

DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

Fourth Parliament—First Session.

OTTAWA, April 16.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 p. m. A number of petitions were presented, praying for the formation of a permanent Railway Commission.

Mr. DONVILLE asked whether it is the intention of the Government to pay Mr. D. H. Waterly, 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.

Hon. JAS. MACDONALD (Picton) said a verdict for some four or five thousand dollars had been given against Mr. Waterly, late Post Office Inspector, at the suit of Mr. Waterly, but the counsel for the crown had obtained a rule nisi to set aside the verdict, and that rule was still pending.

In reply to Mr. McDonnell (Inverness) Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was not the intention of the Government to pay any further dredging of the harbor of Cheticamp, in the county of Inverness, during the coming season.

In reply to Mr. McIsaac Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was not the intention of the Government to place a sum in the supplementary estimates to repair the pier at McMillan's Cove, Antigonish county.

Mr. GILMORE asked whether the Government have or intend to enter into any arrangement with any parties with respect to subsidizing a line of steamers to ply between Halifax and St. John, by which it is hoped to develop a direct trade with that country?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the Government had entered into negotiations with a view to establish a monthly line to carry the mails between Canada and Brazil, with a prospect of extending the service to the River Plate. Mr. KIRK asked whether it was 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.

Hon. Mr. POPE (P. E. I.) said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. KIRK asked whether it was the intention of the Government to complete the work of dredging the Washademoak River this year.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Cartier was passed through Committee, and reported without amendment.

The bill to amend the Act respecting the International Railway, passed in the 33rd year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, was also passed through Committee, and reported without amendment.

Mr. CASSEY moved the second reading of the bill to insure the better qualification of public servants and the greater efficiency and economy in any one time on any subject.

He suggested that radical changes were necessary in connection with the public service. He contended that the matter of qualification had never been properly considered by any Government of the Dominion, though he admitted that the fault was in the system.

He suggested a higher standard of qualification in the lower grades of the service. He went through the bill suggesting numerous improvements.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY complimented the member for West Elgin on his explanations, but asked that the bill should not be pressed.

The Government proposed dealing very fully with the matter during the coming recess with the object of introducing a bill next session.

The motion was withdrawn.

Mr. IVES moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Act to provide for the more effectual enquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at the elections of members of the House of Commons.

He explained the provisions of the bill, which are to the effect that twenty-five persons or any committee may petition Parliament for a Commissioner to investigate into alleged corrupt practices at any election.

The sum of one thousand dollars must be deposited with the accountant of the House before the petition is received. Should the petitioners fail the thousand dollars is to be applied to paying the expense of the enquiry, but should they succeed the money is to be returned to them.

After a lengthy debate the motion was carried on a division. Yeas, 54; nays, 28.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE demanded that the bill be sent to the Standing Committee on railways, canals and telegraphs.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said that as the bill had been passed by the House there was no necessity for this.

Mr. DONVILLE moved the second reading of the bill to make further provision in relation to the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was under the consideration of the Government.

doubt expected would help them should they go to the people. For himself he had no fear of the result in such a case. He rebuked the hon. leader of the Opposition for the charge made by him (Mr. Tilley) that he had two opinions at the one time. He had never gone to Scotland and made a free trade speech and then, a short time after, made a protection speech in Montreal, as the ex-Premier had. He denied that he had held two opinions any one time on any subject.

It had been stated that he had held his constituents during the recent election that, had he been in Parliament when the tariff was increased to 17 1/2 per cent., he would have opposed that increase, and then he had come down with a very large increase in the tariff. He did not deny the statement imputed to him. He had made that statement and he held to that statement yet, but he repudiated the charge that he had done anything to falsify his statement. He had gone to them and asked their support, promising a re-adjustment of the tariff, and the tariff had been re-adjusted. He defied the gentlemen opposite to show that he had been inconsistent. He defied them to produce a speech of his which showed inconsistency. The deficits left by the late Government had been so large that a re-adjustment of the tariff was necessary to secure the requirements of the revenue. (Hear, hear.) He went on to sketch the financial condition of New Brunswick since Confederation, showing that it was superior now to what it had been at the time. It had been prophesied by gentlemen opposite that his name was to be associated with ruin in New Brunswick. The hon. member for the city and county of St. John had said that, but that gentleman would do well to attend to his own case. He (Tilley) had no fear of the threatened execution. In 1864 he had gone back to New Brunswick from Quebec when the resolutions were passed favoring Confederation. He was unpopular at that time. The Legislature was dissolved and they went to the people. He was defeated and the Government was defeated. He had difficulty in carrying on his campaign. He had been obliged to have a posse of friends to protect him. The hon. member for Gloucester, no doubt, remembered that.

Mr. ANGLIN said he could contradict that statement in the most emphatic manner.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said it was a humiliating position he had to occupy at that time. He remembered when the hon. member for Gloucester had come forward and begged that he (Tilley) should get a hearing.

Mr. ANGLIN (Excitedly)—I never did anything of the kind. (Cries of "Order, order.") Hon. Mr. TILLEY replied that he could call a thousand witnesses to the fact that he had fulfilled it. (Cheers.) When he and his friends went back to the country five years after they had their justification, for the people then declared themselves satisfied with Confederation. He had no fears now with regard to the execution which had been promised. He would read from a return made by Mr. Everett, President of the Manufacturers' Association of the city and county of St. John, of the manufacturing industries of New Brunswick in 1874, as compared with 1878. According to that return the number of employees had increased nearly one-half, and the volume of manufacturing had increased proportionately.

Mr. ANGLIN—Will the hon. gentleman state the causes of the decline?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—Yes; there were two causes. The depression of trade and the unfair competition with the manufacturers of other countries. He referred to some length to the facilities afforded in New Brunswick for manufacturing. These, he contended, were such as could not be excelled anywhere in the Dominion, and he expressed his confidence that the time would come when the industry in that Province before a very long period elapsed. Alluding to the question of the price of flour, he said he did not believe the price would be increased an average of more than ten cents a barrel in New Brunswick, which, he had said, would suffer greatly through the operation of the tariff. It had been said that the cost of production would be increased sixty cents per thousand feet. He admitted that the lumber trade was not in a very good position at present, and he thought that the tariff had aggravated matters so much that certain individuals could sell deal ends at a dollar or a dollar and a half a cord more than they were worth. He denied that the cost of producing the lumber would be increased as much as was claimed. He contended that the tariff resolutions were then taken up *seriatim*, and the first clause passed after a slight discussion.

On the second clause, which relates to drawbacks, there was a lengthy discussion, in which members of the Opposition raising objections.

The clause was carried.

After considerable discussion the third and fourth resolutions were passed successfully. On No. 6, relating to the addition of freight charges from the cradle for the manufacture of shirts put on their backs when infants, to the shirts put on their backs.

The item was passed, and the items oats, rice and rye were agreed to.

On the item, wheat 15c. per bushel, Mr. HOUDÉ moved that the item be not considered by the House, but that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole and a report made at any time when the Governor-General in Council has reason to believe that the supply of wheat produced in Canada will not be sufficient to meet the requirements of the country, and that it will be lawful for the Governor-General in Council to reduce or take off the duty on imported wheat for such period as may be appointed in such order-in-Council.

He hoped the Government would accept the amendment, as it asserted nothing against the principle of the policy which had been introduced.

Mr. FIRST moved, in amendment to the amendment, "That the duty of 15c. a bushel on imported wheat be struck off, and the article placed on the free list."

The article was carried. Yeas, 61; nays, 109.

Mr. CHARLTON moved in amendment, "That all the words after 'that' in Mr. Houdé's amendment be struck out, and the following substituted, 'wheat, coal and pig iron be placed on the free list.'" The House divided on Mr. Charlton's amendment which was lost. Yeas, 53; nays, 116.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved that the article in breadstuffs—cornmeal 40 cents a barrel—be struck off and transferred to the free list.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said it was inconvenient at this stage of the session to go into a committee of the whole, and he trusted that the honorable gentleman from Maskinonge would not press his motion. He would state that the Government would give effect to the principle involved in the motion, should the necessary assent be given.

Mr. HOUDÉ expressed his willingness to withdraw his resolution.

On the item wheat flour, fifty cents a barrel, another discussion arose. The point was taken that if duty on flour was only fifty cents, that on wheat should be less than fifty cents.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked if the hon. Finance Minister had promised the millers that the duty on wheat would be removed as soon as the Ontario elections were over. He had heard a rumor that effect would be given to the hon. Mr. TILLEY said he declined answering any such question. It was a question which he could very emphatically answer if he felt disposed to do so, but no hon. gentleman should propose such a question.

Mr. VALLEY moved that the duty of 50c. a barrel on flour should be taken off, and the article placed on the free list.

A long debate ensued, in which Mr. Vallee, Gigault, Houdé, Valin, Fortin, Dugas, Costigan and Landry took part.

Mr. LAROCHE moved the adjournment of the debate, and the House adjourned at 11.5.

OTTAWA, April 21.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

After routine, Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Picton) rose to correct a misstatement attributed to him in the *Herald*, to the effect that he had accused Mr. Carmichael, formerly a member for Picton, of having offered to resign a certain position in office in case he should be elected in a certain way. He denied ever having made such a statement.

Mr. MCCARTHY, for Mr. Donville, presented the report of the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. KNEZER introduced a bill to repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act. He said he introduced the bill on the score of economy. He thought the country was governed far too much, and believed the Supreme Court entirely unnecessary. It cost the country about \$50,000 a year, which amount of money was practically thrown away. The Judges of that Court had very little to do for the large salaries paid them.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Picton) said he supposed the hon. gentleman who introduced the bill was only amusing himself, and he, therefore, would not treat it seriously at present.

Mr. KEELER assured the hon. Minister of Justice that there was no joking about the matter.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the bill might be referred to a committee, but he defended the establishment of the Supreme Court, which he maintained should not be interfered with until it was found that it did not fulfil the intention for which it was established.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE argued strongly in favor of the bill, but he insisted, insisting that it was essential as completing the system of self-government in this country. He thought it was imposing on the House to introduce such a bill at this stage of the session.

Mr. HOGARTY defended the introduction of the bill, although he was not prepared to favor the abolition of a Court already established. Still there was a very strong feeling in Ontario against having so many courts to administer the laws of the country.

After some remarks by Messrs. Mills and Dandridge, the former opposing the bill and the latter the Court, the bill was read a first time. A motion was made fixing the second reading for Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE moved in amendment that the bill be read a second time this day (Tuesday) instead of on Wednesday, as the amendment was lost. Yeas, 44; nays, 120.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings) denied the statement, submitting that the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Brown), a supporter of the Opposition, was this year manufacturing a reaping machine at \$90, which sold last year at \$110.

The item was passed.

The items ale, beer and porter, animals, artificial flowers and rabbit metal were passed without much discussion.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY explained that under the old tariff there was a duty of 17 1/2 per cent. on paper, while on books it was only five per cent. This arrangement had been considered unfair, and hence the present duties had been imposed. The revenue from this source last year was \$44,000 and \$30,000 a year additional was expected.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) raised the question of Sunday-school libraries, which, he thought, ought to be classed with Bibles, periodicals and religious books at 5 per cent.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said this question had been carefully considered by the Government, but they had been obliged to conclude that it would be impossible to decide just what would be considered religious books. There could be no doubt that importers of books would be glad to pay down as religious books which should not come under that class. With four millions of a population he thought it her own time for Canada to begin producing her own Sunday-school literature, and he hoped that would soon be the case.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE hoped a change would be made in the direction referred to by the hon. member for West Middlesex. He sent a number of Sunday-school periodicals across the House to the Finance Minister, complaining that they should be subject to the duty proposed.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY thanked the hon. leader of the Opposition for his kindness, and then pointed out the periodicals in question which were sent through the post-office without paying the duty.

A long discussion followed, in the course of which Mr. Casey made a sneering allusion to the Government.

Hon. Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) rebuked the member for West Elgin for the tone which he invariably adopted when he rose to address the House.

The item passed, as did also the various other classes coming under the head of books, such as Bibles, periodicals and pamphlets.

The items maps and charts, printed music, planimeters, the forms of the landholders bill and the latter the Court, the bill was read a first time. A motion was made fixing the second reading for Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE moved in amendment that the bill be read a second time this day (Tuesday) instead of on Wednesday, as the amendment was lost. Yeas, 44; nays, 120.

The items shoe-blackening and brass and manufacture thereof were passed after a series of objections from the Opposition benches, and at 6 o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess, A bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act, so far as it related to Manitoba, was read a first time.

The bill from the Senate, incorporating the Napanee & Tanworth Railway Company, was reported with amendments, and was read a first time.

Mr. WITTE respecting La Banque Jacques-Cartier was read a third time and passed.

The debate on the tariff was resumed.

On the item, barley 15c. a bushel, Hon. Mr. MILLS and other members of the Opposition contended that the price would not be increased for Canadian farmers. Objection was taken to the proposed tariff.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said there was nothing to prevent the transmission of American barley through Canada in bond for export.

The item was carried, as was also that of buckwheat.

On the item, Indian corn 7 1/2c. a bushel, Hon. Mr. TILLEY explained that last year 7,387,507 bushels of corn, valued at \$3,636,619, were imported into Canada, while 3,987,600 bushels valued at \$2,678,000. It was calculated that by the imposition of the proposed duty, the imports would be reduced by two million bushels, and that the revenue received would be from \$200,000 to \$210,000. It was also expected that barley, peas and oats would be cultivated to a greater extent than now and made to take the place of corn.

Mr. CHARLTON said the duty was too low, suggested that it be increased to 13 cents. He said he would be willing to vote for the increase.

After remarks by Messrs. Mills, Guthrie, Hooper and Gillmor, Mr. WITTE said the duty was high enough already, and protested against any increase.

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant) said corn was the only grain on which protection could be given to the farmers. He believed the farmers of Brant who sold ten thousand bushels annually would be benefited to some extent, but he thought the duty was too small.

Mr. BAIN argued that the duty on corn should be increased to twelve or fifteen cents per bushel.

Mr. ALLISON pointed out the disparity in the views of the members on the Opposition side some contending the duty was too low, and others that it was too high.

Mr. RYAL spoke at some length, denouncing the tariff. He contended that under it the farmers would receive no benefit, but to the contrary would be injured. He argued that the duty was a tax on the cradle for the shirts put on their backs when infants, to the shirts put on their backs.

The item was passed, and the items oats, rice and rye were agreed to.

On the item, wheat 15c. per bushel, Mr. HOUDÉ moved that the item be not considered by the House, but that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole and a report made at any time when the Governor-General in Council has reason to believe that the supply of wheat produced in Canada will not be sufficient to meet the requirements of the country, and that it will be lawful for the Governor-General in Council to reduce or take off the duty on imported wheat for such period as may be appointed in such order-in-Council.

He hoped the Government would accept the amendment, as it asserted nothing against the principle of the policy which had been introduced.

Mr. FIRST moved, in amendment to the amendment, "That the duty of 15c. a bushel on imported wheat be struck off, and the article placed on the free list."

The article was carried. Yeas, 61; nays, 109.

Mr. CHARLTON moved in amendment, "That all the words after 'that' in Mr. Houdé's amendment be struck out, and the following substituted, 'wheat, coal and pig iron be placed on the free list.'" The House divided on Mr. Charlton's amendment which was lost. Yeas, 53; nays, 116.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved that the article in breadstuffs—cornmeal 40 cents a barrel—be struck off and transferred to the free list.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said it was inconvenient at this stage of the session to go into a committee of the whole, and he trusted that the honorable gentleman from Maskinonge would not press his motion. He would state that the Government would give effect to the principle involved in the motion, should the necessary assent be given.

Mr. HOUDÉ expressed his willingness to withdraw his resolution.

On the item wheat flour, fifty cents a barrel, another discussion arose. The point was taken that if duty on flour was only fifty cents, that on wheat should be less than fifty cents.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked if the hon. Finance Minister had promised the millers that the duty on wheat would be removed as soon as the Ontario elections were over. He had heard a rumor that effect would be given to the hon. Mr. TILLEY said he declined answering any such question. It was a question which he could very emphatically answer if he felt disposed to do so, but no hon. gentleman should propose such a question.

Mr. VALLEY moved that the duty of 50c. a barrel on flour should be taken off, and the article placed on the free list.

A long debate ensued, in which Mr. Vallee, Gigault, Houdé, Valin, Fortin, Dugas, Costigan and Landry took part.

Mr. LAROCHE moved the adjournment of the debate, and the House adjourned at 11.5.

OTTAWA, April 21.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

After routine, Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Picton) rose to correct a misstatement attributed to him in the *Herald*, to the effect that he had accused Mr. Carmichael, formerly a member for Picton, of having offered to resign a certain position in office in case he should be elected in a certain way. He denied ever having made such a statement.

Mr. MCCARTHY, for Mr. Donville, presented the report of the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. KNEZER introduced a bill to repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act. He said he introduced the bill on the score of economy. He thought the country was governed far too much, and believed the Supreme Court entirely unnecessary. It cost the country about \$50,000 a year, which amount of money was practically thrown away. The Judges of that Court had very little to do for the large salaries paid them.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Picton) said he supposed the hon. gentleman who introduced the bill was only amusing himself, and he, therefore, would not treat it seriously at present.

Mr. KEELER assured the hon. Minister of Justice that there was no joking about the matter.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the bill might be referred to a committee, but he defended the establishment of the Supreme Court, which he maintained should not be interfered with until it was found that it did not fulfil the intention for which it was established.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE argued strongly in favor of the bill, but he insisted, insisting that it was essential as completing the system of self-government in this country. He thought it was imposing on the House to introduce such a bill at this stage of the session.

Mr. HOGARTY defended the introduction of the bill, although he was not prepared to favor the abolition of a Court already established. Still there was a very strong feeling in Ontario against having so many courts to administer the laws of the country.

After some remarks by Messrs. Mills and Dandridge, the former opposing the bill and the latter the Court, the bill was read a first time. A motion was made fixing the second reading for Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE moved in amendment that the bill be read a second time this day (Tuesday) instead of on Wednesday, as the amendment was lost. Yeas, 44; nays, 120.

The items shoe-blackening and brass and manufacture thereof were passed after a series of objections from the Opposition benches, and at 6 o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess, A bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act, so far as it related to Manitoba, was read a first time.

The bill from the Senate, incorporating the Napanee & Tanworth Railway Company, was reported with amendments, and was read a first time.

Mr. WITTE respecting La Banque Jacques-Cartier was read a third time and passed.

The debate on the tariff was resumed.

On the item, barley 15c. a bushel, Hon. Mr. MILLS and other members of the Opposition contended that the price would not be increased for Canadian farmers. Objection was taken to the proposed tariff.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said there was nothing to prevent the transmission of American barley through Canada in bond for export.

The item was carried, as was also that of buckwheat.

On the item, Indian corn 7 1/2c. a bushel, Hon. Mr. TILLEY explained that last year 7,387,507 bushels of corn, valued at \$3,636,619, were imported into Canada, while 3,987,600 bushels valued at \$2,678,000. It was calculated that by the imposition of the proposed duty, the imports would be reduced by two million bushels, and that the revenue received would be from \$200,000 to \$210,000. It was also expected that barley, peas and oats would be cultivated to a greater extent than now and made to take the place of corn.

Mr. CHARLTON said the duty was too low, suggested that it be increased to 13 cents. He said he would be willing to vote for the increase.

After remarks by Messrs. Mills, Guthrie, Hooper and Gillmor, Mr. WITTE said the duty was high enough already, and protested against any increase.

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant) said corn was the only grain on which protection could be given to the farmers. He believed the farmers of Brant who sold ten thousand bushels annually would be benefited to some extent, but he thought the duty was too small.