

THE HERALD AT OTTAWA.

WEDNESDAY, April 4th, 1900. SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 A YEAR, PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY JAMES McISAAC, Editor & Proprietor.

A LARGE amount of our space is occupied with a report of the budget debate in the House of Commons. We feel sure our readers will find it interesting reading.

As will be seen elsewhere, her Majesty Queen Victoria arrives in Ireland today. The most elaborate preparations have been made for her reception and she will receive a right royal welcome from the Irish people. Her stay in Ireland may be prolonged for a month.

THE Patriot reports that Mr. Wise has unconditionally resigned his seat in the Provincial Legislature; but the Examiner says Mr. Wise contradicts the statement that he has withdrawn his conditions. It will therefore be seen that there is some little disagreement among the Grits as to the exact number of members in the House. No doubt the wish that Mr. Wise should unconditionally resign is father to the thought expressed by the Patriot that he has done so. It remains to be seen what the upshot will be. Beyond these contradictory statements nothing is known as to the status of the Local Government.

THE Grit Gerrymander bill was again killed in the Dominion Senate on Wednesday last. When the bill came up from the Commons and its second reading was moved in the Senate by Hon. Mr. Mills, Minister of Justice and Government Leader, Sir McKenzie Bowell moved an amendment that the second reading take place six months hence. A debate of a few days ensued, participated in by a number of Senators. Senator Ferguson was among those who took an active part in the debate and made one of the best speeches against the bill. It was pointed out that next year the census would be taken, and after that a redistribution of seats would be necessary; consequently to pass the bill now under consideration, even if it were a fustian and equitable one, would only furnish occasion for the needless expenditure of money. But the bill in question was far from being just in its dealings with all parties; it was nothing more nor less than a gerrymander bill, by means of which some constituencies were given double the number of electors they now have, and others were deprived of half their present vote. All this was to give the Conservatives and deprive them of their due representation in Parliament. It was simply a carving up of constituencies in such a way as to secure a preponderance of Grit voters in ridings where they are now in a minority, or would be in a minority under any fair division. When the division was taken on the bill 60 senators voted; 19 in favor of the bill and 41 against the bill and in favor of the six months' delay. The majority against the bill was therefore 22. Thus the Senate has again proved its usefulness and its wisdom in placing its veto upon mischievous legislation and in frustrating the machinations of the Grit majority in the House of Commons.

WITHIN the past week some revelations have been made that throw considerable light on methods employed by our Grit friends to gain elections, and incidentally explain the determination of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his friends to prevent the reopening of the inquiry into the West Huron and Brockville election scandals, before the privileges and elections committee of the House of Commons. Some days ago Mr. Whitney, Leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, proposed in the Assembly several affidavits made in the city of Detroit in the State of Michigan by a Mr. Pritchett, who was a deputy returning officer in the West Huron election, when McNish (Grit) was declared elected over McDermid, Conservative. Mr. Pritchett now swears that he acted as deputy returning officer under an assumed name; that he counted nineteen or twenty ballots for the Grit that had been marked for the Conservative and so secured his election. McNish was afterwards unseated by the courts and acknowledged the crookedness practised by his workers to secure his return. When trouble was brewing for the operators of the election machine, the manipulators came to Pritchett and wanted him to make a statement at variance with the facts regarding his own action. This he refused to do, so he was sent to Detroit to be out of harm's way. He was to be paid \$100 a month during his absence. The pay came all right for a time, then it slacked off. Later he was sent only fifty dollars a month, and the consequence is that he is gone before a judge in Detroit and made these affidavits setting forth his performances in the election scandals. These affidavits have naturally created a flutter of excitement among our Grit friends in Ontario, and it is hard to tell where the matter may end. Thus it has always been, when some dregs fall out of the truth becomes known. This is but a very small installment of the truth concerning the recent practices of our Grit friends at elections; but it is sufficient to prove the methods generally followed by them.

BUDGET DEBATE.

On Tuesday of last week Mr. Foster made a splendid speech in answer to the budget speech of Mr. Fielding. He gave the House a careful and apparently rigid and scientific analysis of Mr. Fielding's statements and presented much more fully than the Finance Minister, and in more exact detail, the financial situation of the country.

This seemed to be the more necessary as Mr. Fielding neglected to show the House any part of the shield, except the gold side. His comparisons were only these which reflected credit on the present ministry. His statistics were expurgated. His returns were either colored by false suggestions or by omission, so that as Mr. Foster said, any stranger who heard that speech would go away with an entirely inadequate idea of the state of affairs. The budget speech was not an exposure of the exact situation, but an appeal leading up to the endless refrain: "Is not this great Babylon that I have builded?" Mr. Foster pointed out the utter failure to explain the expenditure accounts of last year, the taxation and expenditure accounts of this year, the effect of the tariff on home prices, and foreign markets, the possible results of the Trinidad proposal, and of the additional preference now proposed, the character of the immigration and the countries from which it comes, the conditions on which the arrangements about Canadian securities as trust funds have been made, the possibilities of the beet sugar business, which is mentioned in the tariff. These explanations might reasonably be asked, but have not come.

Instead of them, we have a good deal of boasting over the fifty million dollar revenue, every boast cheered by members who used to denounce the late government for raising thirty-six millions. They have the additional expenditure slurred over amid applause in other days of an expenditure many millions lower, who denounced a cabinet of fourteen ministers, and now are satisfied with a cabinet of sixteen. Even Mr. McMillen joined in the cheering of the sixteenth minister, who holds what he formerly called "a useless department to provide a resting place for the balance of his life to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the office, and who is drawing \$7,000 a year for doing nothing." The words are Mr. McMillen's, and the office is now held by Sir Richard Cartwright, who a few weeks ago at Massey Hall stated that he was simply an onlooker on the government. "We have the best of a surplus of nearly five millions for last year and another of over seven millions this year, all applauded by ministers such as Mills, who declared in other years that every dollar of surplus was improperly taken out of the pockets of the people.

Applying to the case the words used by Sir Richard Cartwright in other years, this government is taking from the wage earners \$6,000,000 more than is right, thus fleecing from the pockets of the farmers and laboring classes more than a dollar a head every year. The total expenditure, which was \$42,000,000 in 1892, and less than that in 1896, averaged from 1892 to 1896, \$42,141,763. Immediately after the change of government this began to go up, and in 1899 reached \$51,543,000. This includes both capital and current expenditure. The current expenditure alone has increased from an average of 37 and a quarter millions in the last five years of the late government to forty-two millions in 1899, and a million more the current year. In comparing the total expenditure, Mr. Foster pointed out that Mr. Fielding, after he came in had changed the accounts of 1896 by charging to the expenditure of that year over two million dollars of an old River St. Lawrence claim which was incurred in 1892, and of which Mr. Fielding has not yet paid a single dollar. Taking the whole expenditure, it seems to this that the government had pushed up the outlay by \$500,000 the first year (during which Mr. Fielding explained that he had not full control of the finances) by \$3,182,000 the second year, by \$9,400,000 the third year, and, according to the present estimates, by \$10,908,287 in the 4th year.

The average expenditure per head for the people of Canada for the four years of 1892-1896, inclusive, was \$8.41. In 1896 it was \$8.14, then it went up to \$8.28, \$8.63, \$9.72, and for this current year up to \$10.

Mr. Fielding made an ingenious calculation to show that he had not incurred a much debt annually during the past three years as had been incurred by the late government during their term of office. But Mr. Fielding has not built a Canadian Pacific railway, and has not taken over ten million dollars of the provincial debts. What is more important he has added taxes enough to pay his whole capital expenditure. He claims that on the matter of debt he comes out \$11,000,000 better in the three years than Mr. Foster did in his last three years. But Mr. Foster shows that he has added over \$18,000,000 to the taxation in those three years, and on his own showing is therefore \$7,000,000 worse off than he ought

to be. Mr. Fielding preserves the duties on breadstuffs and on fuel which Sir Richard Cartwright not long ago declared to be "old taxes, never imposed by any civilized country."

Mr. Foster went on to show some of the increase in expenditure under this government. It costs them a third of a million more to carry the debt, seven per cent. more for justice, 23 per cent. more for arts, etc., one per cent. more for civil government, 110 per cent. more for immigration, 42 per cent. more for quarantine, 12 per cent. more for Indians, 84 per cent. more for miscellaneous, 8 per cent. more for penitentiary, 12 per cent. more for pensions, 4 per cent. more for superannuation, 16 per cent. more for customs, and so on. Accordingly, while the late government had reduced the taxation between 1890 and 1895 by six millions, this government increased the taxation between 1896 and 1900 by seven millions. The percentage of taxation on the largely increased imports was practically the same as it was six years ago, and making allowances for a change in bookkeeping, it was rather larger. The average rate of taxation on the imports for the past five years before the change of government was 17.47 per cent., and the last three years it was 17.17, and in the last two years 16.82 per cent.

But then in making up these calculations the "trade tables include among the imports for consumption, upon which the average is taken, some 16,000,000 bushels of corn worth over \$8,000,000 which is not imported for consumption at all, but is re-exported. If we count that as imports for use in Canada, adding it to the goods really used, to make the average duty paid, we naturally cut down the rate of duty, because this corn comes in free. Under the late government corn was not included in the free list, and corn exported was not put down as goods entered for consumption. If the proper correction is made the average rate of duty last year would not be 16.70 but 17.86, which is higher than the rate in 1892 or 1893, or 1894, or 1895.

Mr. Foster then took up the preferential tariff, and showed that whereas the late government imposed an average duty of 30.2 per cent. on British goods this government claimed to have taken a quarter of the duty off the most of those articles. But unfortunately we do not find the average duty cut down to 22.12 per cent. On the contrary it remains 29.52 per cent., a reduction not of seven per cent. but of the half of one per cent. Mr. Foster wants to know what is the matter with the preference tariff that it works out in this absurd way. Of course the fact is that the government put on the duty first before they took any off.

On the question of prosperity of the country Mr. Foster does not contradict the finance minister. We have no blue ruin orators now. He could have used the ancient Cartwright argument that bank discontents are the evidence of a healthy state of prosperity. The savings bank deposits are only signs of borrowed money already buried by the government in public works. But Mr. Foster does not choose to talk like this, and Sir Richard, according to Mr. Foster has found that "the sweets or office motifs the appetites of other days." Nevertheless Mr. Foster corrected the finance minister by showing that he was comparing as the trade of the country all the foreign articles that have passed through Canada in transit and had taken no account of increased values. An interesting calculation based on Bradstreet's index of prices showed that the value of goods imported or exported in 1898 would not be worth as much by 47 per cent. as if they had been moved in 1890, and that the imports and exports of 1895 at the prices of 1890 would have been worth \$238,000,000, or 17 per cent. more than the value as recorded in the returns.

"We all have pride and a sense of gratitude over this increased trade," said Mr. Foster. It is the glory and pride of the liberal conservative party that they stood firm that period of preparation while the transportation routes were organized to open up our western country and while our industries were firmly established so they could now take advantage of the growing demand and the increased prices. Had the late government maintained in power the exports from the mine would have increased from \$8,000,000, to \$18,000,000, as they have under the present government. We would have sold as much animal products and agricultural products, and Mr. Foster admits that probably the sale of fish would have fallen off no less than it did last year. That being the case, he wants to know why Mr. Fielding should waste a budget speech in trying to convince the people that this government has done it all. And if he did show it he ought to explain that this government is responsible for the fact that last year's exports were less than the year before, though Mr. Foster candidly admits that one reason for it is the lower prices for some classes of farm products. This disease has found no market that Canada did not have before. It has spent a large sum on canals, but not a single canal route has been opened for traffic that was not opened to the same depth before the change of government. They have not completed a single line of railway or opened up any country. What, then, have they done to increase trade? Mr. Don's bottle necks ships are not plugging the ocean. The most that this government can say is that its members have let undisturbed the protective policy which they denounced, used the transportation routes which they formerly ridiculed, carried on the policy of cold storage and dairy monopolies which they formerly held up to scorn.

Mr. Foster has some criticism to make of the preference tariff inasmuch as it makes no distinction of articles, giving the same cut on jewelry and gold watches, on silks and laces, as it does on the cheaper goods necessary to the subsistence of the poor. He has also some fear that it may strike the Canadian industries, but this point will be more fully discussed in the details.

Mr. Foster's speech contains probably the best collection available of

the striking declarations and promises made by ministers in other days. It is particularly happy in the commercial union deliverances of Sir Richard Cartwright, who over and over again expressed his willingness to discriminate against England, and asked England's friends that they should tell him what England had ever done for Canada to require concessions on our part. "We owe nothing to England," was Sir Richard's declaration, "except forgiveness." He went on to say that Canadians would have been better off if they had east their lot in the United States. This is not the song that Sir Richard sings now. But Mr. Foster says that the ministers sing the present song on the same principal as they did the old one. The old one was used in the hope that they might get in on it, the new one in the hope that they may stay in on it. In speaking of the party pledges, Mr. Foster described the scheme of Mr. Fisher and Sir Wilfrid Laurier when they put their plibestic plank in the platform to make the temperance people believe that they would get prohibition if the majority of them asked for it. Then Sir Wilfrid and Mr. Fisher sat down together and made a secret agreement that prohibition would not be given unless the

majority of the voters on the list should ask for it which argument they conceded from the people until after the votes were counted. In all these periods when the liberal leaders were changing the liberal conservatives remained true to their policy and platform. They remain so still, out of office as well as in office, and will continue to stand up for Canada and for imperial unity, whatever government may come or go.

Sir Richard Cartwright followed Mr. Foster, Sir Richard was in turn followed by Sir Charles Tupper on the 29th. He began by replying to Cartwright's gentlemanly suggestion that Foster's indisposition, which led him to ask for an adjournment after Fielding's speech, was only pretended. That imputation came at an unfortunate time when two of Cartwright's colleagues in the government were absent, as was stated, on account of their health, at a time when the conduct of their departments would, if they were here, be the subject of inquiry. Sir Richard had expressed pity for Foster, admitting that he had seen hard luck himself. That was true, but his hard luck was mainly due to the fact he always had a higher opinion of himself than others had. He left Sir John Macdonald's party thirty

years ago because Sir John refused to make him a minister. That was Cartwright's strike. Sir Richard contradicted this statement, and a sharp dispute occurred, Sir Charles stating that he had himself seen his letter to Sir John giving this reason for deserting his party. The opposition leader followed Cartwright's career, and gave examples of his hard luck, and his misplacement in the present ministry.

Sir Charles objected to Cartwright's charge that the workmen who sought employment in 1878 were more anxious to get drunk, and his other charge of conspiracy and lawlessness against the Orange body.

Passing from personal matters, Sir Charles took up the charge that the late government in 1896 had started the militia, and was loudly cheered when he showed that Laurier's party in Quebec had issued a campaign pamphlet attacking the Tupper government for buying arms for the soldiers. And these, said Sir Charles, are the same rifles which the war office required our soldiers to use in Africa.

Sir Charles proceeded to review the first of Cartwright's criticism of Foster's speech, and then took up some of Fielding's arguments, showing what were the elements which made up the growth of trade, and referring to the achievements of the conservative party and the gloomy predictions of Cartwright and his colleagues concerning the Canadian Pacific railway and other enterprises, some of the quotations causing much amusement. Shortly after eleven Sir Charles moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir Charles Tupper, resuming his speech on the 30th, suggested that Mr. Fielding was not too modest in claiming for himself the credit of bringing about the great steel works now building at Sydney. The Whitney Coal company was made possible by the coal duty, against which Fielding's friends and Fielding himself had fought, by the failure of Fielding to drag his province out of the union, and by the iron and steel bonnies which Fielding's friends had denounced and opposed. When Mr. Whitney contemplated the erection of steel works in Sydney and Graham Fraser of New Glasgow waited upon this government and asked for an extension of the bounty, Mr. Fielding absolutely refused. Shortly after, Sir Charles was in Cape Breton and was waited upon by the mayor and a delegation of the board of trade of Sydney. The mayor was an opponent of his, but Sir Charles Tupper told him and his friends that he did not despair of the government reconsidering its decision, and that he would himself wait upon the ministers and appeal to them. It happened, soon after, that he met Mr. Fielding and two of his colleagues at the opening of the St. John exhibition in 1898. He obtained an interview at the Royal hotel, and went with the ministers over the whole matter. They were induced to reconsider their refusal.

Mr. Fielding—"Reconsider!" Sir Charles Tupper—"Yes, because they have reconsidered."

Mr. Fielding—"Would the honorable gentleman give his authority for the statement that we refused?" Sir Charles—"Certainly, Mr. Whitney himself is my authority. The ministers undertook to inform him (Sir Charles) of their conclusions. They did not do so, and when Mr. Fielding made his budget speech there was nothing about bounties. Once more Sir Charles pressed the matter on the government, and finally the bounty was extended. He could forgive Mr. Fielding for the delay, because Sir Richard Cartwright was beside him, steadily opposing the bounty, and he could not forgive Mr. Fielding that the government would be stultified if after denouncing the bounty they should adopt it."

Taking up the general question of Fielding's preference, Sir Charles showed that in the last three years, as compared with the previous three, Canadian purchases from the United States increased on an average of over twenty-two million a year, while the purchases from Great Britain decreased one million. He met Mr. Fielding's charge that he (Tupper) declared in 1897 that the Fielding tariff would destroy Canadian industries by pointing out that the manufacturers themselves protested against the original tariff and caused him to make some fifty changes in it. Secondly, the original Fielding tariff gave reciprocal rates to all countries and no preference to England. It was a Cobden model tariff, whereas the present tariff is one which, as the Cobden club president said, would have made it impossible to give Laurier the medal. The Trinidad resolution of Mr. Fielding met Sir Charles's approval. And the fact that it was necessary showed that the speaker was right when he predicted the failure of the previous West Indian tariff clauses.

Sir Charles went into the history of the movement for a mutual preference, showing that this was no Canadian demand for a quid pro quo. On the contrary, the policy originated in England and was first promoted by English public men, not in the interests of Canada, but of the whole empire. Following the history down to Laurier's declaration that he would send a commission to London to negotiate, he asked the premier if he did not consider that he was in 1897 invited to make proposals for an inter-imperial arrangement. Laurier did not answer.

Reading Sir Wilfrid's statement in England that Canada did not want a preference, Sir Charles asked whether Laurier believed he was correctly stating the opinion of Canada.

Sir Charles argued that the imperial authorities in the jubilee year sought from the colonial premiers suggestions as to an imperial trade arrangement. The other premiers were disposed to put forward suggestions, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the first premier to say that his colony wanted no preference, though he had solemnly promised the Canadian people that he would ask for such a preference. Of course there was nothing more to be said after the prime minister of the colony most interested had spoken. In closing, Sir Charles referred to Fielding's claim that his budget story was the story among other things of Canadians defending the empire in foreign lands, and observed that this government could hardly claim exclusive credit for that. He called three witnesses, the premier himself, Dr. Rossell and the Bourassa-Monnet group, who agreed that the course was forced upon

the government by public sentiment. Bourassa, Monnet and Angers denouncing Sir Charles Tupper himself as the author of the amendment of which Mr. Foster gave notice the other day. Sir Charles closed with the following correction of Mr. Fielding's peroration. "It is the story of a party who glorify the federation they did their utmost to obstruct."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."

"It is the story of a party who opposed sending a Canadian contingent to aid England in South Africa until forced by their opponents to do so and now claim the entire credit to themselves."

"It is the story of a party who have violated every pledge they gave to the country when seeking power."

"It is the story of a party who avowed the policy of promoting trade with the mother country and changed the tariff as to cause a diminution of the imports of England in three years of more than three per cent. and an increase of imports from the United States of over 37 per cent. in the same period."