 1453.

Indian Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Sir John A.

Macdonald).

1^o*, 1533; 2^o*, 1669; Com. of W. and reported*, 1702; Senate Amts. agreed to, 2003-4. (42 *Vic.*, c. 34).

Indian Agents, &c., N.W. Territories.

Appointments & Dismissals, M. for O. Cs. (*Mr. Mills*) 666.

Indian Dept. N.W., Supplies for.

Contractors, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 497.

Indian Reservations, Manitoba.

M. for O. Cs., &c., respecting (*Mr. Merner*) 674.

Indians, Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Vaccination of, Ms. for Pap. (*Mr. Cimon*) 241.

Indians, Enfranchisement of.

M. for Ret. respecting (*Mr. Dawson*) 844.

Indians, Expenditure for.

Supply,—discussion in, 1684-90, 1854.

Indian, Sitting Bull, Nationality of.

Statement in papers, *Ques.* (*Mr. Dubuc*) 1756.

Indians, Lakes Huron and Superior.

Arrears due to, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Dawson*) 180.

Indians, starving, at La Chapelle, N.W.T.

Information respecting, *Ques.* (*Mr. Mills*) 1292.

Infectious Diseases (Mr. Pope's B.) See

"Contagious Diseases."

Inland Bills of Exchange (Mr. Doull's B.)

See "Bills of Exchange."

Inland Revenue Refunds.

1873-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 665; 1867-73, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Trow*) 920.

Insolvency Acts Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. Bourassa.)

1^o*, 48; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Insolvency, Assignees, Official, Quebec.

Moneys paid by, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 919.

Insolvency (Bankruptcy) B. No. 2 (Mr. Colby).

1^o*, 41; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Insolvency Laws.

Amt, intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Gigault*) 48.

M. for Sel. Com. of Enquiry (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) 189; Debate resumed, 208; M. agreed to, 221; additional members appointed, 221; Petitions referred, 293.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. No. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*).

1^o, 107; order for 2^o, 1575; postponed, 1578; resumed, 1622; 2^o carried (*Y.* 117, *N.* 60) 1627; Com. of W., 1769; Amts. (*Mr. Girouard, J. Cartier*) 1769, withdn., 1782; Amt., to defer operation of B. (*Mr. MacDonnell*) negatived, 1783; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) negatived (*Y.* 55, *N.* 107) 1783; B. 3^o, 1784.

Insolvent Act, 1875, Repeal, &c., B. No. 85 (*Mr. Colby*).

1^o, 1412; 2^o m., 1594; Amt. Res. for unconditional repeal (*Mr. Béchard*) 1610; M. to adj. debate (*Mr. Coursol*) 1616; withdn., 1621; Amt. carried (*Y.* 99, *N.* 75) 1621.

Insolvent Act Repeal, &c., B. No. 22 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).

1^o, 126; referred to Sel. Com., 293.

Insolvent Act, 1875, Amt. B. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*).

Introduction m., 1885; M. withdn., 1886.

Insolvent Estates, 1877-78.

Particulars, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Drew*) 106.

Insurance, Government Life.

Res. respecting (*Mr. Tilley*) withdn., 1669.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.**Intercol. Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 28 (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*)**

Introduction m., 138; withdn., 139; introduced and 1^o, 156; 2^o, 562; Com. and reported*, 1266; 3^o on a div., 1572. (42 *Vic.*, c. 10).

Rivière du Loup Branch, G. T. R., purchase, etc., B. No. 119 (*Mr. Tupper*).

Res. in Com. of W. and reported*, 1982; Res. considered, 1992; agreed to on a division, 1999; B. 1^o, 1999; 2^o, 1999; 3^o, 2001. (42 *Vic.*, c. 11).

Riv. du Loup Br., G. T. R.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 47; Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 73.

Employés Insurance Fund.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. McKay*) 49.

Dismissals, Northern Division.

Recently, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Fiset*); Amt., 1873-78 (*Mr. Vallée*) 57.

Halifax Terminus.

Waterside Term. and Elevator, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 66.

Private rights, Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*) 66.

Winter Port, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 70.

Carriage of Government Supporters.

Rimonski, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 84.

Lumber, refuse, purchased for.

Northumberland, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville*) 87.

INTERCOLONIAL R'LWAY—Con.**Employés in Rimouski.**

Particulars respecting, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 107.

Rimouski Wharf Improvements.

Intention to make, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 112; M. for Engr.'s Rep., 125.

Monthly Receipts from, and Freight on.

Ms. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 124.

Sleepers, last contract for.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fiset*) 125.

Employés of, on 31st Dec., 1878.

Names, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 137, 178.

Coal on N.S. and N.B. Branches.

Shipment at false rates, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 489.

Cars over-weighted; sale of coal to officials; M. for Pap. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 654.

Ste. Flavie, Land claims.

Marquis and Beaubien; Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 491.

Eastern Extension, purchase of.

N. B. Govt. claims, Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 547; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1399.

Eastern Extension, Coal Rolling Stock.

Amount of, Ques. (*Mr. Doull*) 652.

Wood Supply for, in Rimouski.

Tenders, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 658.

Damages to cattle and goods.

Payments for, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 663.

Metapedia River, Buildings on.

Sale of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robitaille*) 828.

Clarke, Henry, Truro.

Damages claim, M. for Pap. (*Mr. McKay*) \$38.

Murray & Co., Contractors.

Disputed claims, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 916. See "Supply," below.

Stark, E. O., Spring Hill Station Agent.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville*) 918.

Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon Station Master.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Fiset*) 1265.

Bourdeau, J., Ste. Flavie, Engine House Superintendent.

Removal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 1398; M. withdn., 1398.

Branch Ry. to Cape Tortentine.

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 1550.

Supply—Discussion in: St. John Deep Water Extension, 1643, 1856; Nut-locks, 1643, 1858; Maintenance, 1728, 1865; Murray's claim, 1833; carried on div., 1884.

Interest, rate of, B. No. 35 (*Mr. Méthot*).

1^o, 221; 2^o m., 1582; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Plumb*) carried (*Y.* 97, *N.* 68) 1585.

Internal Commission.

Appointment (*H. E.*) 41.

International Bridge Co., B. No. 11 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).

1^o, 71; 2^o, 111; 3^o, 628. (42 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

- Inverness, P. O. at Brodie's.*
Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.
- Iron, Bar, Imports, N. S. and N. B.*
1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 180.
- Isle Blanche, Floating Light.*
Intentions of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 71.
- Isolated Risk & Farmers' Fire Ins. Co. Acts Amt., and change of name of Co. B. No. 18** (*Mr. Mackenzie*).
1^o*, 107; 2^o*, 156; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 924. (42 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- IVES, Mr.**
Red R., B. McKenzie's losses (*M. for Cor.*) 105.
Veterans, 1812 (*M. for Ret.*) 105.
Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2^o, 170.
Elections, Corrupt Practices Act Amt. (*B.* 32, 1^o*) 189; on 2^o, 1274.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 695.
Supply—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1628-30; Militia (Drill Instruction) 1636.
- JACKSON, Mr.**
Ministers' Salaries, Members' Indemnities (*M. for Ret.*) 839-40.
- Jacques Cartier Bank B. No. 50** (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).
1^o*, 409; 2^o*, 489; Com. and reported *, 1266; 3^o*, 1346. (42 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- John Stewart Deposit* (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*) See "Stewart."
- Jolicœur dit Lachaine, Grosse Isle.*
Dismissal of, Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 563.
- JONES, Mr.**
Carillon Dam, M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 45.
Duties, Rebate (*M. for Ret.*) 65.
Trade Marks B. 82 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 1292.
Tariff—Res. 2 (Drawbacks) on 2^o, 1327; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) 1329, 1331; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Cheese) 1421; (Coal) 1431; (Screws, iron) 1462-6.
Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1538; Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1629; Pub. Works, Inc. (Buildings, Que.) 1663; Collection of Revenue (Customs) 1692.
Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) on 3^o, and Mr. Holton's Amt. ("hoist") 1766; on Mr. Brooks's Amt. (to re-com.) 1768.
- Jordan Bay Breakwater.*
Erection, cost, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson*) 54.
- Judges' Salaries, Prov. of Quebec.*
Increase of, Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 562.
- Judges' Salaries (Bs. respecting).* See the respective Provinces.
- Kaministiquia.* See "PACIFIC RAILWAY."
- Kamouraska and Paspébiac Mail Service.*
Change of Cont., Remarks (*Mr. Huntington*) 1729.
Supply,—discussion in, 1729.
- Kamouraska, Fishery Overseer.*
Caron, complaint against, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 920.
- KAULBACK, Mr.**
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 775.
Supply—Estimates: Fisheries (Overseers, and Breeding) 1837.
Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1844.
- KEELER, Mr.**
Trent B. Navigation Works (*M. for Ret.*) 104; (*M. for Cont.*) 904; Addendum, 1025.
P.O.D., use of private letter on file (*M. for Cor.*) 495, 547-9.
Mail route, Brighton and Pr. Edwd. (*Ques.*) 547.
Presqu' Isle Light-keeper, dismissal (*M. for Pap.*) 663.
Presqu' Isle Govt. lands (*Ms. for Rets. respecting*) 829.
Presqu' Isle Channel, dredging of (*Ques.*) 904.
Murray Canal, construction of (*Ques.*) 904.
Presqu' Isle Lighthouse, site of (*M. for Pap.*) 919.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Books, &c.) 1342.
Supreme Ct. Act Repeal (*B.* 84, 1^o m.) 1373; on 2^o, 1379, 1390.
- Ketchum, Mr., St. John Penitentiary.*
Investigation, M. for Rep. (*Mr. Domville*) 492; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 667.
- KILLAM, Mr.**
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 148.
American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 182.
Yarmouth Dyking Co. Incorp. (*B.* 46, 1^o*) 338; on order into Com. of W., 921-2-3; (*B. withdn.*) 924.
Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 668.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 737-8, 1160; Res. 11, on 2^o (Brass) 1346.
Montreal Harb. Dues B. 88 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res. in Com., 1501-2.
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res. in Com., 1503.
- KILVERT, Mr.**
Union Assurance Co. Acts Amt. (*B.* 36, 1^o*) 221.
Moore, S. J., claim for losses (*M. for Cor.*, by *Mr. Hooper*) 240; M. withdn., 241.
Port Huron, vessels reporting at (*M. for Cor.*) 663.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1091,
Detroit Tunnel Co. Incorp. (*B.* 100, 1^o*) 1585.
Canada & Detroit Bridge Co. Incorp. (*B.* 101, 1^o) 1585; 2^o m., 1585.
- Kincardine Harbour Works.*
Expenditure on, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Farrow*) 240.

KING, Mr.

- Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 777. Personal explan., 1451-2-4-5.
Fish-breeding Establt., St. John R. (*Ques.*) 1250.
Washademoak R., dredging of (*Ques.*) 1250.

Kingston & Pembroke Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 24 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).

- 1°, 140; 2°, 208; Com. of W., amd. and reported, 629; 3°, 651; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 1123. (42 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

Kingston, John Stewart Deposit (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*) See "Stewart."**Kingston, Ordinance Lands in.**

- Disposal of, intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Skinner*) 1397.

KIRKPATRICK, Mr.

- Dismissals, Appointments, &c., recent, on Ms. for Ret., 27, 28, 29.

- Public Acts., reference to Sel. Stand. Com. (*m.*) 70.

- Domin. Telegraph Co. Act Amt. (*B.* 10, 1°*) 71.

- International Bridge Co. (*B.* 11, 1°*) 71.

- Kingston & Pembroke Ry. Act Amt. (*B.* 24, 1°*) 140.

- Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 173; (*M. to refer to Com.*) 853.

- Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 382.

- Sarah E. Bryant*, seizure of, on M. for Pap., 681.

- Ont. Maritime Court B. 34 (*Mr. McCuaig*) on M. for 2°, 685.

- Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 916.

- Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (*Mr. Doull*) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.

- Ottawa Loan & Investment Co. Act Amt. (*B.* 78, 1°*) 1123.

- Building Societies, Ont. (*B.* 79, 1°*) 1213.
Stationery, quality of (*M. Print. Com. to enquire*) 1213.

- Supply*—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1658.

- Ont. Maritime Ct. Act Amt. B. 73 (*Mr. McDonald*) in Com., 1804.

Kootenay River, B.C.

- Clearing of, intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Bunster*) 1397.

KRANZ, Mr.

- Custom-houses, expenses, regulation of (*Ques.*) 651.

- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Books, &c.) 1344.

Lachaine, Gatién, Crane Island.

- Postmaster, dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 835.

Lachine Canal.

- Expenditure on, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 47.

- Employés' names, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 125.

Lachine Canal—Con.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington*) 550; Resumed debate, 563; M. agreed to, 610.
Supply,—discussion in, 1649.

Lady Head, Govt. Steamer.

- Loss of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Vallée*) 549.

Lands (*Bs. respecting*). See "Dominion," "N. W. Territories," and "Ordinance."**LANDRY, Mr.**

- Montmagny Basin Survey (*M. for Ret.*) 54.

- St. Lawrence Survey (*M. for Rep.*) 62.

- Grosse Isle Transport Contract (*M. for Pap.*) 67.

- Rimouski, Statute Labour in, (*M. for Pap.*) 67.

- Intercol. Ry., Carriage of Electors, on M. for Ret., 84.

- Intercol. Ry. Employés, Rimouski (*M. for Ret.*) 107.

- Rimouski, Work at Matane, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 113, 117.

- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 216.

- Berthier Wharf repairs, particulars (*M. for Ret.*) 240.

- Grosse Isle, repairs, particulars (*M. for Ret.*) 241.

- Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 339.

- Taschereau, Judges, appointment of (*M. for Cor.*) 505.

- Grosse Isle, Sheds, re-building of (*Ques.*) 546.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 553.

- Jolicœur and Hurst, dismissals of (*Ques.*) 563.

- Grosse Isle, settlement of (*Ques.*) 651.

- Intercol. Ry., Wood Tenders (*M. for Ret.*) 658.

- Rimouski, Harbour of Refuge (*M. for Cor.*) 658.

- Dusseault, J. B., payments to (*M. for Ret.*) 675.

- Montmagny, Postmasters, complaints against (*M. for Pap.*) 835.

- Caron, Clovis, complaints against, &c. (*M. for Pap.*) 920.

- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1369; (Pig iron) on Mr. Bourassa's Amt., 1447.

- Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1593.

LANE, Mr.

- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2°, and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1610.

- Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdougall*) on 3° and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist," 2010.

Langélier, Charles, Chambly Canal.

- Payments to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Houde*) 844.

LANGEVIN, Mr.

- P.O. Dept., Report (*presented*) 71.

- Hamilton, Public Buildings, purchase (*Ans.*) 74.

- P.O. Regulations., returning letters, (*Ans.*) 57.

- Lord's Day observance, Res. (*Ans.*) 79.

LANGVIN, Mr.—Con.

- Intercol. Ry., carriage of electors, on M. for Ret., 86.
 Quebec Fire Ass. Co. Stock (*B. 14, 1^o*) 88.
 Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont. 98.
 St. Fabien, Mail Contract, (*Ans.*) 111.
 Toronto Postmastership (*Ans.*) 111; on M. for O.C., 131.
 Paymasters' Salaries, Increase (*Ans.*) 112.
 Registered Letters, tampering with (*Ans.*) 112.
 Rimouski Wharf Improvement (*Ans.*) 112.
 Rimouski, Work at Matane, &c, on M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 114.
 Post Office Act Amt. (*B. 39, 1^o*) 222.
 Mail Service in N. Bruce (*Ans.*) 223, 651.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 331.
 Ste. Geneviève Mail Cont. (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 489.
 Belrath P. O., closing of (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 489.
 Albert Ry., Postal Car for (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 489.
 Newspaper Postage, abolition (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 547.
 Brighton and Pr. Edwd. Mails (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 547.
 Fraser R., B.C., P.O. at (*Ans.*) 652.
 N.B. Ry., Postal Car for (*Ans.*) 652.
 Allan Mail Cont., on M. for Cont. and Cor., 674.
 Com., Private Bs., extension of time (*m.*) 688.
 Ottawa and Montreal Mails (*Ans.*) 826.
 Postmasters' Salaries, on M. to refer P.M.G.'s Report to P.A. Com., 827.
 St. Anaclet P. O., location of (*Ans.*) 904.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (*Mr. Killam*) on M. into Com., 923.

LANTIER, Mr.

- Banks, Affairs of (*M. for Ret.*, for *Mr. Gill*) 671; M. postpd., 672.

LARUE, Mr.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. 571.
 Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat Flour) on Mr Vallée's Amt., 1363.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on div. and Ques. respecting vote, 1979.

LAURIER, Mr.

- Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 323.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1181.
 Traverse, Navigation Improvement (*Ques.*) 1755.
 Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1843-5.
 Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Excise, Culling) 1717-18.

Lavoie, Capt., Str. "Rimouski."

- Removal of, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 563; M. for orders, 920; Resumed debate, 1581; M. agreed to, 1582.

Laws, Codification of.

- Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Caugrain*) 223.

Leclerc, Victor, Mail Contract of.

- Removal, Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1250.

Legal Services to Govt., 1873-78.

- Particulars of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Leslie, Mr., Postmaster, Toronto.

- Superannuation, M. for O.C. and Cor. (*Mr. Hay*) 130.

LeSueur, Mr., P.O. Dept.

- Superannuation of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington*) 236.

Letellier, Lt.-Governor. See "Quebec."**Letter, private, improper use of.**

- In P. O. Dept., M. for Cor. (*Mr. Keeler*) 495; M. postpd., 496; M. renewed, 547; agreed to, 549.

Letters, Registered, Regulations.

- Intention to alter, Ques. (*Mr. Little*) 112.

Letters, uncalled for, Regulations.

- Ques. respecting (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 75.

Lévesque, Postmaster, St. Donat.

- Complaint against, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Fiset*) 70.

Lévis Graving Dock.

- M. for Ret. of Tends., etc. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 188.

Library of Parliament.

- Annual Report, 5; Com. appointed, 48; Catalogue, discussion in Com. of Supply, 1832, 1875.

Lighthouse Service.

- Supply,—discussion in, 1675.

Lion's Head, Saugeen Peninsula.

- Mail extension to, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 651.

L'Islet, works at, payments.

- To J. B. Dusseault, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 675.

LITTLE, Mr.

- Registered letters, tampering with (*Ques.*) 112.

Loan, Govt., of 1878.

- M. for Ret. respecting (*Mr. Cartwright*) 106.

Loans, Foreign.

- Application of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gill*) 671.

Loans to Railways.

- Before Confederation, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Vallée*) 63.

Lobster-cans, American duty on.

- M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ogden*) 667.

Logs, Measuring, Standard Rule.

- Authorised by Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 111.

London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 69 (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

- 2^o, 825; Com. of W. and reported, 1003; 3^o, 1002. (42 *Vis.*, s. 75).

London, Inspector of W. and Meas.

Spettigue, suspension of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macmillan*) 240; McClary, superannuation of (*Mr. Macmillan*) 241.

LONGLEY, Mr.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 404.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 974.

W. & A. and W. C. Rys., settlement (*Ques.*) 1756.

Lord's Day Observance, Pub. Depts.

Res. (*Mr. Christie*) 75; Amt. (*Mr. Langevin*) 79, agreed to, 84.

Lougheed, Samuel, Molesworth.

Postmaster, dismissal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) 830; similar M. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 920.

"Louise," Schooner, damages by.

Welland Canal, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McCallum*) 830.

Lunatics, N.W.T. (Mr. McDonald's B.)
See "N. W. Territories."**MCCALLUM, Mr.**

Welland Canal Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 104.
Welland Canal Land Damages (*M. for Ret.*) 106.

Tug, Amer., *Sarah E. Bryant*, seizure of, on M. for Ret., 119, 123, 681.

Welland Canal, Damages (*M. for Ret.*, by *Mr. Hesson*) 179.

U.S. Canals, navigation of, on M. for Cor., 188.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 209.
Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, etc., on M. for Ret., 502.

P.O.D., use of private letter on file, on M. for Cor., 549.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 606; on Q. of Ord., 599.

Welland, marsh land claims (*M. for Cor.*) 672.

Maritime Ct., Ont., Repeal B. 34 (*Mr. McCuaig*) on M. for 2°, 687.

Welland Canal, damages by *Louise* (*M. for Pap.*) 830.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 910.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 542, 1008; Res. 11, on 2°—(Carriages, &c.) 1420; (Coal) 1433; (Stone, building) 1484.

Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. Incorp. B. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert*) 1586.

Ry. Acts Consol. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) in Com., 1711.

Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1651-3-4; Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665-6; Collection of Revenues (Pub. Works, Maintenance,—Canals) 1727.

Conc.: Pacif. Ry., (Wallace's claim) 1877.

MCCARTHY, Mr.

Quebec, Lt.-Gov., M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 49.
Collingwood Harbour Expenditure (*M. for Ret.*) 84.

MCCARTHY, Mr.—Con.

Stewart Deposit (*B., propd., withdn.*) 139, 140.

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (*B. 4, 1°**) 59; (*2° m.*) 164.

S. Grenville Election, Enquiry (*M. for Address*) 236-7; M. amd. and agreed to, 238.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal (*B. 44, 1°**) 293; 2°, 1278; M. to refer to Com. of W., 1285; on Res. into Com., 1572-3.

Direct U.S. Cable Co. (*B. 47, 1°**) 338; *withdn.*, 1696.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 271.

Green Island, etc., leases (*M. for Pap.*, by *Mr. Stephenson*) 674.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2°, 1378.

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1590.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Bécharde*) on 2°, 1626.

Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665.

Assiniboine, Prof. O'Donoghue's land claim (*M. for Pap.*) 1763.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

McClary, Peter, London.

Insp. of W. and M., superannuation of (*Mr. Macmillan*) 241.

MCCUAIG, Mr.

Maritime Court, Ont., Act Repeal (*B. 34, 1°**) 221; 2° m., 684, 687; B. *withdn.*, 688.

Moirs River, Timber dues, Repeal of (*B. 49, 1°**) 409; (*2°**) 488; in Com., 1885; 3° 1885; Fees remitted, 1982-3.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 591-2.

Tug, Amer., *Sarah E. Bryant*, seizure of, on M. for Pap., 683-4.

Temperance Act, intent (*B. 70, 1°**) 904; on 2°, 1285.

Maritime Court, Ont., Act Amt. (*B. 73, 1°**) 1026.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 1282.

Montreal Harbour Dues B. 88 (*Mr. Pope*) Res. in Com., 1502.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Bécharde*) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1777.

Weights and Meas. Laws Consol. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1846.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1983-6, 1992.

Supply—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans) 1630; Militia (Brigade Majors) 1631-2; Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1649; Pub. Works, Inc. (Buildings, Ont.) 1662.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. McDougall*) on 3° and Mr. Mills's Amt. for 3 months' "hoist," 2009.

MCDONALD, Mr. (Cape Breton).

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 572-3-5.

McDONALD, Mr. (Cape Breton)—*Con.*
 N. Sydney Harbour, B. respecting (*introduction m., and withdn.*) 649.
Supply—Estimates; Ocean Service (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton & Gaspé) 1674.

MACDONALD, Mr. (King's, P.E.I.)
 Mail Contract, P. E. I. (*M. for Pap.*) 137.
 Mackerel, Seining for (*M. for Cor.*) 224; agreed to, 230.
 Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 248.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com. on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1777.
 Fishery Award, disposal, on Mr. Fortin's Res., 1749.
 Georgetown and Pictou steam ferry (*Ques.*) 1756.

McDONALD, Mr., (Pictou.)
 Insolvency Act, 1875, (*Ans.*) 48.
 Chinese Tax Bill, B. C. (*Ans.*) 66.
 Supreme Court Act Amt. (*Ans.*) 66.
 Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 154, 162.
 Penitentiaries, Report on, presented, 156.
 Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4, on 2°, adj. debate, 178.
 Insolvency Laws (*M. for Sel. Com.*) 189, 213.
 Criminal and Commercial Laws, Codification (*Ans.*) 223.
 Election Petitions, N. B., on M. for Rets., 235.
 Public Works Contracts, 1873-79, on M. for Pap. (*for Mr. Tupper*) 236.
 S. Grenville Election, Enquiry, on M. for Address (*Q. of Proceed.*) 237-8.
 St. John Penitentiary, on M. for Cor. (*Amt. suggested*) 240.
 Penitentiaries Act, 1875, Amt. (*B. 51, 1°*) 409; on 2°, 1298-1300.
 Carriers' responsibilities, legislation on (*Ans.*) 491.
 Ont. Maritime Court, working of, on M. for Ret., 503.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Doull's sp., 526; on Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1455.
 Police of Canada Act Amt. (*B. 54, 1°*) 506.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 602-4.
 Judges' Salaries, Quebec (*Ans., by Mr. Tupper*) 563.
 N. W. Territories Courts P. 5 (Mr. Mills) on M. for 2°, 676, 680.
 Divorce Court Judge for N. B. (*Ans.*) 827.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 923.
 Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on 2°, 925, 926.
 Vice-Chancellor Blake, on Mr. Costigan's remarks, 1084.
 Bills of Ex. B. 31 (Mr. Baby) in Com. of W., 1237-8.
 Waterley, D. H., P. O. Clerk, damages awarded (*Ans.*) 1249.
 Dominion Day B. 72 (Mr. Cockburn) on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1286-7.
 B. C. Supreme Court Judges (*B. 97, M. into Com. of W.*) 1288-9-90; in Com., 1534-5; (*B. 1°*) 1535.

McDONALD, Mr. (Pictou)—*Con.*
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. (*B. 74, 1°*) 1089; on 2°, 1587-8-9, 1890-1-2; in Com. (*Amts.*) 1801-2-3-4; Senate Amts. (*agreement to m.*) 2036, 2042; (*Amt, m.*) 2043.
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. (*B. 75, 1°*) 1080; on 2°, 1294-5.
 Mercer Female Reformatory (*B. 76, 1°*) 1080; on 2°, 1296.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 1°, 1373; on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1379.
Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1536-7; (*Manitoba*) 1540; (*B. C.*) 1540; Legislation (*Speaker's arrears*) 1541.
 Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Penitentiaries (*Manitoba*) 1832; Railways (*Intercol., Murray's claim*) 1834-5.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2°, 1575-6-7-8; B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1621; B. 15, in Com., 1776; (*Amt. m.*) 6 months' "hoist," 1782.
 Defendants' costs in Crown suits B. 17 (Mr. MacDonnell) on 2°, 1578-9-80.
 Ordnance Lands, N. S. and N. B. (*B. 102, 1°*) 1628.
 Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1712.
 Lunatics, N. W. T., keeping of (*B. 106, 1°*) 1730.
 N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge (*B. 109, Res. in Com., 1° and 2°*) 1787-9, 1793.
 P. E. I. County Ct. Judges (*B. 110, Res. in Com., 1° and 2°*) 1793-5-6.
 Ont. Maritime Ct. Act Amt. (*B. 73, 2°*) 1804.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdougall) on 3°, 1879.
 Prevention of Crime Act extension (*B. 115, 1°, 2° and 3°*) 1841.
 Insolvent Act Amt. B. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) on M. to introduce, 1886.

McDONALD, Mr. (Victoria, N.S.)
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 958.
Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (*Weights & Meas.*) 1724.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.
 Election of Speaker, (*M.*) 2.
 Oaths of Office (*B. 1°*) 4.
 Speech from Throne, consideration, (*m.*) 5.
 Select Standing Committees (*M. for*) 5, 25, 47.
 Debates, Reporting (*Ans.*) 6; on M. to ratify cont., 93.
 Address, on the, 22.
 Gov.-Gen'l's Commission & Instructions (*Ans.*) 26, (*Mess.*) 42.
 Dismissals, Appointments, &c., recent, on M. for Ret., 28.
 Dismissals, &c., officials of House, on M. for Pap., 35, 38, 39.
 Messages from His Excellency, 41, 42, 88.
 Riel, Louis, pardon of (*Ans.*) 42, 66.
 Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat, on Ques. Priv., 43, 44.
 Library Committee, (*M.*) 48.
 Princess Alice's death, 48; Address (*moved*) 59; (*Mess.*) 1397.
 Plague, Precautions, on M. for Address, 56.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*

- Sel. Stand. Coms., (*M.*) 5; lists (*conc.*) 47, 59; (*additions to*) 546.
 Quebec Walls, improvement (*Ans.*) 60.
 Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on *M.* for *Ret.*, 62
 Bills, Private, Pts. for, time extended (*M.*) 65.
 Race Rocks, B.C., Fog Bell (*Ans.*) 67.
 Ash Wednesday, adjournment over (*m.*) 71.
 Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1°, 73; on 2°, 110.
 Fishery Award, share of P.E.I. (*Ans.*) 74.
 Lord's Day Observance, on *Res.* for, 81.
 Mounted Police Acts Amt. (B. 13, 1°) 88; in *Com.* of W., 126-9 (*Amt.*), 221.
 Red R., R. McKenzie's losses, on *M.* for *Cor.*, 105.
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co. Bill 6 (Mr. Schultz) on 2°, 108.
 Tug, Amer. Wrecking, seizure, on *M.* for *Ret.*, 123.
 Dominion Lands Act Amt. (B. 21, 1°) 125; (*withdn.*) 1534.
 Toronto Postmastership, on *M.* for O.C., 132, 135.
 Intercol. Ry., Halifax City Ry., on proposed B. (Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.) 139; B. 28, on 1°, 156.
 Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on *M.* for *Cor.*, 161.
 Election Trials, N.B. (*Ans.*) 157.
 Manitoba, Colonisation Roads (*Ans.*) 157.
 Ontario Boundary, confirmation of Award (*Ans.*) 157.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M.* for *Sel. Com.*, 190, 219; to add names to *Com.* (*m.*) 221.
 Mounted Police, Recruiting for (*Ans.*) 222.
 Penny coins, withdrawal of (*Ans.*) 223.
 Banks, Inspection, measure for (*Ans.*) 224.
 Alaska Boundary, on *M.* for *Cor.*, 232.
 Red River, Reservations, on *M.* for O. Cs., 233.
 Quebec Constitutional Question: on *Q.* of *Ord.* respecting vote, 408; H. E.'s action (*Statement*) 944; on Mr. Oulmet's remarks (*Reply*) 983; on Mr. Mackenzie's *Ques.* and remarks (*Replies*) 1027-9; on *Globe* report (*Contradiction*) 1100; on Mr. Mousseau's *M.* for *Res.*, condemning reference of case to England (*Q. of Ord.*) 1762; on Mr. Holton's remarks, 1831; on *conc.* in W. & M. *Res.*, 2002-3; on 3° of *Supply B.*, 2011-15-16, 2021-3-4-5-6.
 Tariff—W. & M., *Res.* in *Com.*, passing *en bloc*, on *Q.* of *Proced.*, 474-5; Special Tariff for B.C. (*Ans.*) 491; *Res.* 2°, discussion on *Q.* of *Proced.*, 507-8; Debate, precedence (*M. & Q. of Ord.*) 650; (*M.*) 688; Additional Copies in French (*Ans.*) 824, 1406; *Res.*, on *conc.* (*Amt.*, *M. into Com.*) 1202; on Mr. Doull's *Q.* of *Priv.* (*Globe* report) 1251; *Res.* 11, on 2° and Mr. Houde's *Amt.* (Wheat) for *Res.* in *Com.* of W., 1355-6; (Wheat flour) 1360; on Mr. Vallée's *Amt.*, Wheat flour free, 1364; Mr. King's personal explan. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1454-5; on Mr. Tilley's personal explan., 1459; (Screws, iron) 1464; on *Q.* of *Ord.*, Mr. Plumb's sp., 1469; (Opium) 1471;

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*

- (Paintings, &c.) 1473; B. No. 93, on 2°, 1820-3-4-5; H. E.'s despatches (*Ans.*) 1669.
 Rifles, importation into N.W. (*Ans.*) 489.
 Ste. Geneviève Mail Contract (*Ans. for Mr. Langevin*) 489.
 Belrath P.O., closing of (*Ans. for Mr. Langevin*) 489.
 Albert Ry., postal car for (*Ans. for Mr. Langevin*) 489.
 Average Adjusters, appointment of (*Ans.*) 491.
 Appointments, &c., 1873 & 1878, Cabinet *cor.* respecting (*Ans.*) 492.
 Dorchester Penitentiary, Robertson, dismissal, on *Q.* of *Proced.*, production of *Pap.*, 494.
 P. O. D., use of private letter on file, on *M.* for *Cor.*, 496, 548-9.
 Mounted Police, supply contracts, on *M.* for *Ret.*, 497.
 Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of, on *M.* for *Pap.*, 498.
 Fertilisers, fraud in manufacture of, on *M.* for *Sel. Com.*, 499.
 Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, etc., on *M.* for *Ret.*, 501.
 Maritime Ct., Ont., working of, on *M.* for *Ret.*, 504.
 Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in *Com.* of W., 507.
 Newspaper Postage, abolition (*Ans.*, for *Mr. Langevin*) 547.
 Mail route, Brighton and Pr. Edwd. (*Ans.*, for *Mr. Langevin*) 547.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal, *M.* for *Pap.*, on Mr. Tilley's personal statement, 604.
 Mounted Police, Supplies (*Ans.*) 651.
 Hemlock bark, export duty (*Ans.*) 651.
 Parliament, time of meeting (*Ans.*) 651.
 Quartz machinery, B.C., duties, on *M.* for *Pap.*, 657.
 Mitchell & Co., supplies by, &c., on *M.* for *Pap.*, 659-62.
 Banks, affairs of, on *M.* for *Ret.*, 672.
 N. W. Terr. Courts B. 5 (Mr. Mills) on *M.* for 2°, 677-8-9.
 Maritime Ct., Ont., Repeal B. 34 (Mr. McCuaig) on *M.* for 2°, 686-8.
 Govt. business, precedence (*Ms. for*) 738, 1290, 1533, 1668, 1841, 1885.
 Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 1°, 740; on 2°, 1396.
 Superannuation Act, working (*M. for Sel. Com.*) 741.
 Census and Statistics, on *Res.* in *Com.* of W. (Mr. Pope) 742; in *Com.*, B. 67, 1233-5-6-7.
 Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. Fortin) on 2° and *Q.* of *Proced.*, 826.
 Indians, enfranchisement of, on *M.* for *Ret.*, 845.
 Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Robertson) on *M.* into *Com.*, 847.
 Controvd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2°, 851-2.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, on *M.* for *Com.*, 912-14-15-16.
 Yarmouth Dying Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on *M.* into *Com.*, 922.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*

- Receiver Genl. and Min. of P.W., B. 66 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1244-6.
 Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1247-8-9.
 Steamship line, Halifax and Brazil (*Ans.*) 1249.
 LeClerc, Victor, P. O. Contract, removal of (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Duval, U., Postmr., St. Nicholas, complaints (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Brodie's, Megantic, P. O. for (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Sir Geo. Cartier, Monument to (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Elections, Corrupt Practices B. 32 (Mr. Ives) on 2°, 1277.
 Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2°, 1283; on M. for Ref. to Com. of W. and Q. of Proceed., 1285.
 B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on M. into Com. of W., 1288-90.
 Official Arbitrators B. 81 (Mr. Cockburn) on 1°, 1291.
 Indians, starving, at LaChapelle (*Ans.*) 1292.
 Manitoba Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 72, 1°) 1003; on 2°, 1296; in Com. of W., 1296.
 Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 51 (Mr. McDonald) on 2°, 1298-9.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 1°, 1374; on 2°, 1381; on Q. of Proceed., 1376, 1386; of Ord., 1389.
 Kingston, Ordnance Lands, disposal of (*Ans.*) 1397.
 St. Fabien P. O., removal of, on M. for Cor., 1399.
 Indian Act Amt. (B. 94, 1°) 1533; Senate Amts. (*Agreement m.*) 2003.
 Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1537; Legislation (Sess. Clks.) 1542; Geolog. Survey, 1681; Indians (Ont.) 1684; (B.C. & N.W.) 1684-8-9, 1690.
 Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Legislation (Library Catalogue) 1832. *See Conc.*
 Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c. (Ont. Exhibition) 1849; Ocean and R. Service (Canada and Brazil subsidy) 1853-4; Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1854; Legislation (Sessional Clerks) 1855-6.
 Conc.: (Intercol. Ry. 'to deep water, St. John) 1858; (Mr. Piché's gratuity) 1874; (Library Catalogue) 1875-6.
 Defendants' costs in Crown Suits B. 17 (Mr. MacDonnell) on 2°, 1579, 1581.
 Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res. in Com., 1700-1.
 Judge Polette, on Pet. for removal, (Q. of Ord.) 1755.
 Manitoba, Settlers' claims (*Ans.*) 1755.
 Red R., Squatters' lands (*Ans.*) 1755.
 Georgetown and Pictou Ferry (*Ans.*) 1756.
 Sitting Bull's nationality (*Ans.*) 1756.
 P. E. I. claims, Fishery Award, (*Ans.*) 1757.
 Militiamen of 1837-38, Land grants for (*Ans.*) 1757.
 Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.
 Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr. Tilley) on Res. 1783-4-6; on 2° of B., 1786.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*

- N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1790-1.
 Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1845.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. McDougall) on 3°, 1883, 2004.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper); on proposed Res., 1906, 1915, 1948; on conc. in Res., 1967-8, 1970-2-3-6-7.
 Vote, Mr. Larue's, B. 116, on Ques. of Ord., 1979.
 Stranger (Macdonell) conduct of, on Ques. of Priv., 1944; (*Summons m.*) 1981.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on discussion (*Remarks*) 1989; on Q. of Ord., 1984.
 Riv. du Loup Branch, G.T.R., B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) on 2°, 1999, 2000-1.
 Ontario Boundary Award (*Ans.*) 2011.

Macdonell, John A., conduct of.

- Insult to a member, Q. of Priv. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1943; charge formulated, and summons issued, 1980; Report, writ not servable, 2044; Remarks (Mr. McLennan and others) 2044.

MACDONNELL, Mr.

- Costs in Crown suits (B. 17, 1°) 107; m. (2° m.) 1578; (*B. withdn.*) 1581.
 Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 228.
 Port Hood Harbour Improvement (Q.) 490.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 608.
 Kaministiquia Terminus, on M. for Pap. (Q. of Ord.) 833.
 Cheticamp Harbour, dredging (*Ques.*) 1249.
 Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1264.
 Truro & Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr. Tupper) on 3°, 1507.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1620; B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1774; (*Amt. m.*) to defer operation of B. 1782.
 Supply—Estimates: Fisheries (Breeding) 1679.
 Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res., 1698.
 Fishery Award, disposal, on Mr. Fortin's Res., 1750.

McDOUGALL, Mr.

- Dismissals, Appointments, etc., M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 28.
 Dismissals, Officials of House, on M. for Pap., 40.
 Ontario Boundaries, on M. for Reports, 52, 54.
 Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1°, 72; on 2°, 109.
 Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 82.
 Debates, reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 101.
 Mounted Police B. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. of W., 129.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 193.
 Quebec Constitutional Questions, on M. for Res., 288.

McDOUGALL, Mr.—Con.

- Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on 2°, 943.
 Pacif. Ry. on offer of Engrs' Reports *confidentially* to Leader of Opp. (*Remarks*) 1081.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1172; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2°, 1331.
 Pacif. Ry. Route W. of Selkirk (*Ques.*) 1551.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief (*B.* 99 1°*) 1572; (*2° m.*) 1707; (*3° m.*) 1878, 1882, 2005.
 Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on Res. into Com. of W., 1573.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Bécharde) on M. for 2°, 1576, 1624-6.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals—Welland) 1650; Geological Survey, 1683.
 Conc.: (Library Catalogue) 1875.
 Pacif. Ry. Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res. in Com., 1961-3-4.

McINNES, Mr.

- Tin, rebate on, B. C. (*Ques.*) 73.
 Fraser R. Salmon Hatchery (*M. for Cor.*) 104; (*Ques.*) 652.
 Fraser R., P.O. for (*Ques.*) 652.
 New Westminster, P. O., construction of (*Ques.*) 652.
 Railway Reserves, B. C., Settlers' rights (*Ques.*) 827.
 Penitentiary, B. C., construction of (*M. for Pap.*) 1406-9.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Agricultural implements) 1338.
Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (B. C.) 1540.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1951.

McISAAC, Mr.

- Tracadie Harbour, Dredging (*Ques.*) 223.
 Arisaig Pier, Improvement (*Ques.*) 827.
 McNair's Cove, Pier (*Ques.*) 1249.
 Bayfield, Breakwater at (*Ques.*) 1550.

McKAY, Mr.

- Intercol. Ry., Ins. Fund (*M. for Ret.*) 49.
 Govt. Rys., N. S. and N. B., coal-cars checked, on M. for Ret., 654.
 Amet Island Breakwater (*M. for Pap.*); 657.
 Intercol. Ry., H. Clarke's claim, (*M. for Pap.*) 838.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 924.

MACKENZIE, Mr.

- Election of Speaker, on M., 2.
 Appointments of Clerks Assistant, on Mr. Speaker's Rep., 5.
 Debates, Reporting (*Ques.*) 6; on M. to ratify cont., 92.
 Address, on the, 16.
 Gov.-Gen'l's Commission and Instructions, (*Ques.*) 26.
 Pacific Railway, tenders (*Ques.*) 26, 824.
 Dismissals, &c., Officials of House, 37.
 Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat, *Ques.* of Priv., 43.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

- Carillon Dam, on M. for Ret., 45.
 Quebec, Lt.-Gov., on M. for Pap., 49.
 Pacific Ry. Route (*M. for Pap.*) 50.
 Princess Alice's Death, Address (*seconded*) 60.
 Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on M. for Ret., 62.
 Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 12, 72; on 2°, 110.
 Red B., R. McKenzie's losses, on M. for Cor., 105.
 Sovereign F. & M. Ins. Co. (*B.* 20, 1°*) 107.
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co., B. 6 (Mr. Schultz) on 2°, 107, 108.
 Rimouski, work at Matane, &c., on M. for Ret., 113-4.
 Tug, Amer. wrecking, seizure, on M. for Ret., 123, 681-3-4.
 Mounted Police B. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. of W., 129.
 Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O. C. (*Amt.*) 130, 133.
 Intercol. Ry. (Halifax City Ry.) on proposed Bill, 138-9.
 Stewart, John, deposit, on propd. B., 139.
 Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141, 160.
 Indians, Treaties with, on M. for Pap., 180.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 192.
 Brit. Amer. Life Ins. Co. Incorp. (*B.* 41, 1°*) 251.
 Priv. and Elections Com. (*M. to add Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) 338.
 Quebec Constitutional Question: on M. for Res., 283, 296; on Premier's statements (*Ques. & Remarks*) 1026-8; on Mr. Mousseau's M. for Res., precedence (*Q. of Ord.*) 1841; on conc. in W. & M. Res., 2001; on 3° of Supply B., 2011-12, 2029.
 Budget, on the, 466; on Mr. Tupper's comments, 508-9.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. in Com., passing *en bloc* (*Q. of Proced.*) 473-4; Res., on 2°, on Mr. Tupper's comments (*Reply*) 508-9; financial statement (*called for*) 509; on Mr. Doull's speech (*comments*) 517, 526.
 Debate, precedence of (*Q. of Ord.*) 650.
 Newfoundland, fish, duty on (*Ques.*) 743. Res., on 2° (*Amt.*), condemning Govt. scheme, *m.*) 1065; on Mr. Kilvert's sp. (*comments*) 1093; on Mr. Pope's, 1163-4. On M. again into Com. on *Proced.* (*Remarks*) 1202. On Mr. Doull's *Q. of Priv.* (*Globe report*) 1251. Res. 2, Drawbacks, on 2°, 1326-7-8; Res. 4, Tea and Coffee, differential, 1329; Res. 11—(Agricult. Implements) 1334; (Animals) 1339; (Books, &c.) 1341-2; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1356; (Wheat flour) 1360, on Mr. Vallée's Amt., Wheat flour free, 1364; (Carriages, &c.) 1418; (Cement) 1420; (Cheese) 1423; (Coal) 1427-35-6-7; (Earthenware) 1441-2; (Furniture) 1444; (India-rubber goods) 1446; (Pig iron) 1449; Screws, iron) 1459-60-2-3-8; (Paintings, &c.) 1472; (Stone, building) 1483-4-5. B. No. 93, on 2°, 1816; on Mr. Tilley's sp., 1813; on Sir John A. Macdonald's, 1821-3. (*Remarks*) H. E.'s despatches, 1628, 1669, 1729.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

- Dorchester Penitentiary, Robertson, dismissal, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 493.
- Fertilisers, fraud in manufacture of, on M. for Sel. Com., 499.
- Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, &c., on M. for Ret., 499-501.
- Taschereau, the Judges, appointment of, on M. for Cor., 506.
- Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 507-8.
- Ryland, Mr., claim of, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 550.
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal, on M. for Pap. (*Mr. Cartwright, on Mr. Bergin's personal statement*) 609.
- N. Sydney Harbour, on propd. B. (*Q. of Ord.*) 649.
- Woodstock, N.B., Bridge at, on M. for Pap., 653-4.
- Quartz-mining Machinery, B.C., duties, on M. for Pap., 657.
- Indian Agents, dismissal of (*M. for O. Cs.*) 666.
- War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 666.
- St. John Penitentiary, Warden (*M. for Cor., for Mr. Burpee*) 667.
- Banks, affairs of, on M. for Ret., 672.
- Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 1^o, 739-40; on 2^o, 1395.
- Census & Statistics, on Res. in Com. of W. (Mr. Pope) 742.
- Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. Fortin) on 2^o and Q. of Proceed., 825.
- Metapedia, disposal of Ry. buildings, on M. for Ret., 829.
- Kaministiquia Harbour, terminus at, on M. for Pap., 833; (*Q. of Ord.*) 834.
- Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 858.
- Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 908, 914-15.
- Intercol. Ry., Murray & Co.'s claims (*M. for Pap.*) 916, 918.—See *Supply*, below.
- Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 923-4.
- Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.
- Pacif. Ry. Conts., Pap. incomplete (*Remarks*) 943; on offer of Engrs.' Reports confidentially, 1080-82.
- Truro & Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr. Tupper) on 2^o, 1239-40; on 3^o, 1504.
- Receiver Genl. and Min. of P.W., B. 66 (Mr. Tupper) in Com. of W., 1242.
- Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1260-62.
- Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon, dismissal, on M. for Pap., 1265.
- Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2^o, 1280-1-4; on reference to Com. of W. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1285; on Res. into Com., 1573-4.
- Dominion Day B. 72 (Mr. Cockburn) on 2^o (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1286.
- B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on M. into Com. of W. on Res., 1288.
- Ont. & Pacific Junct. Ry. B. 27 (Mr. Williams) on Senate Amts., 1290.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

- Official Arbitrators B. 81 (Mr. Cockburn) on 1^o, 1291.
- Manitoba Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on 2^o, 1296.
- Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 51 (Mr. McDonald) on 2^o, 1298-9.
- Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) 1374; on 2^o, (*Amt.*) 3 months' "hoist," 1375; on Q. of Proceed., 1377, 1385.
- B.C. Penitentiary, construction of, on M. for Pap., 1409.
- Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.
- Supply*—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1536-7-8, 1540; (Manitoba) 1540; Legislation (Commons, Dep. Clk.) 1542; (Sess. Clerks) 1543; Quarantine (Cattle) 1548; Militia (Drill instruction) 1639; Public Works, Cap. (Intercol. Ry., Nutlocks) 1644; (Pacif. Ry.) 1645-6; (Welland Canal) 1653-4-5-8, 1660-1; (Buildings, Ottawa, snow-shovelling) 1661; Pub. Works, Inc. (Navigable Rivers, Que. Harbour) 1661; (Buildings, Ont.) 1662; (Que.) 1662; (N.B.) 1663; (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665-6; (N.S.) 1667; Miscellaneous (Telegraph Subsidy, Anticosti) 1668; Collection of Revenue (Weights and Measures) 1720-1-3-4; (Public Works, Maintenance, Canals) 1726-7.
- Suppl. Estimates, 1878-9: Legislation (Debates, Report) 1832; (Library Catalogue) 1832; Pub. Works, Cap. (Intercol. Ry., Murray's claim) 1833-4; Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, Oak Point, N.S.) 1836; Miscellaneous (Trade Mission to France) 1839.
- Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c. (Ont. Exhibition) 1848; Pub. Works Cap. (Pacif. Ry., W. of Red R.) 1850.
- Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to Deep water, St. John) 1858; (Nutlocks) 1858-9, 1860; (Ottawa Drill Shed) 1861; (Intercol. Ry.) 1866-7-8, 1870; (Mr. Piché's gratuity) 1873-4; (Library Catalogue) 1875-6; (Pacif. Ry., Wallace's claim) 1877; (Intercol. Ry., Murray's claim) 1884; (Pacif. Ry., B.C.) 1992.
- Rimouski, Capt. Lavoie, on M. for orders to, 1581.
- Usury Prohibition B. 35 (Mr. Méthot) on 2^o, 1584.
- Canada and Detroit Bridge B. 101 (Mr. Kilvert) on 2^o, 1586.
- Ry. Act, 1868, Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Tupper) on withdrawal, 1587.
- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2^o, 1625.
- Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res. in Com., 1700.
- R. Acts. Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) on 2^o, 1704-5.
- Selkirk Election, on M. for Pap., 1763.
- Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o, and Mr. Brooks's Amt. to recom., 1767.
- Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr. Tilley) on 2^o, 1786.

- MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.**
N.B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1793.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper); on propd. Res., 1896, 1908-9, 1910-11-14; on Q. of Ord., 1938, 1941; 1956-7; in Com., 1964; on conc. in Res. 1, 1965 (*Amt. Res. m.*) 1970, 1973-6-7; on conc. in Res. 12 (*Amt. m.*) 1979.
Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on Mr. Costigan's Remarks and Q. of Ord., 1986.
Riv. du Loup Br, G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res. on conc., 1994-5-6; on 2° of B., 1999.
Stranger (J. A. Macdonell) conduct of (Q. of Priv.) 1943; charge formulated, 1981.
Ont. Boundary Award (*Ques.*) 2011.
- McKenzie, Roderick, Property Destroyed.**
Red River Rebellion, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.
- Mackerel, Practice of Seining for.**
M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's, P. E. I.*) 224.
- "McLean," Schooner.** See "*Ella G. McLean.*"
- McLENNAN, Mr.**
Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 80.
Montreal & Ottawa Junction Ry. Act Amt. (*B. 29, 1°*) 189.
Coteau & Province Line Ry. Act Amt. (*B. 30, 1°*) 189.
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 380.
Tarif—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 517, 521; on Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1166; Res. 11, on 2° (Paintings, etc.) 1472-3.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals—Welland) 1660.
Conc.: (Post Office) 1861.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1925.
Stranger (Macdonell) conduct of (*Remarks*) 2044-6.
- McMahon, James A., Welland Canal.**
Absence from duty, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 60.
- MACMILLAN, Mr.**
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 215.
Spettigue, J. J., suspension of (*M. for Cor.*) 240.
McClary, Peter, superannuation of (*M. for Cor.*) 241.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 607.
Tarif—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1358; (Stone, building) 1483.
Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2°, 1389.
Supply—Estimates: Immigration, 1565; Collection of Revenue (Weights and Measures) 1726.
Toronto P. O., Accounts and Salary, 1874-78 (*M. for Pap.*) 1757.
- Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdonnell) on 2° and Mr. Mills's Amt. for 3 months "hold," 2010.**
- McNair's Cove, Antigonish.**
Repair of, *Ques.* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 1249.
- McRORY, Mr.**
Rideau Canal, damages (*M. for Ret.*) 838.
- Magdalen Islands Telegraph (Mr. Tupper's B.)** See "Anticosti;" also "SUPPLY"
- Mail Services.** See the respective services.
- Mail Subsidies.**
Supply,—discussion in, 1873.
- Malt and Malt Liquor.**
M. for Ret. respecting (*Mr. Eurpee, St. John*) 185.
- Manitoba, Additional Grant to, B. No. 108 (Mr. Tilley).**
Res. in Com. of W., 1784; reported, 1786; 1°, 1786; 2°, 1786; 3°, 1806. (42 *Vic.* c. 2).
- Manitoba and N. W. Loan Co. (Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.)** See "Ottawa Loan and Investment Co."
- Manitoba, Colonisation Roads in.**
Intention of Govt., *Ques.* (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 157.
- Manitoba, Financial position of.**
Papers respecting (*Message*) 1627.
- Manitoba, Half-breed Reservations.**
M. for O. C.s, etc., respecting (*Mr. Werner*) 674.
- Manitoba, Immigration, encouragement.**
Grants of land for, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Oliver*) 106.
- Manitoba, Immigration into.**
1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 180.
- Manitoba, Indian Agents, etc.**
Appointments and Dismissals, M. for O. C.s. (*Mr. Mills*) 666.
- Manitoba, Land Claims.**
Of Prof. O'Donoghue, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1763.
- Manitoba, Land Patents.**
M. for list, with dates, &c. (*Mr. Schultz*) 185.
- Manitoba Lands (Sir John A. Macdonald's B.)** See "Dominion Lands."
- Manitoba, means of Transport to.**
Arrangements with Railways, *Ques.* (*Mr. Dubuc*) 74.
- Manitoba Penitentiary.**
Supply,—discussion in, 1540.
- Manitoba Rebellion, R. McKenzie.**
Property destroyed, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.
- Manitoba, Reservation of Lands.**
On Red R., M. for O. C. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 232.
- Manitoba, Settlement arrangements.**
With Mr. Prittie, &c., M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 496.
- Manitoba, Settlers' claims.**
Recognition of, *Ques.* (*Mr. Dubuc*) 1755.
Squatters' lands, price, *Ques.* (*Mr. Dubuc*) 1755.

Manitoba, Telegraph.
 Selkirk and Battleford Cont., M. for Pap. (Mr. Schultz) 830.

Manitoba, Temperance (Mr. McCuaig's B.) See "Temperance."

Manitoba, Timber Leases.
 Red R. Belt, M. for Ret. (Mr. Dubuc) 189.

Marine Telegraphs Act repeal B. No. 44 (Mr. McCarthy).
 1^o, 293; 2^o m., 1278; agreed to (Y. 54, N. 28) 1284; referred to Com. of W., 1285; order into Com. of W., 1572; Com. and reported*, 1575; 3^o* on a div., 1575.

Maritime Court, Ontario.
 Rules of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Rykert) 503; M. withdn., 505.
 Working of, &c., M. for Ret. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 663.
 (Mr. McCuaig's B.) See "Ontario."

Marquis, Alex., Ste. Flavie.
 Land claims of, Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 491.

MASSON, Mr.
 Militia Report (Presented) 26.
 Veterans, 1812 (Capt. Goddu) on M. for Ret., 105.
 Camps of Military Instruction (Ans.) 112.
 War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 666.

MASSUE, Mr.
 Ste. Anne de Sorel, Piers (M. for Pap.) 106.
 Yamaska R. improvement (M. for Pap.) 106.
 Fertilisers, fraud in manufacture of (M. for Sel. Com.) 498; M. withdn., 499.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1130.

Master Mariners, examination of.
 For extra Certificates, M. for Documents (Mr. Fortin) 842.

Masters and Mates' Certificates Act Extension B. No. 112 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)
 Res. in Com. of W., 1799; reported, 1800; 1^o and 2^o*, 1800; 3^o*, 1806. (42 Vic., c. 26).

Matane, Work performed at.
 During election, &c., M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry) 113; Amt. (Mr. Fiset) 114.

Mates' Certificates (Mr. Pope's B.) See "Masters and Mates."

Measuring Saw-logs, Standard rule.
 Authorised by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Farrow) 111.

Melbourne Township P.O. See "Bel-rath."

Members' Indemnities, rates of.
 Since 1841, M. for Ret. (Mr. Jackson) 839

Members, indemnity of (Mr. Béchard's B.) See "Indemnity."

Members' Stationery, quality of.
 Printing Com. to report, M. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 1213.

Memorial from an English Association.
 Reception of, Ques. (Mr. Speaker) 1412; ruled, reception irregular, 1453.

Mennonite Immigration.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1549.

Mercer Reformatory, Ont. (Mr. McDon-ald's B.) See "Ontario."

Mercier, P.A. & E.H., Montreal Customs.
 Absence from duty, Ms. for Rets. (Mr. Teller) 105.

MERNER, Mr.
 Weights & Meas., Inspectors (Ques.) 71.
 Half-breed Reservations (M. for Ret.) 674.

Messages from His Excellency.
 Internal Commission, appointment, 41.
 Royal Instructions and Commission, 42.
 Reply to Address in Ans. to Speech, 88.
 Estimates, 1879-80, 251; Supplementary, 1878-79, 1796; 1879-80, 1840; further Supplementary, 1879-80, 1982.
 Princess Alice, death of; H. M.'s reply to Address, 1397.
 Manitoba, financial position of, Pap. respecting, 1627.
 Brit. Columbia, graving dock, Pap. respecting, 1628.
 Tariff, copy of H. E.'s despatch, 1784.

Metapedia, Buildings. See "INTERCOL. Ry."

MÉTHOT, Mr.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 204.
 Interest, rate of (B. 35, 1^o*) 221; (2^o m.) 1582.
 Lighthouses, coal oil supply (M. for Pap.) 836.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1111.
 Judge Polette, Pet. against (Presented) 1755.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1776.

Metropolitan Ins. Co. (Mr. Rochester's B.) See "Ottawa Agricult."

Michigan, Lake, Entrance of. See "Dun-canon City."

Middlesex, E.R., Insp. of W. & M.
 Spettigue, suspension of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Macmillan) 240.
 McClary, superannuation of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Macmillan) 241.

Military Camps of Instruction.
 Intention this year, Ques. (Mr. Thompson, Hald.) 112.

Military Properties, Fredericton and other places.
 Transfer or Sale of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Strange) 664.

Militia & Defence Acts Amt. B. No. 105 (Mr. Bowell).
 Res. in Com. of W., 1697; reported, and B. 1^o*, 1702; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1848. (42 Vic., c. 35.)

Militia Expenditure.

Supply,—discussion in: Pensions to Veterans, 1812 & 1837, 1628; Brigade Staff, &c., 1630; Drill instrn. allowances, 1634; Ammunition & Stores, 1642; Annual Training, 1642; Bands, 1642; Drill in Colleges, 1643; Ottawa Drill Shed, 1861.

Militia, 21st Batt., No. 1 Co.

Drill of 1873-74, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tellier*) 505.

Militia Veterans.

Pensions to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.
Supply,—discussion in, 1628.
Land Grants for, *Ques.* (*Mr. Hooper*) 1757.

Militia, Volunteers for War Service.

M. for Ret. of names, &c. (*Mr. Bunster*) 665.

Mills, Children in (*Mr. Bergin's B.*). See "Factories."**MILLS, Mr.**

Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat, on *Ques. Priv.*, 43.
Ontario Boundaries, on M. for Reports, 53; (*Ques.*) 157.
Debates, Reporting, on M. for Sel. Com., 58; on M. to ratify Cont., 93.
N. W. Territories Courts (*B. 5, 1^o*) 65; 2^o m., 675-7-8-9.
Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 121.
Royal Instructions (*M. for Cor.*) 124.
Mounted Police, B. 13 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. of W., 127-8.
Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 134.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 189.
Alaska Boundary, on M. for Cor., 231-2.
P.O.D., Messrs. Forsyth and LeSueur (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Huntington*) 236.
S. Grenville Election, Enquiry, on M. for Address, Amt., and Q. of *Proced.*, 238.
Territories, Real Property Act (*B. 43, 1^o*) 293.
Quebec Constitutional Question: on M. for Res., 362; on Q. of *Ord.*, 408; on conc. in W. & M. Res., 2002; on 3^o of Supply B., 2019-20-1.
P.O.D., use of private letter on file, on M. for Cor., 496.
Maritime Court, Ont., working of, on M. for Ret., 504.
Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 499, 500.
Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 507.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for *Pap.*, 604-5, 609.
Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 2^o and Q. of *Proced.*, 826.
Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on M. into Com., 846.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 870, 1013; Res. 2 (*Drawbacks*) 1325; Res. 4 (*Tea and Coffee, differential*) 1330; Res. 11—(*Stands*) 1334; (*Agricult. Implements*) 1335; (*Books, &c.*) 1340-2-5; (*Barley*) 1346; (*Corn*) 1348; (*Wheat*) on Mr.

MILLS, Mr.—Con.

Houde's Amt., 1359; (*Butter*) 1416; (*Carriages, &c.*) 1420; (*Cheese*) 1424; (*Screws, iron*) 1463; (*Paintings, &c.*) 1473; (*Sugars*) 1492-8. B. No. 93, on 2^o, 1825.
Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (*Mr. Killam*) on M. into Com., 922-4.
Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (*Mr. Doull*) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.
Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 942.
Census & Statistics B. 67 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 1234-6.
Bills of Ex. B. 31 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com. of W., 1238.
Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1247-8.
Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1262.
Marine Telegraph Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2^o, 1283.
Dominion Day B. 72 (*Mr. Cockburn*) on 2^o and Q. of *Proced.*, 1286.
B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (*Mr. McDonald*) on M. into Com. of W., 1290; in Com., 1534.
Indians, starving, at La Chapelle (*Ques.*) 1292.
Manitoba Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 72 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1297.
Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 1^o, 1375; on 2^o and Q. of *Proced.*, 1378, 1389.
Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (*St. V. de Paul*) 1539; Legislation (*Sess. Clks., &c.*) 1543; Immigration (*Salaries*) 1545; Militia (*Drill Instruction*) 1637; Pub. Works Inc. (*Harbours, &c., Ont.*) 1666; Geolog. Survey, 1681; Indians, (*N. W.*) 1685-8-9, 1690.
Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c., (*Ontario Exhibition*) 1849; Pub. Works, Cap. (*Pacif. Ry., W. of Red B.*) 1852; Legislation (*Sess. Clks.*) 1855-6.
Conc.: (*Pacif. Ry., Wallace's claim*) 1877, 1883.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2^o, 1590.
Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 1697-8, 1700-1.
Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2^o, 1706; on 3^o, 1715.
Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (*Mr. Tilley*) on Res., 1785; on 2^o of B., 1787.
N.B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Res., 1791-2.
Indian Act Amt. B. 94 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Senate Amts., 2003.
Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1845.
Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdougall*) on 3^o, 1878; (*Amt. m.*) 3 months' "hoist," 2005.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on propd. Res., 1928; in Com., 1951-4; on conc. in Res., 1977.
Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on Mr. Costigan's Remarks and M. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1985-6, 1988.

- Mill-waste in Navigable Streams Act.*
Intentions respecting, Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 74.
- Ministers' Salaries (Mr. Béchard's B.)*
See "Indemnity."
- Ministers' Salaries, rates of.*
Since 1841, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.
- Miramichi, Marine Hospital.*
State of, &c., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Snowball*) 497.
- Mitchell & Co., Payments to.*
1870-74, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 659.
- Moir River, Timber Tolls (Mr. McCuaig's B.)* See "Belleville."
- Molesworth, Postmaster.*
Lougheed, dismissal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) 830; similar m. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 920.
- Monk, Land Damages.*
Welland Canal, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 106.
- Moneys due from Public Servants.*
Recovery of, Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 140.
- MONGENAIS, Mr.**
Tobacco, Canadian, duties (*Ques.*) 74.
Rivière à la Graisse, survey, &c. (*Ques.*) 74.
Mill-waste in Navigable streams (*Ques.*) 74.
Ottawa R., drag-nets, prohibition (*Ques.*) 74.
- Montmagny Basin Survey.*
Labour, cost, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 54.
Survey, M. for Engr's. Rep. (*Mr. Landry*) 62.
- Montmagny, Postmasters in.*
Dismissals of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 835.
- Montreal & Champlain Junction Ry. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. Scriver).**
1°*, 107; 2°*, 156; Com. of W. and reported*, 629; 3°*, 651. (42 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- Montreal & Ottawa Junction Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. McLennan).**
1°*, 189; 2°*, 488.
- Montreal and Ottawa Mails.*
Twice daily, Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 826.
- Montreal Custom House.*
Appointments, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Coursoy*) 26.
Officials, conduct of. See "Mercier."
- Montreal, Tobacco Seizures.*
1874-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tellier*) 505.
- Montreal Trinity House Acts Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.).**
Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1°*, 1502; 2°*, Com of W. and reported*, 1669; 3°*, 1702. (42 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- Moore, S. J., Claim of.*
Australian Exhibition, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Hooper*) 240.
- Morpeth Harbour, Appropriation for.*
Supply,—discussion in, 1664-5.
- Mounted Police Acts Amt. B. No. 18 (Sir John A. Macdonald).**
1°*, 88; 2°*, 125; in Com., 126, Amd., 221; 3°*, 221. (42 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- Mounted Police, Expenditure for.*
1876-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 837.
- Mounted Police, Recruiting for.*
In Manitoba, Ques. (*Mr. Schultz*) 222.
- Mounted Police, Supplies for.*
Contracts, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 497.
Contracts, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Schultz*) 651.
- MOUSSEAU, Mr.**
Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat (*Ques. of Priv.*) 42.
Maintenance of Roads, &c. B (*M. for Cor.*) 46.
Quebec Constitutional Question (*M. for Pap*) 49; (*M. for Res.*) 251-70; carried (*Y.* 136, *N.* 51) 407-9; on Premier's statements (*Remarks*) 986; (*Notice of M.*) for Res. respecting reference of case to England, 1762; M. postponed, 1763; on 3° of Supply B. and Mr. Mackenzie's remarks, 2026, 2032-3.
- Ministers' Salaries (Mr. Béchard's B.)** See Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 176.
Beauharnois Canal, site (*M. for Pap.*, for *Mr. Bergeron*) 188.
Société de Construction d'Iberville (*B.* 63, 1°*) 738.
Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1778, 1781.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1591.
Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdougall*) on 3° and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist," 2008.
- Murray & Co., Contractors, Intercol Ry.*
Disputed claims, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 916.
Supply,—discussion in, 1833; vote carried on div., 1884.
- Murray Canal, Construction of.*
Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 904.
- MUTTART, Mr.**
Souris Breakwater (*M. for Tend.*) 69.
Souris Ry., Extension (*M. for Tend.*) 69.
Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 224.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 584.
P. E. I., Civil Service dismissals (*M. for Sess. & other Pap.*) 838.
Campbell's Cove Breakwater (*Ques.*) 1397.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 955.
Supply—Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Miscellaneous on Testimonial to M. Delfosse, P. E. I. Fishery claims) 1838.
- Nanaimo and Esquimalt Ry.* See "PACIFIC RY."
- Nanaimo, Canal communication with.*
Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1250.

Nanaimo, Customs Officer.

Peck, salary of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Bunster*) 667.

Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Incorporation, B. No. 40 (*Mr. Hooper*).

1^o, 251; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3^o, 798. (42 *Vic.*, c. 67).

National Currency, adoption of.

Res. proposed (*Mr. Wallace*) 1551; Amt. 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Charlton*) 1561.

Negro Point Breakwater. See "St. John."**New Brunswick, Bar Iron Imports.**

1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 180.

New Brunswick, Canada "Gazette" in.

Officials supplied, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Connell*) 1763.

New Brunswick, claims of Govt.

Eastern Extension Ry., Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 547.

Fishery claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658.

Eastern Extension, Fishery and other claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1399.

New Brunswick, Confederation Campaign.

Personal Explanations (*Mr. Tilley and others*) 1304, 1317, 1456-9.

New Brunswick, Divorce Court.

Judge's salary, provision for, Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 827.

New Brunswick, Election Trials.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 156; M. for Ret., 233; M. withdn., 235.

New Brunswick, Fishery Award.

Share of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658; (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1399.

New Brunswick, Govt. Rys.

Coal shipment at false rates, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 489; M. for Pap., 654.

New Brunswick, Lands (*Mr. McDonald's B.*) See "Ordnance Lands."**New Brunswick, Lighthouse Inspector.**

Supply,—discussion in, 1675.

New Brunswick, Mail Service in.

Postal Car, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Connell*) 652.

New Brunswick, Public Works in.

Supply,—discussion in: Buildings, 1663; Harbours, &c., 1643, 1666, 1856.

New Brunswick Supreme Court, salary for additional Judge, B. No. 109 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

Res. in Com. of W., 1787; reported, and B. 1^o and 2^o, 1793; 3^o, 1806. (42 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

Newcastle District Navigation Works.

Transfer to Ont. Govt., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 104; M. for Sel. Com., 904; Ad-dendum, 1025.

"Newfield," Capt. Purly's dismissal.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 141; adjd. debate, 157; agreed to, 164.

Newfoundland and the Tariff.

Admission of Fish, Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 743.

Newfoundland, Customs Dues.

M. for Cor. respecting (*Mr. Fortin*) 1410.

Newspaper Postage, Abolition.

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 547.

New Westminster, B.C., Post-office.

Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.

Niagara Contd. Election.

Judge's Report, 610; Mr. Plumb introduced, 618.

North Amer. Mutual Life Ins. Co. Incorporation, B. No. 41 (*Mr. Mackenzie*).

1^o, 251; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o, 1003. (42 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

"Northern Light," Construction of.

M. for Tend. and other Pap. (*Mr. Valin*) 235, 684.

Supply,—discussion in, 1669.

Northern Ry. Co. Act (40 *Vic.*, c. 57) Amt.

B. No. 64 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*).

1^o, 738; 2^o, 1391; B. withdn., 1730.

North River, dredging of.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Oliver*) 223; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Christie*) 664.

North Shore Railway.

Mail Contract, Leclerc, removal of, Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1250.

North Sydney Harbour B. (*Mr. McDonald, C. Breton*).

Introduction m., 649; over-ruled and withdn., 649.

North Sydney Harbour B. No. 89 (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*).

Res. in Com. of W., 1502; 1^o, 1503; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o, 1669. (42 *Vic.*, c. 30.)

Northumberland, Lumber purchased in.

For Intercol. Ry., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville*) 87.

N.-W. Police (*Sir John A. Macdonald's B.*) See "Mounted Police."**N.-W. Territories, Breech-loading Rifles.**

Introduction of, stoppage, Ques. (*Mr. Schultz*) 489.

N.-W. Territories, Colonisation Roads in.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 157.

N.-W. Territories Courts B. No. 5 (*Mr. Mills*).

1^o, 65; 2^o m., 675; negatived, 680.

N.-W. Territories, Immigration, encouragement.

Land Grants for, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Oliver*) 106.

N.-W. Territories, Indians.

Agents, Appointments, &c., M. for O. C.s (*Mr. Mills*) 666.

Supply,—discussion in, 1684-90.

N.-W. Territories, Real Estate Transfer & Registration B. No. 48 (*Mr. Mills*).

1^o, 293.

N.-W. Territories, Safe-keeping of Lunatics B. No. 106 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
1°*, 1730; 2°*, Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1848. (42 *Vic.*, c. 38.)

Notes, Promissory (Mr. Baby's B.) See "Bills of Exchange."

Nova Scotia, Bar Iron Imports.
1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 180.

Nova Scotia, Fishery Award.
Share of, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 490; M. for Cor., 658.

Nova Scotia, Govt. Rys.
Coal, shipment at false rates, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 489; M. for Pap., 654.
Coal rolling stock for, Ques. (*Mr. Doull*) 652.

Nova Scotia, Harbours and Breakwaters.
Supply,—discussion in, 1667, 1836.

Nova Scotia Lands (Mr. McDonald's B.)
See "Ordnance Lands."

Nut-locks. See "INTERCOL. RY."

Oak, for St. Lawrence Canals.
Contract, remission of duties, &c., M. for Cor. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Oak Point Breakwater.
Woodworth's claim, discussion in Supply, 1836.

O'Donoghue, Professor, Land Claims.
On Assiniboine R., M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1763.

Official Arbitrators B, No. 81 (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*).
1°, 1291; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1865. (42 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

Official Assignees. See "Assignees."

OGDEN, Mr.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 158.
Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 246.
Lobster-cans, Amer. duty on (M. for Cor.) 667-9, 671.

Oil for St. Lawrence Lighthouses.
M. for Tends., Conts., &c. (*Mr. Méthot*) 836.

OLIVER, Mr.
Elections, General, expenses (M. for Ret.) 65.
Standard Weights and Measures, cost (M. for Ret.) 65.
Immigrants, N.W., grants of land (M. for Pap.) 106.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 203.
North River, dredging of (Ques.) 223.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 701-4-5, 721; Res. 11, on 2° (Carriages) 1418-19; (Cheese) 1421-2; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1512.
Ministers' Salaries, &c., on M. for Ret. (Q. of Ord.) 839.
Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Robertson) on M. into Com. of W., 847.
Supply—Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to deep water, St. John (Amt. m.) to Mr. Domville's Amt., 1857.

OLIVIER, Mr.

Duval, Ulric, Postmr., complaints against (Ques.) 1250.
Brodie's, P.O., establishment of (Ques.) 1250.

Ont. & Pacif. Junct. Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 27 (*Mr. Williams*).
1°*, 140; 2°*, 208; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3°*, 798; Senate Amts. agreed to, 1290. (42 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

Ontario, Boundaries of.
M. for Arbitrators' Reps. (*Mr. Dawson*) 50.
Arbitration, cost of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 67.
Confirmation of decision, Ques. (*Mr. Mills*) 157.

Ontario Building Societies B. No. 79 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).
1°*, 1213; 2°*, 1287; 3°*, 1805. (42 *Vic.* c. 49.)

Ontario Common School Fund.
Payment of Award, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 1756.

Ontario, Divorce in (Mr. Hooper's B.)
See "Divorce."

Ontario Exhibition, Expenditure for.
Supply,—discussion in, 1848.

Ontario Female Reformatory B. No. 76 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
1°*, 1080; 2°*, Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1296. (42 *Vic.*, c. 43.)

Ontario Indians, Expenditure for.
Supply,—discussion in, 1684.

Ottawa Loan & Investment Co. Incorp. Act Amt. & change of name of Co. B. No. 78 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).
1°*, 1123; 2°*, 1141; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1540. (42 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

Ontario Maritime Court.
Rules of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 503; M. withdn., 505.
Work performed by, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 663.

Ontario Maritime Court Act Amt. B. No. 73 (*Mr. McCuaig*).
1°*, 1026; 2°*, 1804; Com. of W. and reported, 1804; 3°*, 1805. (42 *Vic.*, c. 40.)

Ontario Maritime Court Act Repeal B. No. 34 (*Mr. McCuaig*).
1°*, 221; order for 2°, 684; dischgd. and B. withdn., 688.

Ontario, Public Works in.
Supply,—discussion in: Buildings, 1662, 1836, 1861; Harbours, &c., 1664.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.
Speech from the Throne, 4.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF.

ORDER:—
Vote of mover of previous Ques. challenged as necessarily negative (Mr. Anglin); discussion, difference of Canadian practice defined (Mr. Speaker) 408.
Reports and Returns, Ms. for, without due reasons being given, objected to (Mr. Tupper and others) 492-4, 1265; *Confidential Reports, production of, objected to (Mr. Mackenzie)*, 550.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

Reports, Engineers', communication of, confidentially, to Leader of Opposition, offered by Min. of P. W.; objected to (Messrs. Holton and Macdougall); Report tabled, 1080-83.

Precedence of Tariff Debate, on private day, without formal notice of M., objected to (Mr. Mackenzie); objection sustained (Mr. Speaker) 650.

Precedence of Govt. business, Ms. for (Sir John A. Macdonald) 738, 1290, 1533, 1668, 1841, 1885.

Allusions to proceedings of P. A. Com., still incomplete and not reported, objected to (Mr. Oliver); objection sustained by Mr. Speaker, 839.

Censure, in debate, upon the action of the Sovereign, or of Her Representative, a breach of Order; pointed out by Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd., in remarks on Que. Constitutional Question, 984.

Cabinet Proceedings. On Res. for Cor. respecting dismissals, &c. (Mr. Ross, W. Middx.) the Premier declined to bring down anything of a Cabinet nature, 491. Upon the Premier's statement (p. 944) that, certain advice having been offered, H. E. had referred the case to England, Messrs. Mackenzie & Holton pressed for copy of the O. C. and more precise information; the Premier declined, it being a matter not of "Council," but of the Cabinet, 1026.

Com. of W. (Marine Telegraphs B.) order into being read, and Mr. Holton suggesting reference of B. to Ry. Com., instead, Mr. McCarthy objected that the H. had already ordered itself into Com. of W. Mr. Speaker ruled the propriety of Amt. or discharge of that order if desired, 1572.—See also "PROCED." on this B.

Amt., for absolute Repeal, to M. for 2° of a B. for provisional Repeal (of Insolvent Laws) ruled in order by Mr. Speaker, 1610.

Amts., in Com. of W., to Mr. Béchard's B. for absolute Repeal of Insolvency Laws, objected to (English practice being quoted) as virtually destroying the B., which had passed 2°; ruled (Mr. Chairman) the Amt. not irrelevant to the B., 1769-75.

Objection to progress of a B. (the B. not being printed in French) over-ruled by Mr. Speaker, being raised too late, 1620.

Petition for dismissal of Judge Polette, Three Rivers, ruled out of order, 1755.

M. for Res., implying Want of Confidence. Mr. Holton objected to such being allowed to "stand"; but Mr. Speaker said it came within an agreement of the House, 1762.

Discussion to previous Debate objected to; and checked by Mr. Speaker, 1824.

Language, unparliamentary, 1938..

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

Strangers ordered to withdraw from the floor, 1940.—See "PRIVILEGE" for this case.

Speaking to a proposed M. without notice; objection taken (Mr. Holton). Mr. Speaker decided that it must be taken when Ques. on the M. is put, 1984.

M. to adj. H., as a conclusion to Remarks (Mr. Costigan) objected to, 1985; M. for Cor., without notice, objected to, and over-ruled by Mr. Speaker, 1986.

PRIVILEGE:—

Taking seat on telegraphic cert. of Returning Officer, objected to, and not allowed, 42.

Explanations respecting reports in Le Canadien (Mr. Huntington) 488; in Courrier du Canada, 613.

Explanation, respecting Mr. Patterson's personal charges in Tariff Debate (Mr. Rykert) 808, 818.

Explanation respecting report in Toronto Globe (Mr. Doull) 1250.

Explanation of Remarks in Debate on R. Cardinal's dismissal (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) 1373.

Explanations, continuing those made in Tariff Debate respecting Queen's, N.B., Election Protest, 1451-3 (Mr. King and others) 1454-6.

Explanations, Confederation Campaign in N.B. (Mr. Tilley and others) 1304, 1317, 1456-9.

Explanation, on statement in London Advertiser, as to vote (Mr. Coughlin) 1734.

Explanation, on statement in Chignecto Post, as to Reciprocity Treaty expenses (Sir A. J. Smith) 1754.

Explanation, on statements respecting Selkirk Election (Mr. Smith) 1805.

Stranger, conduct of, in insulting a Member of House, 1940. Charge formulated and offender summoned to Bar, 1943, 1980. Discussion as to Proceed. in such cases, 1980. Report, writ not servable, 2044; Remarks (Mr. McLennan and others) 2044.

PROCEDURE:—

Private B., Selkirk Ry. (Mr. Rykert). Introduction opposed (Mr. Schultz) length of notice in Gazette being insufficient. The Com. on Standing Orders having passed the B., that decision concurred in and B. 1°, 71-3.

Private B., affecting Crown rights (Intercol. Ry., Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland) introduction opposed (Mr. Mackenzie) 138; B. withdn., 139; introduction allowed, 156.

B. to authorise payment of deposit to John Stewart, Kingston, not introduced as Private B., objected to (Mr. Mackenzie) 139; decided against (Mr. Speaker) and withdn., 140.

Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elections.—Reference to, of Petition respecting South Grenville Election (M. of Mr. McCarthy for Address; Amt., Mr. Holton) 237.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

- B.* respecting N. Sydney Harbour, overruled by *Mr. Speaker*, not being based on Res.; *B.* withdn., 649.
- B.*, Northern Ry. Act Amt.; *Mr. Mackenzie*, objecting to its principle, opposed 1°. On discussion, decided that the principle might be discussed in Ry. Com.; *B.* 1°, 739-40.
- B.*, Que. Geographical Society Incorp. On 1°, *Mr. Casgrain* objected that the Legislation should have been obtained from Provincial Parlt., which had full powers, 741. On 2°, *Mr. Anglin* and others raised same objection; but the *Premier* maintained that the *B.*, though local in name, was general in nature, 826.
- Private Bs.*, Suggestion (*Mr. Cartwright*) of a legal examiner for, as in England, 826.
- B.*, Yarmouth Dyking Co. Incorp. (*Mr. Killam*). Ques. of:—1st, Jurisdiction of Dominion and Provincial Legislatures in such matters; 2nd, Incorporation of one individual as a Co. *B.* withdn., 921-4.
- B.*, Protest of Inland Bills of Exchange, N.S. (*Mr. Doull*). Ques. of:—1st, Jurisdiction of Dominion Parlt.; 2nd, Proper procedure. *B.* referred to Banking Com., 924-7.
- B.*, Contagious Diseases, Animals (*Mr. Pope*). In Com., *Mr. Mills* urged that such legislation was vested in Local Parlt. *B.* reported, 1247-9.
- Memorial* from Free Trade Association of England. Ques. as to propriety of its reception (*Mr. Speaker*) discussed; tabled, 1412. Ruled, its reception irregular, 1453.
- B.*, Supreme Ct., abolition of (*Mr. Keeler*). On "hoist" Amt. to 2° being lost, Opposition claimed their right (quoting English authorities) to oppose Bills at any stage, and held that members voting for 2° on div. committed themselves to general principle of *B.* The Govt. claimed that *B.* should go to 2°, and have its merits then discussed, 1376-9. See also page 1586 for a similar point.
- B.*, Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal (*Mr. McCarthy*). Reference to Ry. Com. recommended by *Mr. Mackenzie*; ruled not necessary, unless desired by mover of *B.* Referred to Com. of W., 1285. Again objected, by *Mr. Holton*, that the *B.* affected private rights, and should be referred to Ry. Com. for examination; also, by *Mr. Anglin*, that Govt. should assume responsibility for such a measure. But *B.* was passed in Com. of W. and by H., 1572-5. See also *Q. of Ord.* on this *B.*
- B.*, Defendants' costs in Crown suits (*Mr. MacDonnell*). The *Premier* objected that the *B.* affected Prerogative, and declined to obtain Assent; *B.* withdn., 1578-81.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

- B.*, Militia Acts Amt. Discussion on constitutional powers of Dominion Parlt. respecting employment of Militia in case of riots, 1697-1702.
- Fees*, remission of, on Moira R. Timber Tolls *B.*, it not being considered a Private *B.* Ques. as to propriety thereof (*Mr. Holton*) 1982.
- Ordinance Lands, N. S. & N. B., B. No. 102** (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
1°, 1628; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669. (42 *Vic.*, c. 33)
- ORTON, Mr.**
Introduction, 407.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 872-4; Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat) on *Mr. Houde's* Amt., 1357; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1526.
Election Act Amt. *B.* 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2° and *Mr. Arkell's* Amt. for "hoist," 929. Supreme Ct. Act Repeal *B.* 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2°, 1382.
Memorial, Free Trade Association, Eng., on *Q. of Ord.*, 1453.
Insolvency Laws Repeal *B.* 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on *M.* for 2° and *Mr. Béchard's* Amt., 1619.
Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights and Measures) 1719.
- Ottawa Agricult. Ins. Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 48** (*Mr. Rochester*).
1°, 338; *B.* withdn., 1453.
- Ottawa and Montreal Mails*.
Twice daily, Ques. (*Mr. Christie*) 826.
- Ottawa Drill Shed*. See "Militia."
- Ottawa Exhibition*. See "Ontario."
- Ottawa, Public Buildings*.
Western Block Extension, *M.* for Ret. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 920.
Supply,—discussion in, 1661, 1836, 1861.
- Ottawa R. Bridge* (*Mr. Holton's B.*)
See "*Q.M.O. & O. Ry.*"
- Ottawa River, use of Dray-nets*.
Intention of forbidding, Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 74.
- OUMET, Mr.**
Debates, Reporting, on *M.* to ratify Cont., 97-8.
Quebec Constitutional Question: on *M.* for Res. (*Previous Ques. m.*) 282; carried (*Y.* 136, *N.* 51) 407; on *Q. of Ord.* as to affirmation vote, 408; on *Premier's* statement of *H. E.'s* action (*Remarks*) 981; on 3° of *Supply B.*, 2025, 2032-3.
Dual Representn. Abolition Act Repeal (*B.* 62, 1°) 649.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 986; Res. 11, on 2° (Books, &c.) 1344.
Penitentiaries Act Amt. *B.* 51 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1299.
Insolvency Laws Repeal *B.* 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on *M.* for 2°, 1576.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. *B.* 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1593.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Pembina Branch C. P. R. Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. No. 60 (*Mr. Tupper*).

1^o, 611; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3^o, 1702. (42 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

Canadian Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. No. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*).

Res. m., 1886 (Res., 1895); Resumed Debate, 1944; H. in Com. of W., 1960; Res. reported, 1^o and 2^o, 1965; conc. in Res. 1 m., 1965; Amt., to re-com. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1970; neg. (*Y.* 37, *N.* 115) 1978. On Res. 12, Amt., route (*Mr. Mackenzie*) neg., same div., 1979. Res. 13 and 14 agreed to, on a div., 1979. B. 1^o, 2^o and 3^o, 1980. (42 *Vic.*, c. 14.)

Expenditure on, to 1st Jan., 1879.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 47.

Route of.

Ms. for Rets., &c., (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 50; (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 57.

Pembina Branch, Conveyance on.

Arrangements, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 74.

Esquimalt & Nanaimo Line.

M. for Reps. of Surveys (*Mr. Dewdney*) 87. Rails, removal to Frazer River, Ret. refd. to P. A. Com. (*Mr. Bunster*) 837.

Engineers' Report.

Publication of, Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 222.

Pembina and other Branches.

Expenditure on, M. for Rets. (*Mr. Haggart*) 235.

British Columbia, Special Tariff for.

Ad interim, Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 491.

Section "B," Contract for.

Signature, Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 547.

Sections "A" and "B," Tenders and Contracts.

Submitted (*Mr. Tupper*) 611.

Tenders, all, and Engineers' Reports.

Ques and Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 824, 943.

Statement (*Mr. Tupper*) Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie and others*) 1080.

Reserve Lands in B.C.

Rights of settlers, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 827.

Prince Arthur's Landing.

Propd. Ry. connection, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Plumb*) 831.

Harbour, Lands and Buildings, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Plumb*) 834.

Vessel clearances, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Plumb*) 835.

Kaministiquia, the

Dredging and Harbour capabilities, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Plumb*) 831.

Vessel clearances, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Plumb*) 835.

Route, West of Selkirk.

Reports upon, Ques. (*Mr. Macdougall*) 1551.

Supply,—discussion in: Can. Central Extension, subsidized, 1645; Georg. Bay Br., 1648; B. C., expenditure, carried on div., 1992; Surveys, 1649; Line W. of Red R., 1749; Wallace's claim, 1876, 1883, carried (*Y.* 114, *N.* 37) 1884.

Route, in Manitoba.

Remarks upon (*Messrs. Smith and Ryan*) 2035-6.

Paisley, N. Bruce, Mail Service.

Extension to, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 223.

Palace Cars (*Mr. Bergeron's B.*) See "Railway."*Paris Exposition, Canadian expenses.*

Names of Staff, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 658.

Paris Exposition, Medals.

For N. S. exhibitors, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 490.

Parliament, 4th, Session 1st, 1879, 42 Victoria.

Meeting, 1; Opening, 4; Prorogation, 2048. Commons. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

See also "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Parliament (Bs. respecting). See "Dual Representation," "Elections," and "Independence of Parliament."*Parliament, time of meeting.*

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 651.

PATERSON, Mr. (South Brant).

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 193. Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Ord.*) 597-9.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 804. Personal, on Mr. Rykert's statements, 820. Res. 2, (Drawbacks) on 2^o, 1329. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349; (Wheat flour) 1361; (Carriages, &c.) 1419; (Cheese) 1423; (Coal) 1434; (Copper rivets, &c.) 1437; (Earthenware) 1442; (Pig iron) 1449; (Screws, iron) 1466; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o—(Wool) 1522.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on 2^o, 1622.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

PATTERSON, Mr. (Essex).

Civil Service Examinations (*M. for Ret.*) 113. *Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 642.

Ont. Maritime Ct., working of (*M. for Ret.*) 663.

Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on 2^o, 1587.

Patteson, Mr., Postmaster, Toronto.

Salary of, Ques. (*Mr. Hay*) 111; Appointment of, M. for O.C. and Cor., 130.

Peck, Thomas G., Nanaimo.

Customs officer, salary, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Bunster*) 667.

Pembina Branch Ry. See "PACIFIC RAILWAY."**Penitentiaries Act, 1875, Amt. B. No. 51** (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1^o, 409; 2^o, 1298; Com. of W. and reported*, 1533. (42 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

Penitentiaries, Questions respecting.

Supply,—discussion in, 1536, 1540, 1832.

Penny and Halfpenny Coins.

Withdrawal of, Ques. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 223.

Pensions.—See "Militia" and "SUPPLY."

PERREAULT, Mr.

Introduced, 73.

St. Simon, Wharf for (*Ques.*) 490.Petite Rivière, Breakwater for (*Ques.*) 490.Bay St. Paul, wharf, completion, (*Ques.*) 490.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 585.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1637.*Petite Rivière, Breakwater.*Construction, *Ques.* (*Mr. Perreault*) 490.**Petroleum, Inspection and Storage of, B. No. 104** (*Mr. Baby*).Res. in Com. of W., 1696; reported, and B. 1^o, 1697; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o, 1805. (42 *Vic.*, c. 18.)**Petroleum, Inspection and Storage of, Act Amt. B. No. 117** (*Mr. Baby*).1^o, 2^o and 3^o, 1980. (42 *Vic.*, c. 19.)*Philadelphia Exhibition.* See "Centennial."*Piché, Mr., (Clerk Asst.), retirement of.*Report (*Mr. Speaker*) 5; discussion on, M. for Pap., 29; gratuity, discussion in *Supply*, 1873.**PICKARD, Mr.***Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat Flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1414.*Pictou & Truro Ry. (Mr. Tupper's B.)* See "Truro."**Pictou Harbour Act Amt. B. No. 90** (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*).Res. in Com. of W., amd*, 1503; 1^o*, 1503; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1669, (42 *Vic.*, c. 29.)**Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 91** (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*).Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3^o*, 1702. (42 *Vic.*, c. 25.)*Pilots' Fund, Control of.*M. for Pilots' Pet. (*Mr. Valin*) 675.*Plague, Precautions against.*Enforcement, M. for Address (*Mr. Charlton*) 55.*Pleuro-pneumonia (Mr. Pope's B.)* See "Contagious Diseases."**PLUMB, Mr.**

Introduced, 618.

Mitchell & Co., supplies by, &c., on M. for Rets., 659.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 734; on Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1141; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1367; (Furniture) 1443-4-5; (Fig Iron) 1448; (Screws, iron) 1466; (Tobacco) 1509. B. No. 93, on 2^o, 1826.Prince Arthur's Landing, Pacific, Ry. Connection (*M. for Pap.*) 831.Kaministiquia Harbour, Terminus (*M. for Pap.*) 831, 833-4.Prince Arthur's Landing, Harbour, Buildings, &c., (*M. for Pap.*) 834.**PLUMB, Mr.—Con.**Prince Arthur's Landing, Vessels' clearances (*M. for Pap.*) 835.Kaministiquia Harbour, Vessels' clearances (*M. for Ret.*) 835.Ventilation of Chamber (*M. for Com.*) 858; (*withdn.*) 859.Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (*Mr. Killam*) on M. into Com., 921.Election Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 929.Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1247.Usury Prohibition B. 35 (*Mr. Méthot*) on 2^o, 1584.Canada & Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on 2^o, 1586.*Supply*—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans) 1629-30; Militia (Drill Instruction) 1634; Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1652-4; Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1670. Conc.: (*Mr. Piché's gratuity*) 1873-4.*Glendon, purchase of (M. for Pap.)* 1757.Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (*Mr. Tupper*) Res. on Conc., 1997.Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Senate Amts., 2037.*Point Clair and Ste. Geneviève Mails.*Contract, cancellation, *Ques.* (*Mr. Huntington*) 489.*Polette, Judge, Three Rivers.*Pet. for dismissal of; reception m. (*Mr. Méthot*); ruled out of order (*Mr. Speaker*) 1755.*Police, Canada (Mr. McDonald's B.)* See "Canada Police."*Police, N. W. (Sir John A. Macdonald's B.)* See "Mounted Police."*Pool-Selling (Mr. Robertson's B.)* See "Betting."**POPE, Mr. (Compton).**

Plague, precautions, on M. for Address, 55, 57.

Agriculture Dept., Report (*Presented*) 71.*Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor.*, 162.Contagious Diseases, Animals, Prevention (B. 37, 1^o*) 221; order for 2^o dischgd. (*B. withdn.*) 562; (*B. 55, Res. in Com. of W. and 1^o*) 506-7; re-com. (*Amt.*) 1293.

Moore, S. J., claims for losses, on M. for Pap., 241.

Paris Exhibition, delay of medals (*Ans., by Mr. Tupper*) 490.Grosse Isle Sheds, rebuilding (*Ans., by Mr. Tupper*) 547.*Courrier du Canada, on Mr. Huntington's statement*, 616.Grosse Isle, settlement of (*Ans.*) 651.Census & Statistics (B. 67, *Com. of W. and 1^o*) 742; in Com. of W., 1233-4-5.*Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (*Wool*) 1523.*Supply*—Estimates: Immigration, 1544-5; Quarantine (Cattle) 1548-9; Immigration (Mennonites) 1549.

POPE, Mr. (Queen's, P. E. I.).

- Marine & Fisheries Report (*Presented*) 41.
 Race Rocks, B. C., Fog Bell (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 67.
 Isle Blanche, floating light (*Ans.*) 71.
 Mill-waste in navigable streams (*Ans.*) 74.
 Ottawa R., drag-nets, prohibition (*Ans.*) 74.
 Bic Seigniori, fishing rights (*Ans.*) 111.
 Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141, 149, 152-3.
 Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 229.
 Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 243, 251.
 Shelburne, Fog whistle for (*Ans.*; by *Mr. Tupper*) 489.
 Fishery Award, N. S. claims (*Ans.*, by *Mr. Tilley*) 491.
 Miramichi Marine Hospital, State of, on M. for Pap., 498.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 590-1.
 Jolicoeur and Hurst, Grosse Isle, dismissal (*Ans.*) 563.
 Salmon Hatchery for B. C. (*Ans.*) 652.
 Fishery Award, Maritime Prov. claims, on M. for Cor., 659.
 Mitchell & Co., supplies by, &c., on M. for Pap., 660-2.
 Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 668-9.
 Riv. du Loup Pier, light for (*Ans.*) 826.
 Barnaby R., N. B., salmon fry for (*Ans.*) 826.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1163-4.
 St. John R., fish-breeding estab. for (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Tonnage Dues (*B. 80, Res. in Com. of W. and 1°*) 1287.
 Trade Marks (*B. 82, Res. in Com. of W.*) 1292.
 Cape Beale, B. C., light-keeper, appointment of, on M. for Cor., 1405.
 Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.
 Montreal Harbr. Commrs. Acts Amt. (*B. 88, Res. in Com.*) 1501.
 North Sydney Harbour (*B. 89, Res. in Com.*) 1502-3.
 Pictou Harbour (*B. 90, Res. in Com., Amt.*) 1503.
 Pilotage Act Amt. (*B. 91. Res. in Com.*) 1503.
 Seamen's Act Amt. (*B. 92, Res. in Com.*) 1503.
 Supply—Estimates: Ocean & River Service (Dom. Steamers) 1669, 1672; (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton and Gaspé) 1673-4; Lighthouses, &c. (Construction) 1675-6; Fisheries (Salaries, overseers) 1676; (Breeding) 1678.
 Traverse, Navigation improvement (*Ans.*) 1755.
 Glendon, purchase of, on M. for Pap., 1759-60.
 Masters and Mates' Certs. Act Extension (*B. 112, Res. in Com. and 1° and 2°*) 1799-80.

Port Elgin, Harbour Improvement.

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 1551.

Port Elgin, Mail Service.

Extension to, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 223.

Port Hood, Harbour Improvement.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. MacDonnell*) 490.

Port Huron, reporting of Vessels at.

On entering L. Michigan, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Kilvert*) 663.

Port Stanley Harbour.

Revenue and expenditure, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Casey*) 655.

"Post," Chignecto, Statement in.

Of expenses, correction (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 1754.

Postmasters, pay of.

Intention to increase, Ques. (*Mr. Drew*) 112; P.M.G.'s Rep. referred to P. A. Com., 827.

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 39 (Mr. Langevin)

1°, 222; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1249. (42 Vic., c. 20).

Post Office Department, changes in.

Messrs. LeSueur and Forsyth, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington*) 236.

Post Office Department, charge against.

Private letter on file, improper use of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Keeler*) 495; M. postpd., 496; M. renewed, 547; agreed to, 549.

Post Office, Expenditure.

Supply,—discussion in, 1861.

Post Office Regulations.

Letters, uncalled for, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 75.

Lord's Day Observance, Res. (*Mr. Christie*) 75; Amt. (*Mr. Langevin*) 79; agreed to, 84.

Letters, registered, Ques. (*Mr. Little*) 112.

Postmasters' salaries, scale of, Ques. (*Mr. Drew*) 112.

Newspaper postage, abolition of, Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 547.

Prescott Controverted Election.

Judge's Report, 107.

Presqu'Isle Bay, Channel into.

Dredging, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 904.

Presqu'Isle, Government Lands.

Surveys and propd. sales, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 829.

Trespassers, prosecutions of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 829.

Presqu'Isle, Lighthouse.

Construction of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 919.

Presqu'Isle, Lighthouse keeper.

Simpson, dismissal of, &c., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 663.

Prevention of Crime Act (Mr. McDonald's B.) See "Crime."**Prince Arthur's Landing.** See "PACIFIC RY."**Prince Edward and Brighton Mail route.**

Reason of change, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 547.

Prince Edward Island, Civil Service.

Dismissals, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Muttart*) 838.

Prince Edward Island, Claims of.

Fishery Award, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 74; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Yeo*) 241, M. withdn., 251; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658; Ques. (*Mr. Bain, for Mr. Yeo*) 1756; Remarks, in Supply (*Mr. Muttart*) 1838.

Prince Edward Island, County Court Judges, salaries for, B. No. 110 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

Res. in Com. of W., 1793; reported and B. 1°, 1795; 2°, 1795; 3°, 1806. (42 *Vic.*, c. 4.)

Prince Edward Island Ferry.

Georgetown to Pictou, Ques. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's*) 1756.

Prince Edward Island, Mail Contract to.

M. for Pap. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's*) 137.

Prince Edward Island Ry.

Branch to Cape Traverse, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 1550.

Princess Alice, Death of.

Mess. from Sen., 48; Address concurred in, 59; Mess., H. M.'s reply, 1397.

Printing Committee.

Appointment (*Mr. Stephenson*) 59.

Privilege, Ques. of. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."**Procedure, Ques. of.** See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."**Promissory Notes** (*Mr. Buby's B.*) See "Bills of Exchange."**Promotions.** See "Civil Service" and "HOUSE" for general questions; and the names or places referred to for special cases.**PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.**

Communication from H. E., 2048.

H. E.'s Speech, 2048.

Protest of Bills (*Mr. Doull's B.*) See "Bills of Exchange."**Provincial Legislatures** (*Mr. Ouimet's B.*) See "Dual Representation."**Public Accounts.**

Referred to Com. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 70.

Public Buildings. See "SUPPLY."**Public Lands** (*Bs. respecting*). See "Dominion" and "Ordinance"; see also (*for Mr. Mills's Real Property B.*) "N. W. Territories."**Public Service** (*Mr. Casey's B.*) See "Civil Service."**Public Works, 1873-78.**

M. for Ret. of Tenders, &c. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 125.

Public Works, Arbitrators' Awards.

Appeals from, legislation, Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Norihd.*) 66.

Public Works Dept., Division of, &c., B. No. 66 (*Mr. Tupper*).

Res. in Com. of W., agreed to *, 741; 1°, 741; 2°, 1241; Com. of W., 1241; reported, 1246; 3°, 1293, (42 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

Public Works, Railways, Canals, &c.

Expenditure, 1873-79, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bergin*) 236. See also "SUPPLY."

Purdy, Capt., Steamer "Newfield."

Dismissal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 141; adjd. debate, 157; carried, 164.

Quarantine Precautions.

Against Plague, M. for Address (*Mr. Charlton*) 55; M. withdn., 57.

Quartz Mining Machinery, B.C.

Securities for duty on, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Thompson, Cariboo*) 655.

Quebec and Grosse Isle Transport.

Contract, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 67.

Quebec, Assignees. See "Assignees."**Quebec Building Societies Liquidation B. No. 113** (*Mr. Desjardins*).

1° and 2°, 1800; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1865, (42 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

Quebec, City, Walls.

Improvement of, Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 60; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Vallée*) 67.

Quebec Fire Ass. Co. Stock, reduction, B. No. 14 (*Mr. Langevin*).

1°, 88; 2°, 111; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 798. (42 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

Quebec Geographical Society Incorp. B. No. 65 (*Mr. Fortin*).

1°, 740; 2°, 825; 3°, 1141. (42 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

Quebec Harbour Works.

Tenders, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 188.

Supply,—discussion in, 1661.

Quebec, Judges' Salaries.

Increase of, Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 562.

Quebec, Military Properties.

Transfer from Govt., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Strange*) 664.

Q. M. O. & O. Ry. Bridge over Ottawa River B. No. 45 (*Mr. Holton*).

1°, 338; 3°, 1141. (42 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

Quebec, Province, Constitutional Question.

M. for Pap. respecting (*Mr. Mousseau*) 49.

Ques. as to communication with Lt.-Gov. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 294.

Res. condemning Lt.-Gov.'s action, M. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 251, 270; previous Ques. m. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 282; resumed Debate, 294, 312, 339; carried (*Y.* 136, *N.* 51) 407; main Ques. carried on same division, 409.

Statement, H. E.'s action, case referred to Home Govt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 944.

Remarks thereon (*Mr. Ouimet and others*) 981.

Ques. and Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie and others*) 1026.

Contradiction of *Globe* report (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1100.

Res. condemning reference of case to England (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1762; M. postpd., 1763.

Remarks on conduct of Ministers (*Mr. Holton*) 1830.

- Quebec Constitutional Question—Con.*
Debate, on conc. in Res. W. & M. (*Mr. Mackenzie and others*) 2001; on 3^o of Supply Bill, 2011.
- Quebec, Province, Judges' salaries.*
Increase of, Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 562.
- Quebec, Public Works in.*
Supply,—discussion in: Buildings, 1662; Harbours, &c., 1661-6.
- Quebec, Weights (Mr. Casgrain's B.)*
See "French Weight."
- Queen's, N.B., Election Protest.*
Personal explanations, continuing those in Tariff Debate, 1451-3 (*Mr. King and others*) 1454-6.
- Race Rocks, B.C.*
Fog-horn or bell for, Ques. (*Mr. Dewdney*) 67.
- Rails, British Columbia.*
Removal to Frazer R., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunster*) 27.
- Rails, Iron, old, disposal of.*
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 837.
- Rails, Steel, removal of.*
Nanaimo to Frazer R., Ret. referred to P. A. Com. (*Mr. Bunster*) 837.
- Railway Act, 1868, Amt. respecting Bridges, B. No. 59** (*Mr. Tupper*).
1^o, 611; order for 2^o dischgd. and B. withdn., 1587.
- Railway Acts Consolid. B. No. 98** (*Mr. Tupper*).
1^o*, 1550; 2^o, 1702; Com. of W., 1705, 1711; reported, 1715; 3^o on a div., 1716. (42 *Vic.*, c. 9).
- Railway Palace and Sleeping Cars B. No. 96** (*Mr. Bergeron*).
1^o*, 1533.
- Railway Reserve Lands, B.C.*
Rights of settlers, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 827.
- Railways, Accidents, and Employés on.*
M. for Rets., 1878 (*Mr. Fleming*) 129.
- Railways, Expenditure on, 1873-79.*
Details of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bergin*) 236.
- Railways, in Dominion.*
Loans to, before Confederation, M. for Pet. (*Mr. Vallée*) 63.
- Railways, Minister of (Mr. Tupper's B.)*
See "Public Works."
- Railways, the various.* See under their names.
- Rebate of Duties.*
1874-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jones*) 65.
On Tin, B.C., Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 73.
On goods exported, 1877-8, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 1763.
- Receiver-General, Office of (Mr. Tupper's B.)* See "Public Works."
- Reciprocity and Free Trade Association, Eng.*
Memorial from, Ques. of its reception (*Mr. Speaker*) 1412; ruled, reception irregular, 1453.
- Red River, Lands on.*
Reservation of, M. for O.C. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 232.
- Red River Rebellion, R. McKenzie.*
Property destroyed, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.
- Red River Road, J. L. Audy's claim.*
In Com. of Supply,—carried on div., 1885.
- Red River, Timber Leases.*
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 189.
- Reformatory, Female, Ont. (Mr. McDonald's B.)* See "Ontario."
- Refunds, Inland Revenue.*
1873-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 665; 1867-73, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Trow*) 920.
- Registered Letters, Regulations.*
Intention to alter, Ques. (*Mr. Little*) 112.
- Registration of American Vessels.*
In Canada, M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*) 180.
- Removals.* See "Civil Service" and "House" for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.
- Reporting of Debates, Official.* See "Debates."
- Representation, Dual (Mr. Ouimet's B.)*
See "Dual Reprn."
- Revenue, Receipts.*
Recent, Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54, 119; on Malt, Liquor, Tobacco (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.
- Richard, Mr., Brandy Pots.*
Lighthouse Keeper, resignation of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 844.
- RICHEY, Mr.**
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 155.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 228.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 582.
tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1131.
Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton & Gaspé) 1674.
- Rideau Canal, Damages caused by.*
Claims, 1872-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McRory*) 838.
- Riel, Mr. Louis.*
Pardon, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 42, 66.
- Rimouski, Carriage of Electors.*
On Intercol Ry., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 84.
- Rimouski, Harbour of Refuge.*
M. for all Pap. respecting (*Mr. Landry*) 653.
- Rimouski, Intercol. Ry. Employés.*
Names, pay, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 107.

- Rimouski, Statute Labour in.*
Remittance, during elections, M. for Pap. (Mr. Landry) 67.
- "*Rimouski*," Steamer, Capt. Lavoie.
Removal, Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 563; M. for Orders, 920; Resumed debate, 1581; M. agreed to, 1582.
- Rimouski, Wharf Improvements.*
Intention to make, Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 112; M. for Engr.'s Rep., 125.
- Rimouski, Wood Contracts in.*
For I. C. R., M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry) 658.
- Rimouski, Works at Matane and R. Blanche.*
During Election, M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry) 113; Amt. (Mr. Fiset) 114.
- RINFRET, Mr.**
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 360.
Leclerc, Victor, Mail Contract, removal (Ques.) 1250.
- Rivers, Act against throwing Mill-waste.*
Intentions of repealing, Ques. (Mr. Mongenais) 74.
- Rivière à la Graisse.*
Survey, intention, Ques. (Mr. Mongenais) 74.
- Rivière du Loup Branch, G. T. R.*
M. for Cor. with G. T. R. Co., (Mr. Fiset) 47; Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 73.
(Mr. Tupper's B.) See "INTERCOL. RAILWAY."
- Rivière du Loup Pier.*
Work, &c., 1878, M. for Ret. (Mr. Grandbois) 84.
- Rivière du Loup Wharf.*
Light for, Ques. (Mr. Grandbois) 826.
- Roads, Construction Companies.*
Bill, M. for Cor. (Mr. Mousseau) 42.
- ROBERTSON, Mr. (Hamilton).**
Canada Life Ass. Co. Act Amt. (B 7, 1^o) 71; (2^o) 108.
Burlington Bay Canal Piers, repair (Ques.) 74.
Hamilton, Public Buildings, purchase (Ques.) 74.
P. O. Regns., returning letters (Ques.) 75.
Weights & Measures Act (M. for O. C.s) 88. ●
Hamilton, appointments in, (M. for Ret.) 112.
Sarah E. Bryant, Amer. tug, seizure (M. for Ret.) 119, 120.
Emigrants, Hamilton, aid to (M. for Ret.) 124.
Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O. C., 133.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 197.
Pool-selling Act Amt., (B. 38, 1^o) 222; (M. into Com. of W.) 845-6.
Manitoba, settlement of, arrangements (M. for O. C., &c.) 496.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 556.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 618, 632. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Screws, iron) 1460-1.
Election Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) 927.
Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Bécharé) on M. for 2^o, 1426; in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1773-8.
- ROBERTSON, Mr. (Hamilton)—Con.**
Insolvency Act Amt. B. (M. to introduce) 1885; (m. withdn.) 1886.
Welland Canal Solicitors, payments to (M. for Ret.) 1763.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald) in Com., 1802.
Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1847.
- ROBERTSON, Mr. (Shelburne).**
Shelburne Harbour Light (Ques.) 48.
Jordan Bay Breakwater (M. for Ret.) 54.
Intercol. Ry., Halifax Terminus (Ques.) 66.
C. Sable Id., Customs District (M. for Pap.) 70.
Halifax as Winter Port (M. for Cor.) 70.
Intercol. Ry., Receipts and expenses (M. for Ret.) 124; Freight on, 124.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 227.
Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 242.
Shelburne, Fog-whistle for (Ques.) 489.
Govt. Rys., Coal shipments (Ques.) 489; and sales to officials (Ms for Paps.) 654.
Paris Exhibition, Medals for N. S. contributors (Ques.) 490.
Fishery Award, N. S. claims (Ques.) 490.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 580.
Fishery Award, appropriation (M. for Cor.) 658.
Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 668.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 766; Res. 11, on 2^o and Mr. Houde's Amt. (Amt. m.) Cornmeal free, 1354.
Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 922.
Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.
Supply—Estimates: Lighthouses, &c. (Maintenance) 1675; (Construction) 1675; Fisheries (Overseers, &c) 1676; (Breeding) 1679.
Ry. Acts Consolid., B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1714.
- Robertson, Wm., Dorchester Penitentiary.*
Dismissal, M. for Pap. (Sir A. J. Smith) 492.
- ROBINSON, Mr.**
Toronto, Civil Serv. appts, 1873-78 (M. for Ret.) 47.
Private Bills, time, extension (moved) 71, 126, 221, 562.
Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1^o, 72.
War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 665.
Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 1^o, 739; on 2^o, 1393.
Tariff—W. & M. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Coal) 1434-5; (Pig iron) 1450.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, etc., Ont.) 1664.
- ROBITAILLE, Mr.**
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 227.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 572.
Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 670.

ROBITAILLE, Mr.—Con.

L'Assomption R., deepening (*M. for Cor., for Mr. Hurteau*) 671.
Metapedia, disposal of Ry. buildings (*M. for Ret.*) 828.

Rocher Bay, Pier, erection.

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Rogers*) 546.

ROCHESTER, Mr.

Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on M. for Ret., 62.
U. S. Canals, navigation of (*M. for Cor., for Mr. Currier*) 185.
Ottawa Agricult. Ins. Co. Act Amt. (*B.* 48, 1^o) 338; (*B. withdn.*) 1453.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1104; Res. 11, on 2^o—(India-rubber goods) 1446; (Shovels, tools, &c.) 1481-2.
Supply—Estimates: Immigration, 1544.

ROGERS, Mr.

Albert Ry., postal car for (*Ques.*) 489.
Rocher Bay, pier, erection of (*Ques.*) 546.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1111.

Rondeau, Harbour of Refuge.

Improvements, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 675.

Ross, Mr. (Dundas).

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 211.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o: Personal (*Mr. Rykert*) 819. On Ques., 896.
Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1621.
Supply—Estimates: Public Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1654; Collection of Revenues (Weights and Meas.) 1724.
Conc.: (Post-office registration system) 1864.

ROSS, Mr. (West Middlesex).

Debates, official reporting (*M. for Tenders*) 27; on M. to ratify cont., 89.
Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 82.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 210.
Civil Service superannuations, 1873-78 (*M. for Ret.*) 496.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 631; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Agricul. Implem'ts.) 1338; (Books, &c.) 1341; (Book-binders' materials) 1345; (Furniture) 1444; (Printing presses) 1475.
Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 932; personal explanation, 938.
Supply—Estimates: Legislation (Commons, Deputy Clk.) 1541; (Sess. Clks., &c.) 1543; Militia (Drill Instruction) 1638; (Ammunition and Stores) 1642; Collection of Revenue (Customs) 1693.
Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Legislation (Report of Debates) 1832.
Conc.: (Post-office—electric pen circulars) 1865; (Library catalogue) 1875-6.

ROULEAU, Mr.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 552; on Q. of Ord., 553.

Royal Instructions. See "Governor-General."

Roy, Vidal, St. Fabien.

Postmaster, removal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 1398.

RYAN, Mr. (Marquette).

Manitoba, Colonisation Roads (*Ques.*) 167.
Manitoba Land Patents (*M. for Ret.*) 185.
Mounted Police, Conts. for Supplies (*M. for Ret.*) 497.
Supply—Estimates: Indians (N.W.) 1690.
Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (*Mr. Tilley*) on Res., 1785; on 2^o, 1786.
Indian Act Amt. B. 94 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Senate Am'ts., 2004.
Pacific Ry. Route in Manitoba, on Mr. Smith's Remarks, 2035.

RYAN, Mr. (Montreal Centre).

Gazette Co. Incorporation (*B.* 23, 1^o) 126.
Average adjusters, appointment of (*Ques.*) 491.
Carriers' responsibilities, legislation on (*Ques.*) 491.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 558.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1636-7; Geological Survey, 1682; Collection of Revenue (Customs) 1691-3.
Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1987.

RYKERT, Mr.

Smith (Welland Canal) dismissal (*M. for Ret.*) 46.
McMahon (Welland Canal) conduct of (*M. for Ret.*) 60.
Ft. Frances Lock, expenses (*M. for Ret.*) 70.
Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. (*B.* 9, 1^o); 71, 72; (*withdn.*) 1213.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 207-8.
Seamen's Act, 1873, extension to Inland Waters (*B.* 33, 1^o) 221.
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 317.
Maritime Ct., Ont., working of (*M. for Ret.*) 503; (*M. withdn.*) 505.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 587.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 782. On Mr. Paterson's speech, personal, 808-18-20.
Controvd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2^o, 847.
Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o and Q. of Proceed., 1381; (*Q. of Ord.*) 1390.
Independence of Parlt. Act Amt. (*B.* 86, 1^o) 1453.
Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenues (Pub. Works, Maintenance, Canals) 1727-8.
Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Am'ts., 1775.
Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1987.

Ryland, Mr., Claim of.

M. for Pap. (*Mr. Cournot*) postpd., 550; agreed to, 652.

RYMAL, Mr.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 202.
Tariff—W. & M. Res. on 2°—personal (Mr. Rykert) 808-19; Res. 11, on 2° (Corn) 1351.

Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1248.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res. in Com., 1965.

Sabbath Observance in Public Depts.

Res. (Mr. Christie) 75; Amt. (Mr. Langevin) 79; agreed to, 84.

Sarvenny Indians.

Vaccination of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Oimon) 241.

Salaries. See "Civil Service," "HOUSE," &c., for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.

Salmon Fishery. See "Fisheries."**"Sarah E. Bryant," Wrecking Tug.**

American, seizure of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) 119; Resumed debate, 680; M. agreed to, 684.

Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 6 (Mr. Schultz).

1°, 71; 2°, 107; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1706. (42 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

Saugeen River, Lighthouse for.

M. for Cor. respecting (Mr. Gillies) 836.

SCHULTZ, Mr.

Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co. (B. G. 1°) 71; on 2°, 108.

Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1°, 71, 73.

Mounted Police B. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. of W., 126.

Mounted Police, recruiting for (Ques.) 222.

Rifles, importation into N. W. (Ques.) 489.

Mounted Police, supplies (Ques.) 651.

Telegraph, Selkirk & Battleford (M. for Cont., etc.) 830.

Sitting Bull's nationality (Ques.) 1756.

SCRIVER, Mr.

Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 80.

Montreal & Champlain Junction Ry. Act Amt. (B. 20 1°) 107.

Chinese in B. C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1263.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Agricult. Implem'ts.) 1335; (Books, &c.) 1344; (Butter) 1417; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1519.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Major) 1633.

Fees, on remission of, Moira B. Toll B., 1983.

Seamen's Act, 1878, Extension to Inland Waters Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. Rykert).

1°, 221.

Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. Pope, Queen's P.E.I.).

Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 1°, 1504; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669. (42 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

Seining in Gulf of St. Lawrence.

M. for Cor. (Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.) 224.

Select Standing Committees.

M. for, 5; Com. for Lists, 25; Report, 47; Conc., 59; additions, 338, 546.

Selkirk and Battleford Telegraph.

Contracts, &c., M. for Pap. (Mr. Schultz) 830.

Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 9 (Mr. Rykert).

1°, 71; 2°, 109; B. withdn., 1213.

Selkirk Election.

Recount, M. for Cor. (Mr. Cameron, N. Vict.) 1764.

Personal explanation (Mr. Smith, Selkirk) 1805.

Sessional Clerks.

Supply,—discussion in, 1542, 1855.

SHAW, Mr.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2°, 175.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 559-60.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 770.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1712-15.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenues (Pub. Works, Maintenance—Canals) 1726.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1777, 1782.

Sheboygan. See "Duncan City."**Shelburne County, Customs Districts.**

C. Sable Isld., M. for Pets. (Mr. Robertson) 70.

Shelburne, Fog-whistle for.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 489; Ques. in Supply, 1675.

Shelburne Harbour Light, re-building of.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 48; Ques. in Supply, 1675.

Sherwood, Wm. H., Lighthouse-keeper.

Presqu'Isle, appointment of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Keeler) 663.

Shippegan Gully, N. B., Breakwater.

Supply,—discussion in, 1666.

Ship-masters and Mates (Mr. Pope's B.)

See "Masters and Mates."

Shipping of Seamen (Mr. Pope's B.) See "Seamen's Act."**Simpson, George B., Lighthouse-keeper.**

Presqu'Isle, dismissal of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Keeler) 663.

Sitting Bull's Nationality.

Statement in St. Paul Press, Ques. (Mr. Dubuc, for Mr. Schultz) 1756.

SKINNER, Mr.

Kingston, Ordnance Lands, disposal of (Ques.) 1397.

Beet Sugar, Excise duty on (Ques.) 1267.

SKINNER, Mr.—Con.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Agricult. Implem'ts.) 1335; (*Ques.*) Beet sugar, excise duty on, 1397.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1639.

Sleeping Cars (Mr. Bergeron's B.) See "Railway."

Smith, John B., Welland Canal.

Dismissal, M. for Ret. (Mr. Rykert) 46.

SMITH, Mr. (Selkirk).

Supply—Estimates: Indians (N.W.) 1689-90; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1693.

Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr. Tilley) on Res., 1785.

Selkirk Election (*Personal explan.*) 1805.

Pacific Ry. route in Manitoba (*Remarks*) 2035.

SMITH, Sir ALBERT J.

Clark, W. R., payments to (*M. for Pap.*) 113.

Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 123.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 142-4-5, 150, 153.

Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 226.

Robertson, Wm., dismissal of (*M. for Pap.*) 492-5.

Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of, on M. for Pap., 498.

Ella G. McLean, purchase of (*M. for Pap.*) 505.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 557, 573, 575, 591.

Mitchell & Co., Supplies by, &c. (*M. for Res.*) 659-62.

Presqu'Isle, Govt. lands, survey of, and lawsuits, on Ms. for Res., 830.

Presqu'Isle, Lighthouse site, on M. for Pap., 919.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1190; M. to adj. Debate, neg., 1201; Res. amd., on 2°, 1214; on Mr. Tilley's sp., (*comments*) 1228, 1231-2, 1311-15; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2°, 1333; Res. 11, on 2° (Sugars) 1499.

Tonnage Dues B. 80 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com. of W., 1288.

Cape Beale, B.C., Light-keeper, appointment of, on M. for Pap., 1404-5.

N. Sydney Harbour B. 89 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com., 1502.

Seamen's Act Amt. B. 82 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com., 1503.

Truro and Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr. Tupper) on 3°, 1505-7.

B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on Res. in Com., 1534.

Supreme Ct. Acts Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald) on 2°, 1590; on 3°, 1804.

Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1669-70; Lighthouses, &c. (construction) 1676.

Chignecto Post, statement in (*Correction*) 174-5.

Glendon, purchase of, on M. for Pap., 1758, 1760-1.

SMITH, Sir ALBERT J.—Con.

N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1787.

Anticosti, &c., Telegraph Subsidy B. 111 (Mr. Tupper) on 1°, 1796-7.

Ont. Maritime Ct. Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. McDonald) in Com., 1805.

SNOWBALL, Mr.

Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of (*M. for Pap.*) 498.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 561.

Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 670.

Barnaby R., Salmon fry for (*Ques.*) 826.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 945; Res., amd., on 2°, 1315-16; Res. 7 (Appraisers) on 2°, 1332; Res. 11, on 2° (Earthenware) 1443; (Shovels, tools, &c.) 1481; (Stone, building) 1485.

Supply—Estimates: Lighthouses (Salaries, Keepers) 1675; Fisheries (Breeding) 1676.

Société Permanente de Construction d'Iberville B. No. 63 (Mr. Mousseau).

1°, 738; 2°, 825; Com. of W., reported and 3°, 1885. (42 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

Souris, P.E.I.

Breakwater, construction, M. for Tend. (*Mr. Muttart*) 69.

Railway extension, M. for Tend. (*Mr. Muttart*) 69.

Southampton, Mail Service.

Extension to, *Ques.* (Mr. Gillies) 223.

South Grenville Election. See "Grenville, S.R."**Sovereign F. and M. Ass. Co. (Mr. Mackenzie's B.)** See "Isolated Risk Co."**SPEAKER, Mr. (Mr. Blanchet).**

Election as Speaker, 3.

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Rep., 3.

Speech from Throne, Rep., 4.

Librarian's Rep., 5.

Appointment of Clerks Assistant, 5.

Account current of House, presented, 6.

Messages from His Excellency, 41, 42, 88, 251, 1397, 1627, 1628, 1784, 1796, 1840, 1982.

East Elgin Election, Judge's Rep., 41.

North York Election, Judge's Rep., 58.

Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's election, Rep., 73.

Prescott Election, Judge's Rep., 107.

Niagara Election, Judge's Rep., 610.

Mr. Coughlin's vote on Usury B. (*Remarks*) 1754.

Bellechasse Election, Judge's Rep., 1784.

Stranger's misconduct. See under "Rulings."

RULINGS:—

B. John Stewart, Deposit, irregular, 140.

Vote, mover of previous *Ques.*, not necessarily negative, 408.

Policy of Local Govts., irrelevant matter, 553.

Repeated and irrelevant speaking checked, 597-9, 1874.

SPEAKER, Mr. (Mr. Blanchet)—*Con.*

B., N. Sydney Harbour, irregular, 649.

Tariff Debate, precedence of, by Agreement, 650.

Previous Debate, allusions to, and irrelevancy checked, 660-1, 1824.

Right of reply, 662.

Speaking twice on M. allowed, leave having been granted, 833.

Reference to evidence before sitting Com., irregular, 839.

M. having no seconder, further speaking to it checked, 1079.

Privilege, explanation, limits of digression defined, 1251.

B. (Marine Telegraphs) referred to Com. of W., unless mover requests reference to a Sel. Com., 1285, 1572.

Memorial (Free Trade Association, Eng.) rejected, not being in form of a Pet., 1412, 1454.

Latitude in Tariff debate, permitted, 1451.

Amt., *absolute*, to B. for *conditional* Repeal of Insolvent Act, in order, 1610.

B. not printed in French, objection to its progress, taken too late, 1620.

Pet. against Judge Polette, out of order, 1755.

M. for Res. against Govt. action (Mr. Mousseau) allowed to stand, 1762.

Language, unparliamentary (Pacific Ry. Debate) 1938.

On M. to adj. H., latitude in personalities permitted, 1941.

Stranger ordered to withdraw, 1940; on *Proced.*, 1980; Report, Writ not servable, 2044; Remarks, apology offered, 2046.

M., objection to, must be taken when Ques. is put to House, 1984-6.

W. & M., conc. to be taken *to-morrow*, 2003.

See also "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Speaker's Salary, till successor appointed.

Supply,—discussion in, 1541.

Speech from the Throne, 4.

For the Address, &c, see "Address."

Speedy Trials Acts Amt. B. No. 75

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1^o, 1080; 2^o, 1294; Com. of W., reported and 3^o, 1533. (42 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

Spettigue, J. J., London.

Insp. of Weights & Meas., suspension, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macmillan*) 240.

Spirits, manufacture and consumption.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.

Spring Hill Station. See "INTERCOL. Rx."**SPROULE, Mr.**

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 99.

American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 184.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 219. Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 589.

SPROULE, Mr.—*Con.*

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o. 625; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349; (Stone, building) 1483; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1516.

Ministers' Salaries, Members' Indemnities, on M. for Ret., 841.

Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 859.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights & Meas.) 1719.

Standard Weights and Measures.

Cost of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 65.

Stark, E. O., Spring Hill Station.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville*) 918.

Stationery, Members', quality of.

Printing Com. to Report, M. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 1213.

Statutory Holidays (Mr. Domville's L.)

See "Holidays."

STEPHENSON, Mr.

Printing, Joint Com. (*moved*) 59.

Ont. Boundary Arbitration, cost (*M. for Ret.*) 67.

Tug. American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 121.

Paris, Canadian exhibit (*M. for Ret.*) 658.

Green Island Leases (*M. for Pap.*, for *Mr. McCarthy*) 674.

Yarwood, C. St. G., superannuation of (*M. for Pap.*, for *Mr. Bunting*) 675.

Rondeau Harbour, Repairs (*M. for Ret.*) 675.

Mounted Police, expenditure for (*M. for Ret.*) 837.

Centennial Commission, expenses, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 837.

Legal services for Govt., payments, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 838.

Oak contracts for Canals (*M. for Ret.*) 838.

Wrecking and Coasting (*M. for Cor.*, by *Mr. Bunting*) 1405.

Supply—Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Legislation (Report of Debates) 1833.

Stewart, John, Deposit B. (Mr. McCarthy)

Introduced, m., 130; over-ruled and withd., 140.

Stock-broking Regulations B. No. 61

(*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).

1^o, 612; 2^o, 1285.

STRANGE, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 629; Res. 11, on 2^o (Paintings, &c.) 1473.

Military Properties, transfer (*M. for Pap.*) 664.

Election Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on 2^o, 927.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1634.

Stratford, Dynamite explosion.

Remarks (*Mr. Hesson and others*) 1800.

Stratford, Public Buildings.

Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 222.

Sugar, Beet-Root, Excise duty on.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Skinner*) 1397.

Superannuation Act, working of.

M. for Sel. Com. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*)
741.

Superannuations of Officials. See "Civil Service" and "Hous." for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.

SUPPLY.

Resolution, 25.

ESTIMATES:—

Message, 251; referred to Com. of Supply*, 251.

*Charges of Management**, 293; Res. 2° and agreed to*, 409.

*Civil Government**, 1536, 1855.

*Administration of Justice**, 1536.

*Police**, 1536.

Penitentiaries:

Kingston, 1536.

St. Vincent de Paul, 1538.

St. John*, 1540.

Halifax*, 1540.

Manitoba, 1540.

British Columbia, 1540.

Legislation:

Senate—

Salaries*, 1541.

Hansard*, 1541.

Commons—

Salaries, Clerk's Estimate, 1541.

Committees and Sess. Clks., 1542, 1855.

Contingencies*, 1543.

Debates, publishing*, 1543.

Salaries, &c., Sergt. at Arms' Est.*, 1543.

Miscellaneous*, 1513.

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics**, 1543.

Immigration and Quarantine:

General, 1544.

Mennonites, 1549.

Pensions:

J. Bright and Mrs. Antrobus*, 1550.

New Militia Pensions—

Nominal List (Vote 67)*, 1550.

Compensation in lieu of land*, 1550.

Veterans of 1812, 1628.

Militia:

Ordinary—

Salaries, Milt. Branch and Dist. Staff*, 1631.

Salaries, Brigade Majors, 1630.

Allowances for Drill Instru., 1634.

Ammunition, clothing and Milt. stores, 1642.

Armouries and care of arms*, 1642.

Drill and Training, Pay and Expenses, 1642.

Contingencies (Bands, &c.) 1642.

Drill Sheds and Rifle Banges*, 1643.

Extraordinary—

Military properties, care of*, 1643.

Royal Military College*, 1643.

Military Schools and Drill in Colleges, 1643.

"A" and "B" Batteries*, 1643.

Rideau Hill Guard*, 1643.

SUPPLY—Gen.

Special—

Ordnance and improved fire-arms*, 1643.

Public Works and Buildings, chargeable to Capital.

Railways:

Intercolonial—

To deep water, St. John, 1643; on Conc., 1856.

Nut-locks, 1643; on Conc., 1858; carried (*Y. 111, N. 42*) 1860.

Pacific—

Canada Central Extension, 1645.

Georgian Bay Branch, 1648.

Fort William to English R., 1648.

English R. to Eagle R., 1648.

English River to Keewatin*, 1648.

Keewatin to Selkirk*, 1648.

Engine House at Selkirk*, 1648.

Pembina Branch*, 1648.

Station House and Water Supply*, 1648.

British Columbia, 1648; on Conc., agreed to on a division, 1992.

Telegraph lines and roadway*, 1648.

Surveys, 1648.

Canals:

Lachine, 1649.

Cornwall, 1649.

St. Lawrence, 1649.

Welland, 1649.

St. Anne's Lock and Canal*, 1661.

Carillon Lock and Canal*, 1661.

Grenville*, 1661.

Culbute*, 1661.

St. Peter's*, 1661.

Miscellaneous*, 1661.

Public Buildings and grounds, Ottawa, 1661.

Public Works and Buildings, chargeable to Income.

Improvement of Navigable Rivers, 1661.

Public Buildings:

Ontario, 1662; on Conc. (Ottawa Drill Shed) 1861.

Quebec, 1662.

New Brunswick, 1663.

Nova Scotia*, 1664.

N. W. Territories*, 1664.

British Columbia*, 1664.

Public Buildings, generally*, 1664.

Penitentiaries*, 1661.

Rents, Repairs, &c.*, 1664.

Harbours and Breakwaters:

Ontario, 1664.

Quebec, 1666.

New Brunswick, 1666.

Nova Scotia, 1667.

Prince Edward Island*, 1667.

Slides and Booms*, 1667.

Dredging*, 1668.

Miscellaneous (including Telegraphs) 1668.

Ocean and River Service:

Dominion Steamers, 1669.

Mail Subsidies—

Halifax, Yarmouth & St. John, 1673.

Other subsidies*, 1673.

Campbellton, N. B., and Gaspe, 1673.

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Masters and Mates, examination 1675.
 Life boats, &c., 1675.
 Wrecks, investigations*, 1675.
 Shipping, registration*, 1675.
 Montreal Water Police*, 1675.
 Quebec River Police*, 1675.
 Navigable Rivers, obstructions*, 1675.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
 Salaries, &c., of Light-keepers, 1675.
 Maintenance and Repairs, 1675.
 Lighthouses, &c., construction, 1675.
Fisheries:
 Salaries, &c., Fishery Overseers, 1676.
 Fish-breeding, 1676.
*Scientific Institutions—Observatories**, 1630.
*Marine Hosp. & Distressed Seamen**, 1630.
*Steamboat Inspection**, 1630.
*Inspection of Insurance Companies**, 1681.
Geological Survey, 1631.
Indians:
 Ontario and Quebec, 1684.
 Nova Scotia*, 1684.
 New Brunswick*, 1684.
 P. E. Island*, 1684.
 British Columbia, 1681.
 Manitoba and the N. W., 1689 90.
*North-West Mounted Police**, 1690.
Miscellaneous:
*Canada Gazette**, 1690.
 Miscellaneous Printing*, 1630.
 Unforeseen Expenses*, 1630.
 Commutation of Duties*, 1690.
 N. W. Territories, Government*, 1690.
 Kewatin, Government*, 1691.
 Liquor Traffic Act, expenses*, 1691.
Collection of Revenues:
 Customs, 1691.
 Excise*, 1716.
 Culling Timber, 1716.
 Weights & Measures and Gas—
 Salaries, Dep. Insp'rs. W. & M., 1718.
 Salaries, Gas Inspectors*, 1726.
 Rent, Fuel, &c., 1726.
 Inspection of Staples*, 1726.
 Adulteration of Food*, 1726.
 Pub. Works., Maintenance and Repairs—
 Salaries, &c., Canal Officers*, 1726.
 Collection Slide & Boom dues*, 1726.
 Repairs, &c., Canals, 1726.
 " Harbs. & Slides*, 1728.
 Intercol. Ry., 1728; on Conc., 1865.
 P. E. I. Ry., 1728.
 Telegraph lines, B. C., 1728.
 " " P. E. I., 1728.
 Agent, &c., B. C., 1728.
 Post-office*, 1729; on Conc., 1861.
 Dominion Lands*, 1729.
 Minor Revenues*, 1729.
 SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-79:—
 Message, 1793.
 Charges of Management, 1831.
 Civil Government*, 1831.
 Police*, 1831.
Penitentiaries:
 Manitoba, 1832.
 British Columbia*, 1832.
Legislation:
 Witnesses and Reporters, 1878*, 1832.
 Debates, publication, 1878, 1832.

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Library, Catalogue, 1832; on Conc., 1875.
 Gratuity, Mr. Piché*, 1832; on Conc., 1873.
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics**, 1832.
*Immigration and Quarantine**, 1833.
*Pensions**, 1833.
*Militia**, 1833.
Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Capital:
 Railways, 1833.—On conc. (Mr. Wallace's claim) 1876, 1883; carried (Y. 114, N. 37) 1884.—On conc. (Boggs' & Murray's claim) 1884; carried on a div., 1885.
 Canals*, 1835.
 Public Buildings, Ottawa, 1835.
Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Income:
 Public Buildings*, 1836.
 Penitentiaries*, 1836.
 Rents, Repairs, &c., 1836.
 Harbours and Breakwaters—
 Ontario*, 1836.
 Nova Scotia, 1836.
 Improvement of navigable Rivers*, 1836.
 Red River Road*, 1836; on Conc. (Arrears of Wages, D. L. Audy) carried on a div., 1885.
 Arbitrations and Awards*, 1836.
 Slides and Booms*, 1836.
Ocean and River Service, 1836.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
 St. Paul Island, 1837.
Fisheries:
 Salaries, additional overseers, 1837.
 Fish-breeding establishments, 1837.
*Steamboat Inspection**, 1838.
*Indians**, 1838; on Conc., item, houses for farming instructors, withda., 1885.
*N. W. Mounted Police**, 1838.
Miscellaneous:
 Four items*, 1833.
 Testimonial to M. Delfosse, 1838.
 One item*, 1838.
 Trade Mission to France and Spain, 1839.
 Two items*, 1839.
Collection of Revenues:
 Customs, 1839.
 Excise*, 1840.
 Public Works*, 1840.
 Post Office*, 1840.
 Unprovided Items, 1877-78*, 1840.
 SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1879-80:—
 Message, 1840.
Arts, Agriculture & Statistics:
 Ontario Exhibition, 1848.
Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Capital:
 Pacif. Ry., W. of Red R., 1849.
*Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Income**, 1852:
Ocean and River Service:
 Steamer subsidy, Canada and Brazil, 1853.
 Three items*, 1854.
*Fisheries**, 1854.

SUPPLY—*Con.**Indians:*

Ontario and Quebec, 1854.
Manitoba and N. W.*, 1854.

Collection of Revenues:

Customs (Experts, &c.) 1854.
Other services*, 1855.

FURTHER SUPPL. ESTIMATES, 1879-80:—

Intercol. Ry.:

Riv. du Loup Br., purchase, &c.*, 1932;
Conc.*, 2001.

Collection of Revenue:

Intercol. Ry., working R. du Loup Line*,
1982; Conc.*, 2001.

CONCURRENCE, 1856, 1883, 2001.—(See also
the respective items, in Estimates above,
where discussion occurred on Concur-
rence).

Supply B. No. 118 (Mr. Tilley).

Res. in Com. of W. & M., agreed to and re-
ported*, 2001; B. 1° and 2°, 2011; 3°
m., 2011, debate; 3°, 2035. (42 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

Supreme Court Act, Amt.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Cockburn, W.
Northd.) 66.

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou).

1°, 1080; 2°, 1587; Com. of W., 1801;
Amd. and reported, 1803; 3° m., 1803,
postpd., 1804; 3°, 1806; Senate Amts.
propd., 2036; Amt., respecting appeals
(Mr. McDonald) agreed to, 2043. (42
Vic., c. 39.)

Supreme Court Act Repeal B. No. 84 (Mr. Keeler).

1°, 1373; 2° m. for to-morrow, 1875; 3
months' "hoist" m. (Mr. Mackenzie) neg.
(Y. 44, N. 120) 1375; debate on pro-
cedure, 1376-91.

*Supreme Court Judges (Mr. McDonald's Bs. See "B.C." and "N.B.")**Supreme Court, the Judges Taschereau.*

Appointments of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Landry)
505.

Supreme Court, Work and Expense of.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Bolduc) 496.

*Sydney Harbour (Bs. of Messrs. McDonald and Pope.) See "North Sydney."**St. Anaclet, Post-office.*

Location of, Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 904.

St. Anne de Sorel, Piers.

Construction, M. for Pap. (Mr. Massue)
106.

St. Anne's (J. Cartier) Lighthouse Keeper.

Deschamps, discharge of, M. for Pap. (Mr.
Girouard) 675.

St. Anne's Lock.

Widening, intention, Ques. (Mr. Girouard,
Jacques Cartier) 141.

St. Boniface, Emigrant Shed.

Erection of, Ques. (Mr. Dubuc) 111.

St. Donat, Postmaster.

Lévesque, complaint, M. for Pap. (Mr.
Fiset) 70.

St. Fabien, Mail Contract.

Taken from J. Danjou, Ques. (Mr. Fiset)
111; M. for Cor., 232.

St. Fabien, Postmaster.

Roy, removal of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Fiset)
1398.

St. Flavie, Engine-house Supt.

Bourdeau, removal of, M. for Cor. (Mr.
Fiset) 1398; M. withdn., 1398.

St. Francis River, Dredging.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Gill) 74.

St. François Xavier, Breakwater.

Construction, Ques. (Mr. Perreault) 490.

St. Genève and Point Clair Mails.

Contract, cancellation, Ques. (Mr. Hunting-
ton) 489.

St. John, Deep Water extension.

Supply,—discussion in, 1643, 1856.

St. John, Negro Point Breakwater.

Repair, Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 222; Supply,
statement in, 1666.

St. John Penitentiary.

Uses of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Weldon) 239-40.
Warden, investigation, M. for Rep. (Mr.
Domville) 492; for Cor. (Mr. Burpee, St.
John) 667.

St. John Post-office, Clerk in.

Waterley, dismissal, damages, Ques. (Mr.
Domville) 1249.

St. John, Public Buildings at.

Supply,—discussion in, 1663.

St. John River, Bridges across.

Woodstock and Andover, M. for Pap. (Mr.
Connell) 653. Also see "Addenda," Vol. i.

St. John River, Fish-breeding in.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. King) 1250.

St. Johns Infantry Co., Drill of.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Tellier) 505.

St. Joseph's Island, Land Sales.

To 1st July, 1867, M. for Ret. (Mr. Dawson)
1763.

St. Lawrence Canals.

Oak supply for, M. for Cor. (Mr. Stephenson)
839.

Supply,—discussion in, 1649, 1726.

St. Lawrence Harbours, provisioning.

M. for Cont. (Mr. Vatin) 70.

St. Lawrence, Islands in.

M. for Leases in 1878 (Mr. McCarthy) 674.

St. Lawrence, Lighthouses.

Oil supply, M. for Conts., &c. (Mr. Méthot)
836.

St. Lawrence, Surveys (Montmagny, &c.)

M. for Engr's Reps. (Mr. Landry) 62.

St. Nicholas, Postmaster.

Duval, complaint against, Ques. (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.

St. Paul & Pacific Ry. Co., arrangements with.

For conveyance to Manitoba, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 74.

St. Simon Station. See "INTERCOL. RY."*St. Simon, Wharf.*

Construction, Ques. (*Mr. Perreault*) 490.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.

Employés, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 497. Supply,—discussion in, 1536.

TARIFF, THE.

Ques., Tobacco, Canadian, excise duty (*Mr. Mongenais*) 74.

H. resolved into Com. of W. & M., 409.

Speech of Finance Minister, 409; Debate, 430.

Res. agreed to and reported, 475.

Res., 2° m. (*Mr. Tilley*) 507; Resumed Debate, 618, 629; Ques. as to precedence of Debate, 649; Resumed Debate, 688, 705; Ques. as to Newfld. fish (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 743; Resumed Debate, 743, 782, 798. No. of copies of Tariff, complaint (*Mr. Casgrain*) 824. Resumed Debate, 859, 944, 986, 1003, 1028.

Amt., condemning Govt. scheme (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1079; Debate, 1084, 1101, 1123, 1141; M. to adj. Debate (*Sir A. J. Smith*) neg. on a Div., 1201; Amt. neg. (*F. 53, N 36*) 1201.

Ques. on the M. to agree to Res. (*Mr. Tilley*); Amt., H. m. into Com. of W. & M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1201; carried, 1202.

Com. of W. & M., Res. (amended) agreed to, H. resumed and Res. reported, 1202.

Res. (amended) 2° m. (*Mr. Tilley*) 1214; explanation (personal) of vote (*Mr. Doull*) 1250; Resumed Debate, 1300.

Res. 1 (p. 1202) Bottles, packages, &c., 2° and agreed to*, 1324. Lard, packages containing, Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 1510.

Res. 2 (p. 1202) Foreign drawbacks (sugars, &c.) 1324; agreed to, 1329.

Res. 3 (1202) Reciprocal reductions, equal to those of U.S., agreed to*, 1329.

Res. 4 (p. 1203) Tea and Coffee, differential, 1329, agreed to, 1331; renewed discussion, 1332-4.

Res. 5 (p. 1203) Refunds for breakages, &c., agreed to*, 1331.

Res. 6 (p. 1203) Transportation charges, agreed to*, 1331.

Res. 7 (p. 1203) Appraisers, 1331; agreed to, 1332.

Res. 8 (p. 1203) Reduction in values, agreed to*, 1332.

Res. 9 (p. 1203) Reciprocal reductions with France and Spain, agreed to*, 1332.

Res. 10 (p. 1203) Repeal of former Acts, agreed to*, 1332.

Res. 11 (p. 1203) Duties. Debate on items: Acids, 1334; Agricult. Impts., 1334; Ale, etc., bottled, 1339; Animals, living, 1339; Artificial flowers, 1339; Babbit metal,

TARIFF, THE—Con.

1339; Books, etc., 1340; Brit. copyrights, 1344; Books through post, 1345; Blank books, 1345; Bookbinders' materials, 1345; Billiard tables, 1346; Brass, 1346; Bread-stuffs, (Barley) 1346; (Indian corn) 1347; (Wheat) 1352.

Amt., on Item—Wheat 15c. per bushel; to go into Com. of W. for permissive clause, relaxation of duty by O. C. (*Mr. Houde*) 1352; Amt. withdn., 1355, 1359.

Amt., to place wheat on Free List (*Mr. Fiset*) neg. (*F. 61, N. 109*) 1353.

Amt., wheat, coal and pig iron tree (*Mr. Charlton*) neg. (*F. 53, N. 116*) 1354.

Amt., cornmeal free (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (*F. 57, N. 112*) 1354.

Amt., on Item—Wheat flour 50c. per barrel, 1359—to place flour on Free List (*Mr. Vallée*) 1362; Debate resumed, 1412; neg. (*F. 61, N. 121*) 1415.

Ques., Beet-root sugar, Excise duty on (*Mr. Skinner*) 1397.

Remarks, French copies of Tariff (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1405.

Items: Brooms, 1416; Butter, 1416; Candles, parafins, 1417; Carriages, &c., 1417; Cement, 1420; Cheese, 1421; Clocks 1426; Coal, 1426; Copper, 1437; Cotton* (Sheetings, &c.) 1437; (Jeans, &c.) 1439; Earthenware, 1440; Fruits, 1443; Furniture, 1443; Gunpowder, 1446; India rubber, 1446; Pig iron, 1447.

Amt., on Item—Pig iron \$2 per ton—pig iron free, &c. (*Mr. Bourassa*) neg. on a div., 1447; Discussion continued, 1447-50.

Item: Tin plates, 1450.

Personal discussions (*Mr. Donville and others*) 1451; (*Messrs. Anglin and Tilley*) 1304, 1317, 1456.

Items: Iron, manufactures of, 1459; Oil cloth, 1470; Opium, 1470; Organs, 1472; Paintings, &c., 1472; Paper hangings, 1473; Paper, calendered, 1473; Plants, 1474; Plaster of Paris, 1474; Printing presses, 1474; Quinine, 1476; Salt, 1476; Spirits, &c. (Wines) 1478; Steel manufactures (Shovels, tools, &c.) 1481; Stone, building, 1483; Sugars, 1485; Tobacco, manufactured, 1508; Vegetables, 1510; Wool, unmanufactured, free, 1510, agreed to, 1531.

Res. 12 (p. 1210) Free List.—On Item: Steel in ingots, &c., till 1st Jan., 1881, Debate; Res. agreed to, 1531.

Res. 13 (p. 1213) Newfoundland Fish and Animals free, agreed to*, 1531.

Res. 14 (p. 1213) Excise duty on Spirits, 1531, agreed to, 1533.

Res. 15 (p. 1213) Excise duty on Malt, agreed to*, 1533.

Res. 16 (p. 1213) Drawback on Malt Liqueurs, present stock, agreed to*, 1533.

Res. 17 (p. 1213) Excise duty on Tobacco, agreed to*, 1533.

Res. 18 (p. 1213) Tariff to take effect Mch. 15, agreed to*, 1533.

Customs and Excise B. No. 93 (*Mr. Tilley*) 1° 1533; order for 2°, 1806, debate; 3° agreed to on a div., 1830. (*2 Vic., c. 15.*)

TARIFF—Con.

Ques., publication of H. E.'s despatches (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1628, 1669, 1729.
 Message, copy of H. E.'s despatch, 1784.

Taschereau, the Judges.

Appointments of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Landry*) 505.

TASSÉ, Mr.

The Address (*seconded*) 1A.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 962.
 Sir Geo. Cartier, monument to (*Ques.*) 1250.
 Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1670.
Glendon, purchase of, on M. for Pap., 1762.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) in Com., 1801.

Telegraphs, Dominion (*Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.*) See "Dominion Telegraph."

Telegraphs, Marine (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*) See "Marine Telegraph."

Telegraph, Anticosti, &c. (*Mr. Tupper's B.*) See "Anticosti."

Telegraph, U. S. Cable Co. (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*) See "U. S."

Telegraphs, Expenditure for.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1668.

TELLIER, Mr.

Mercier, P. A. and E. H., absence from duty (*M. for Ret.*) 105-6.
 Tobacco, Canadian, seizures, 1874-78 (*M. for Ret.*) 505.
 Militia, No. 1 Co., 21st Batt., Drill of, &c., (*M. for Ret.*) 505.

Temperance Act, 1878, intent of, B. No. 70 (*Mr. McCuaig*).

1°, 904; 2°, 1285; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1575. (42 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

Territories, N. W., Lands (*Mr. Mills's B.*) See "N. W. Territories."

THOMPSON, Mr. (Cariboo).

Lord's Day observance, on Res. for, 80.
 Quartz-mining Machinery, B.C., duty on (*M. for Pap.*) 655-7.
 Election Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2°, 927.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1059.
 Chinese in B. C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1261.
 B. C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (*Mr. McDonald*) on M. into Com. of W., 1290; in Com., 1534.

THOMPSON, Mr. (Haldimand).

Camps of Mily. Instruction (*Ques.*) 112.
 War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 666.
 Welland Canal, supplies for (*M. for Ret.*) 673.
 Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1631; (Drill Instruction) 1636-7, 1641; (Ammunition and Stores) 1642.
 Mr. Coughlin's vote on Usury B. (*Remarks*) 1754.

TILLEY, Mr.

Election of Speaker (*M. seconded*) 2.
 Public Accounts, presented, 26.
 Estimates, Message, 251; referred to Com. of Supply*, 251; Suppl. Est., 1878-9, Mess., 1796; Suppl. Est., 1879-80, Mess., 1840.
 Budget Speech, 409; comments in reply to Mr. Cartwright, 437, 446-8-9; Ques. on Res., 473; Passing *en bloc*, on Q. of Proceed, 474; Res. agreed to and reported, 475.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res. (2° m.), 507-9; Comments on Mr. Charlton's speech, 529; on Mr. Oliver's, 704-10; on Ques., 712-13; on Mr. Cartwright's sp., 732; on Mr. Killam's, 737-8, 1163. Respecting duty on Newfld. fish (*Ans.*) 743. On Mr. Cameron's sp., 745; on Mr. Weldon's, 797; on Mr. Mills's, 892; on Mr. Snowball's, 948; on Mr. Guthrie's, 999, 1006; on Mr. Casgrain's, 1179-80. W. & M. Res., amd. (2° m.) 1214; on Sir A. J. Smith's sp., 1214-16, 1222-6. (*Personal explan.*) 1227, 1232, 1309-10. On Ques., 1300; on Mr. Cartwright's sp., 1323. Res. 1, Packages, lard (*Ans.*) 1510. Res. 2, Drawbacks, on 2°, 1324-5-7. Res. 4, Tea and Coffee, differential duty, 1329-30, 1333. Res. 7, Appraisers, 1331-2. Res. 11, on 2° (Acids) 1334; (Agricult. implemts.) 1334-5; (Ale) 1339; (Animals) 1339; (Artificial flowers) 1339; (Babbit metal) 1339; (Books, &c.) 1340-1-2-4-5; (Book-binders' material) 1345; (Billiard tables) 1346; (Brass) 1346; (Barley) 1346-7; (Corn) 1347-8; (Wheat flour) 1359-80. Respecting Beet-sugar Exciise duty (*Ans.*) 1397. (Brooms, &c.) 1416; (Butter) 1416-17; (Candles, paraffine) 1417; (Carriages, &c.) 1418-20; (Cement) 1420; (Cheese) 1422-3-6; (Clocks) 1426; (Coal) 1426; (Copper rivets, &c.) 1437; (Cotton sheetings, &c.) 1437-8; (Cotton jeans, &c.) 1439; (Earthenware) 1440-41; (Fruits) 1443; (Furniture) 1444-5; (Gunpowder) 1446; (India-rubber goods) 1446; (Tin plates) 1450. (*Personal explanation*) 1456-8. (Screws, iron) 1459-63; (Oil-cloth) 1470; (Opium) 1470; (Organs) 1472; (Paintings, &c.) 1472-3; (Paper, calendered) 1473-4; (Plants) 1474; (Plaster of Paris) 1474; (Printing presses) 1475; (Quinine) 1476; (Salt) 1477-8; (Wines) 1479-80; (Stone, building) 1483; (Sugars) 1486-7-8-9; (Tobacco) 1509; (Vegetables) 1510. Res. 1, Packages containing lard, 1510. Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1510, 1529; (Steel in bars, &c., till 1881) 1531. Res. 14 Exciise duty, Spirits, on 2°, 1532. B. No. 93 (1° m.) 1533; on 2°, 1812; on Mr. Mackenzie's speech, 1816-17; on Mr. Holton's, 1823. H. E.'s despatches (*Ans.*) 1628, 1669. Copy of H. E.'s despatch (*Mess.*) 1784. W. & M. Res. (*General*) in Com., 2001; (*Cons. m.*) 2001.
 Eastn. Extension Ry., N.B. claims (*Ans.*) 547.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 600-4.
 Civil Service B. 8 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2°, 1273.
 Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.

TILLEY, Mr.—Con.

Supply—Estimates: Legislation (Dep. Clk.) 1541; Militia (Pensions) 1630; Ocean Service (Mail Subsidies,—Campbellton and Gaspé) 1674-5.

Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Charges of Management (Seigniorial Tenure Comn.) 1831; Miscellaneous (Trade Mission to France) 1839.

Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c. (Ont. Exhibition) 1848; Collection of Revenue (Customs, Experts) 1854-5.

Usury Prohibition B. 35 (Mr. Méthot) on 2°, 1584.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2°, 1578.

Govt. Life Ins. (*Res., withdn.*) 1669.

Ont. School Fund, payment (*Ans.*) 1756.

Manitoba, Additional Grant (B. 108, *Res. in Com., 1° and 2°*) 1784-6.

Esquimalt Dock (*Res., withdn.*) 1787.

N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on *Res.*, 1792.

Consolidated Bank (B. 114, 1°) 1805.

Fees, remission of, Moira R. Toll B. (*Remarks*) 1983.

Riv. du Loup Br., G. T. R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) on 2°, 2001.

Timber Tolls, Belleville (Mr. McCuaig's B.) See "Belleville."

Tin, Rebate on, B.C.

Intention of Govt., *Ques.* (Mr. McInnes) 73.

Tobacco, Canadian.

Duties, intention, *Ques.* (Mr. Mongenais) 74.
Revenue from, 1873-79, M. for Ret. (Mr. Vallee) 119.

Tobacco, Manufacture, Exportation, &c.
M. for Ret. (Mr. Burpee, St. John) 185.

Tobacco, Seizures, Montreal.

1874-78, M. for Rep. (Mr. Tellier) 505.

Tonnage Dues B. No. 80 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.).

Res. in Com. of W., 1287; and reported and B. 1°, 1288; Com. of W. and reported, and 3°, 1535. (42 *Vic., c. 24.*)

Toronto, Civil Service Appointments.

M. for Ret., 1873-78 (Mr. Robinson) 47.

Toronto Harbour, Dredging.

Supply,—*Ques.* (Mr. Robinson) 1664.

Toronto, Military Properties.

Transfer from Govt., M. for Pap. (Mr. Strange) 664.

Toronto Postmastership.

Mr. Patteson's salary, *Ques.* (Mr. Hay) 111;
Appointment, M. for O. C. and Cor., 130.
Accounts and salary, 1874-78, M. for Pap. (Mr. Macmillan) 1757.

Toronto Savings Bank, Selling Powers, B. No. 26 (Mr. Cameron, North Victoria).

1°, 140; 2°, 825; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1470. (42 *Vic., c. 55.*)

Tracadie Harbour, Dredging of.

Intention of Govt., *Ques.* (Mr. McLeaac) 223.

Tracadie, Lazaretto, support of.

Claim of N. B. Govt., on Mr. Burpee's M. for Cor. (Mr. Anglin) 1401.

Trade Marks and Designs B. No. 82 (Mr. Pope, Compton).

Res. in Com. of W., 1292; and reported and B. 1°, 1293; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1594. (42 *Vic., c. 22.*)

Traverse, Navigation of.

Improvement of, *Ques.* (Mr. Laurier) 1755.

Trent River Navigation Works.

Transfer to Ont. Govt., M. for Pap. (Mr. Keeler) 104.

Address, refd. to Sel. Com. (Mr. Keeler) 904, 1025.

Trials, Speedy (Mr. McDonald's B.) See "Speedy Trials."

Trinity House, Montreal (Mr. Pope's B.)
See "Montreal."

TROW, Mr.

Pacific Ry., Sec. "B," Cont. (*Ques.*) 547.

Newspaper postage, abolition (*Ques.*) 547.

Cardinal, Régis, disml. of, on M. for Pap., 585.

Inland Revenue refunds (M. for Ret.) 920.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1113; *Res.* 11, on 2°—(Books, &c.) 1342; (Corn) 1350.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on *Res.* in Com., 1960.

Trug, Wrecking. See "Sarah E. Bryant."

Truro and Pictou Ry. Transfer Act Amt., B. No. 58 (Mr. Tupper).

1°, 610; 2°, 1238; Com. of W. and reported*, 1241; 3° m., 1504; Amt., to refer back to Com. of W. (Mr. Brecken) 1605; neg. on a div., 1508; 3°, 1508. (42 *Vic., c. 12.*)

Truro and Pictou Ry.

Transfer of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Doull) 1763.

TUPPER, Mr.

Public Works, Report (*presented*) 26.

Pacific Railway Tenders (*Ans.*) 26, 824.

Carillon Dam, completion (*Ans.*) 42; on M. for Ret., 45.

G. T. R., Riv. du Loup Branch, on M. for Cor., 47; (*Ans.*) 73.

Railways and Canals, certain expenditure, on M. for Ret., 47.

Chambly Canal, widening (*Ans.*) 48.

Shelburne Harbour Light (*Ans.*) 48.

Intercol. Ry. Dismissals, on M. for Pap., 57.

" Halifax Terminus (*Ans.*) 66.

" Acts, Amt. (*Ans.*) 66.

Arbitrators' Awards, Appeal (*Ans.*) 66.

Windsor Branch Ry. (*Ans.*) 73.

St. Francis and Yamaska Rts., (*Ans.*) 74.

Burlington Bay Canal Piers, (*Ans.*) 74.

Rivière à la Graisse, Survey (*Ans.*) 74.

Manitoba, Transportation to, arrangements (*Ans.*) 75.

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 94-6.

Manitoba, Emigrant Sheds (*Ans.*) 111.

Rimouski Wharf Improvement (*Ans.*, by Mr. Langevin) 112.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O. C., 181.

TUPPER, Mr.—*Con.*

Intercol. Ry., Halifax City Ry., on proposed Bill (Mr. Cockburn) 138.
 Intercol Ry., Ste. Flavie Land Claims (*Ans.*) 491.
 Public servants, money due from, recovery (*Ans.*) 140.
 Beauharnois Canal, enlargement (*Ans.*) 141.
 St. Anne's Lock, widening (*Ans.*) 141.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141, 144, 145.
 Negro Point Breakwater, Repair (*Ans.*) 222.
 Pacific Ry., bringing down reports (*Ans.*) 222.
 Stratford, Govt. Offices, erection (*Ans.*) 222.
 North River, Dredging of (*Ans.*) 223.
 Woodward's Cove, N. B., appropriation for (*Ans.*) 223.
 Tracadie Harbour, dredging of (*Ans.*) 223.
 Public Works Conts. (1873-79) on M. for Pap., 236.
Tariff—Budget, on the, 454; comments in reply to Mr. Mackenzie, 469-70, 508-9.
 W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Coal) 1427;
 (Pig iron) 1448. On Mr. Tilley's personal explan., 1458. (Stone, building) 1484; (Sugars) 1490-1. H. E.'s despatches (*Remarks*) 1729.
 Shelburne, fog whistle for (*Ans.*) 489.
 Coal on Govt. Rys., shipment at false rates; (*Ans.*) 490; do, and sales to Govt. officials, on M. for Ret., 654.
 Petite Rivière, Breakwater for (*Ans.*) 490.
 St. Simon, Wharf for (*Ans.*) 490.
 Port Hood, Harbour improvement (*Ans.*) 490.
 Paris Exhibition, delay of medals (*Ans.*) 490.
 Bay St. Paul Wharf, completion (*Ans.*) 490.
 Dorchester Penitentiary, Robertson, dismissal, on M. for Pap., 492-5.
 Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of, on M. for Pap., 498.
 Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, &c., on M. for Ret., 499, 502.
 Rocher Bay Pier, erection (*Ans.*) 546.
 Grosse Isle Sheds, rebuilding (*Ans.*, for Mr. Pope) 547.
 Pacific Ry., Sect. "B" cont. (*Ans.*) 547.
 Ryland, Mr., claim of, on M. for Pap., on Q. of Proceed., 550.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 551, 605; (*Q. of Ord.*) 598.
 Judges' Salaries, Quebec (*Ans.*, for Mr. McDonald) 563.
 Lavoie, Capt., dismissal of (*Ans.*) 563; on M. for orders to, 920, 1581-2.
 L'Assomption R., deepening of (*Ans.*) 563.
 Truro and Pictou Ry. Act Amt. (*B.* 58, 1°) 610; on 2°, 1238-41; on 3°, 1504-7-8.
 Railway Act, 1868, Amt. (*B.* 59, 1°) 610; withdn., 1587.
 Pacific Ry. Act Amt. (*B.* 60, 1°) 611.
 Pacific Ry., Conts. A. and B. (*submitted*) 611; (*Remarks*) 944.
 Eastern Extension Ry., coal rolling stock for (*Ans.*) 652.
 New Westminster, P.O., construction (*Ans.*) 652.
 Woodstock, Bridge at, on M. for Pap., 653-4.
 Port Stanley Revenue and Expenditure, on M. for Pap., 655.

TUPPER, Mr.—*Con.*

B. C. Ry. Reserves, squatters' rights (*Ans.*) 827.
 Arisaig Pier, improvement (*Ans.*) 827.
 Metapedia, disposal of Ry. buildings, on M. for Ret., 829.
 Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 858.
 Presqu'Isle Bay, dredging of (*Ans.*) 904.
 Murray Canal, construction of (*Ans.*) 904.
 Intercol. Ry., Murray & Co's. claims, on M. for Pap., 917.
 Intercol. Ry., Stark, reml, on M. for Pap., 919.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 921.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on 2°, 941-2.
 Pacific Ry. Conts., Engrs.' reports offered confidentially to Leader of Opp., 1080; all reports will be tabled (*Remarks*) 1083.
 Census and Statistics B. 67 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 1234.
 Receiver-Genl. and Min. of P. W. (*B.* 66, 1°) 741; in Com. of W., 1241-2.
 Cheticamp Harbour, dredging of (*Ans.*) 1249.
 McNair's Cove Pier, repair (*Ans.*) 1249.
 Washademoak R., dredging (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Vancouver I., Canal, forecast side (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Intercol. Ry., Bouchar, disml., on M. for Pap., reasons for such Ms. (*Remarks*) 1256.
 Ont. and Pacif. Junct. Ry. B. 27 (Mr. Williams) on Senate Amts., 1290.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1377.
 Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 2°, 1395.
 Campbell's Cove, P. E. I., Breakwater for (*Ans.*) 1397.
 Kootenay R., clearing of (*Ans.*) 1397.
 Intercol Ry., Bourdeau, disml. of, on M. for Pap., 1398.
 B. C. Penitentiary, construction of, on M. for Pap., 1409.
 Montreal Harbour Dues B. 88 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com., 1502.
Supply—Estimates: Legislation (Commons, Dep. Clk.) 1542; Pub. Works, Cap. (Intercol., to Deep Water, St. John) 1643; (Nut-locks) 1643-4; (St. John, Passenger Station) 1645; (Pacific Ry) 1645-6-8-9; (Georgian Bay Br.) 1648; (Canals, Lachine) 1649; (Cornwall) 1649; (Welland) 1650-2-3-4-5-7-8; (Buildings, Ottawa, snow-shovelling) 1661; Pub. Works, Inc. (Navigable Rivers, Quebec Harbour) 1662; (Pub. Buildings, Ont.) 1662; (Que.) 1663; (N.B.) 1663; (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1664-5-6; (Que.) 1666; (N.B.) 1666; (N.S.) 1667; Miscellaneous (Telegraph Subsidies) 1668; Collection of Revenues (Customs, Salaries, &c.) 1691; (Weights & Meas., Salaries) 1719, 1722; (Maintenance, Canals, Welland) 1726-7-8. (*Remarks*) Kamouraska and Paspebiac Mail Service, 1729.
 Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Pub. Wks., Cap. (Intercol. Ry., Murray's claim) 1833-5; Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., Oak Point, N.S.) 1836.
 Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Pub. Wks., Cap. (Pacific Ry., W. of Red E.) 1849, 1850-1.

TUPPER, Mr.—Con.

- Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to Deep Water, St. John) 1857-8-9; (Nut-locks) 1859-60; (Ottawa Drill Shed) 1861; (Intercol. Ry.) 1865-6-7-9, 1870-2-3; (Mr. Piché's gratuity) 1873; (Pacific Ry., Wallace's claim) 1877.
- Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater (*Ans.*) 1550.
- C. Tormentine, Govt. Br. Ry. (*Ans.*) 1550-1.
- Port Elgin Harb. Improvemt. (*Ans.*) 1551.
- Pacific Ry. Route W. of Selkirk (*Ans.*) 1551.
- Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (Mr. Kilvert) 1586.
- Ry. Acts Consolid. (B. 98, 1^o) 1550; on 2^o, 1703-4-5-6; in Com., 1711-12-13-14-15; on 3^o, 1716.
- W. & A. and W. C. Rys., settlement (*Ans.*) 1756.
- Public Lands Acts Consolid. (B. 107, 1^o) 1765.
- Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o and Mr. Holton's Amt., for "hoist," 1766.
- Anticosti, &c., Telegraph Subsidy (B. 111, 1^o and 2^o) 1796.
- Dynamite explosion, Stratford (*Remarks*) 1800.
- Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. (B. 116); Res. propd., 1886; on Res., 1895, 1909, 1916-18, 1954; in Com., 1960-4; on conc., Res. 1, 1965, 1974-6-8; Res. 12, 1979; B. 1^o, 2^o and 3^o, 1979.
- Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase (B. 119) Res., in Com., 1982; Res., on conc., 1992-6.
- Quebec Constitutional Question: in Debate, on 3^o of Supply B., 2002.

Twenty-first Battalion, No. 1 Company.
Drill of, 1873-74, M. for Ret. (Mr. Tellier) 505.

Union Ass. Co. of Canada, B. No. 36 (Mr. Kilvert).
1^o, 221; 2^o, 312.

U. S. Direct Cable Co., extension of powers to Canada, B. No. 47 (Mr. McCarthy).
1^o, 338; B. withdn., 1696.

United States Vessels, &c. See "American."

Usury, Prohibition of (Mr. Méthot's B.)
See "Interest."

VALIN, Mr.

- St. Lawrence, Harbours, provisioning (*M. for Conts.*) 70.
- Grosse Isle, Pub. Works (*M. for Conts.*) 70.
- American Vessels, Registration of (*M. for Pap.*) 180.
- Northern Light (M. for Ret., respecting)* 235; agreed to, 684.
- Cardinal, Régis, disml. of, on M. for Pap., 572.
- Pilots' Fund, managemt. (*M. for Pet.*) 675.
- Official Assignees, Que., proceedings of (*M. for Ret.*) 919.
- Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 994. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Wheat-flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1362; (Coal) 1433; (Wines) 1480; (Sugars) 1488.*

VALIN, Mr.—Con.

- Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.
- Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1670.*
- VALLÉE, Mr.**
- Intercol. Ry., dismissals, &c., on M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 57.
- Quebec Walls, improvement (*Ques.*) 60; (*M. for Ret.*) 67.
- Railways, Loans to (*M. for Ret.*) 63.
- Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 100.
- Bic, Seignior, Fishing rights (*Ques.*) 111; (*M. for Pap.*) 137.
- Rimouski, works at Matane, &c., on M. for Ret., 115.
- Tobacco, Canadian, 1873-79 (*M. for Ret.*) 119.
- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com. (*Amt. propd.*) 217; (*withdn.*) 219.
- Lady Head, loss of, &c. (Ms. for Ret.) 549.*
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 563, 565.
- Courrier du Canada, on Mr. Huntington's statement, 613.*
- Hemlock Bark, export duty (*Ques.*) 651.
- Rails, old, disposal of (*M. for Ret.*) 837.
- Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 922.
- Quebec Constitutional Question, on Premier's statements, 985.
- Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1101; Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat flour) (Amt., free) 1362.*
- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2^o and Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1779.

Vallée, Stanislas, Montmagny.

Postmaster, dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Lanjry*) 835.

Vancouver Island. See "Brit. Columbia."

Ventilation of Chamber.

Remarks (*Mr. Charlton and others*) 858.

Vessels, American, Registration.

In Canada, M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*) 180.

Veterans, of 1812 & 1837. See "Militia."

Volunteers for War Service, recently.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Bunster) 665.

WADE, Mr.

Windsor Branch and W. & A. Rys. (*M. for Ret. respecting*) 844.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 951.

WALLACE, Mr. (South Norfolk).

Tariff—W. & M. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Cheese) 1421; (Shovels, Tools, &c.) 1482.

National Currency (*Res. propd.*) 1550.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

Wallace's Claim. See "PACIFIC RY."

Washademoak River, Dredging of.

Completion, *Ques. (Mr. King)* 1250.

Washington Treaty. See the respective subjects thereof.

Waterley, D. H., St. John P. O.

Clerk, dismissal of, damages, Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 1249.

WAYS AND MEANS.

M. into Com. and Budget Speech (*Mr. Tilley*) 409; Debate, 430; Res. agreed to and reported, 475.

For further proceedings in House and in Com., see "TARIFF" and "Supply Bill."

Weatherbe, Judge. Appointment of.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Doull*) 842.

Weeds Destruction Companies.

Bill, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 46.

Weight, French (Mr. Casgrain's B.) See "French Weight."

Weights and Measures.

Standard, cost of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 65.

Inspectors, intentions of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Merner*) 71.

Act, working of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 88.

Supply—discussion in, 1718.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 87 (Mr. Baby).

Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1^o, 1501; 2^o, 1841; Com. of W., 1841; reported, 1848; 3^o, 1848. (42 *Vic.*, c. 16.)

WELDON, Mr.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 157.

Negro Pt. Breakwater, intention (*Ques.*) 222.

St. John Penitentiary, Provincial claims (*M. for Cor.*) 239; M. amd. and agreed to, 240.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 599, 600.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 795-8; on Mr. Domville's speech, 801. On Mr. Tilley's personal explan., 1459.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o, 1383.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1613.

Welland Canal.

Smith, John B., dismissal, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 46.

Enlargement, expenditure, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 47.

McMahon, James A., conduct of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 60.

Employés' names, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 104.

Land damages, Haldimand and Monck, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 106.

Damages, caused and paid, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 179.

Supplies purchased, 1873-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunting*) 185; 1871-78 (*Mr. Thompson, Haldimand*) 673.

Damages by schooner *Louise*, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McCallum*) 830.

Oak supply for, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Supply—discussion in, 1649, 1726.

Collectors, payments to, 1877-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 1708.

Welland, Marsh Lands in.

Govt. claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McCallum*) 672.

Welland Ry. Co. Debentures conversion, &c., B. No. 12 (Mr. Drew).

1^o, 88; 2^o, 111; Com. of W. and reported^d, 629; 3^o, 650. (42 *Vic.*, c. 60).

Western Block, Ottawa, Extension.

Expense of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 920.

Western Counties Ry.

Settlement with W. & A. Ry., Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 73; (*Mr. Longley*) 1756. Windsor Br., earnings of, claims, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wade*) 844.

West Indies, Steamer, subsidy to.

Supply,—discussion in, 1853.

Westminster, B. C., Post-office.

Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.

WHITE, Mr. (Cardwell).

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 100.

Pub. Works Conts., recent (*M. for Ret.*) 125.

Quebec Harbour Works and Graving Dock (*M. for Ret.*) 188.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 294.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 577-8.

Northern Ry. Act Amt. (B. 64, 1^o) 738; (*withdn.*) 1730.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 910.

Western Building, Ottawa, expenditure on (*M. for Ret.*) 920.

Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 932-9.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 1028, 1068; Res. 4, Tea and Coffee, differential, on 2^o, 1330; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Books, &c.) 1343; (Carriages) 1419. On Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1455.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. Carthy*) on 2^o, 1281-2.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1615; B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1778.

Supply—Estimates: Public Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1659-60.

Ry. Acts consolid. B. 93 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2^o, 1714.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on propd. Res., 1934; personal remarks, 1939.

WHITE, Mr. (East Hastings).

Introduction, 293.

Controv'd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for reference to Com., 853.

Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 928.

Tariff—Res. 11, on 2^o—(Agricuilt. Implem-
ents) 1338; (Cheese) 1422-4.

Supply—Estimates: Public Works, Inc. (Buildings, Ques.) 1662-4.

WHITE, Mr. (North Rentfrew).
 Carillon Dam (*M. for Ret.*) 45.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 910.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 952.
 Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) 1248.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2° and M. Béchard's Amt., 1611.
 Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) on 2°, 1705.
Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenues (Excise, Culling) 1716-17-18.
 Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) in Com., 1766; on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1767.
 Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1847.

Wilkins, Judge, Resignation of.
 M. for Cor. (*Mr. Doull*) 842.

WILLIAMS, Mr.
 Ont. and Pacif. Junct. Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 27, 1°*) 140.
 Appointments, &c., 1873 and 1878 (*M. for Cabinet Cor.*) 491.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1633.

Windsor and Annapolis Ry.
 Earnings of, claims, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wade*) 844. See also "Western Counties Ry."

Woodstock, N.B., Bridge at.
 M. for Pap. (*Mr. Connell*) 653.

Woodstock, N.B., Mail Service.
 Postal Car for, Ques. (*Mr. Connell*) 652.

Woodward's Cove, Grand Manan.
 Re-vote, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor.*) 223.

Wrecking, Amer., in Canadian Waters.
 M. for Cor., since 1874 (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1405.

Wrecking Tug, American.
 Seizure of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 119; Resumed Debate, 680; M. agreed to, 684.

WRIGHT, Mr.
 Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1848.

Yamaska River, Dredging, &c.
 Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Gill*) 74.
 M. for Pap. respecting (*Mr. Massue*) 106.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. Incorp. B. No. 46
 (*Mr. Killam*).
 1°, 338; M. into Com. of W., 921; order dischgd. and B. withdn., 924.

Yarwood, C. St. G., Chippewa.
 Landing waiter, superannuation, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunting*) 675.

YEO, Mr.
 Cascumpec Harbour, improvement, M. for Reps. (*seconded*) 87.
 Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims (*Ques.*) 74; (*M. for Cor.*) 241, 247; (*M. withdn.*) 261; (*Ques.*) 1756.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 586.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1171.
 Capes Tormentine and Traverse, Branch Bys. (*Ques.*) 1550.

York, North R., Election.
 Judge's Report, 58.