

MR. CHARLTON'S SPEECH.

ZETTE, Montreal, Friday, February 13, 1891.

VENUE.
of customs duties,
which we collect
coming from the
point admitted by
tariff. There is
merchandise would
a, and we should
is means, another
00. How should
common, an ex-
the other day, in
world to the speech
of the Young
Thomson accuses
a part of the
tint that direct
and inevitable
reciprocity. It
quote, in such a
facts from Mr.
one passage, he

Charlton's speech.
it as a fact, ad-
on several occa-
reciprocity would
at least, \$14,
on please, whether
written agree with
former admits that
but he appears to
e Globe says, we
the substitution of
and and the Old
ca. If American
on enter into anse-
mean mere anse-
when English
indie could not
30 or 40 per
merican merchandise
to such an extent,
to the \$14,000,000
Federal Treasury?
is at fault, in this
e, Mr. Charlton
with him in the
which he presented
possible that the
p, by unrestricted
ake up much
sustained by
if \$14,000,000,
one between the
e of Mr. Charlton,
from the customs
e sense to affirm
and scale would be
of unrestricted re-
ed Mr. Mackenzie,
direct taxation on
taxation on a grand

son's letter was
who offer a pro-
on on a grand
no, reasonably
th them, unless
or direct taxation
Dominion Govern-
ing, neither in-
derstand that the
00,000 by a direct
of Mr. Charlton
as a simple ad-
dicted reciprocity,
us, who then the
et. taxation on a
ously and ener-
the people by the
on Federal Gov-
rison, which I be-
Nalvern, in 1887,
not want direct
he wish in sup-
ptions, who then
not vigorously
ing that it is the
revenue?"

I plans frank-
by a Liberal.
the honesty of
t at the Windsor
be, in stating
consequences?
be blindfolded?
of the Globe it
of the Liberal

commercial relations between the United States and Canada."

The following year Sir Charles Tupper made a new appeal to the Americans, and in the course of his financial exposition in the House of Commons, he spoke as follows:—"I need not recall to the House, that both parties, whether in power or not, have been exceedingly anxious to obtain a renewal of the treaty of 1854, or commercial relations similar to those which Canada and the United States enjoyed under the treaty. The House knows that we have not only made efforts to obtain a re-establishment of a reciprocity treaty, in the shape of a treaty, but we have also tried to establish more liberal commercial relations between Canada and the United States, requesting the latter to grant the same as ourselves in relation to certain articles. The articles do not comprise all those that the reciprocity treaty embraced, but since 1849 Canada, before Confederation, had adopted this clause which has been reinscribed in every change of the tariff act up to the present time. The object of this proceeding was to direct the attention of our American neighbors to the fact that we were anxious to have freer commercial relations between the two countries."

Thus, almost every year, we addressed the United States, either by direct invitation or by a notice in the tariff, to manifest our good intentions, and we believe the American Government would have responded to it if the intervention of interested politicians had not created an agitation in the United States.

THE LATEST ATTEMPT.

Finally, on the 13th December last, the Government of Lord Stanley made a final appeal to President Harrison and it remains for us to hope that it will have greater success than its predecessors. In short, if you wish to judge the value of Mr. Laurier's plan of unrestricted reciprocity, listen to what was said about it a few days ago at a banquet given to Sir Richard Cartwright by the Boston Board of Trade, by Mr. Lane, vice-president of that association:—

"It would be but a small matter for the United States to abandon some \$6,000,000 that we now collect for duty on the products of Canada."

as means, as to be able to relieve from his revenue duty the products of American manufactures of all kinds, which would replace in a large proportion the importations from other countries. Such is the grave financial responsibility that the Canadian Liberals are about to assume; are not all the advantages all on our side?"

THE INEVITABLE RESULT.

All the advantages on the side of the Americans. Why should they not desire such a reciprocity? The project of unrestricted reciprocity will lead with fatal celerity to annexation. As to commercial union it means annexation whenever the Americans desire it. It may, perhaps, be rash to say that the Ontario Liberals wish to become a portion of the American Union. Mr. Mackenzie is squarely opposed to it. As for Mr. Blake he has declared that he has no more ardent desire than to live and die under the British flag. Mr. Charlton is a native American, and is suspected of annexationist tendencies. Sir Richard Cartwright has made no declaration, but it is at least singular to see him, without official position, intruding against his Government with American politicians. If we have justifiable doubts on the aims of the Grits, we cannot ignore the secret hopes of the Rouges of all shades. The Union Liberals, of Quebec, printed the following on 31st January last,

pect that should cool the ardor of the numerous Liberal aspirants to public life.

THE ATTRACTION OF CAPITAL.

The great Liberal argument is that annexation would attract American capital in our direction. This is a pretension that is somewhat problematical. Capital has no prejudices, no prepossessions. It goes any place where there is a prospect of placing itself to advantage. It is English gold that has built a portion of the American railroads, that has taken up Turkish and Spanish loans, etc. We offered the Americans the chance of constructing the Northern railroad, to subscribe to the Mercier loan. Do you think that if they had seen any advantage in them that they would not have taken hold of them? No; they were not willing to accept a moderate interest and they refused the offer. But when it is a paying affair that we offer them they are always ready. This is the reason they work our forests so well and that we see so many Americans among the lumber merchants of Ottawa. I maintain that if we had had annexation instead of Confederation in 1867, the Northern railroad and most of the other railroads of the province would never have been constructed.

THE WEIGHT OF TAXATION.

In reality, under the American regime, the state governments receive no subsidy from the central government and it would have been impossible to have collected by direct taxation the necessary sums for the construction of this road. Accordingly, from the point of view of material interests, the benefits of annexation are problematical, and from a sentimental point of view it is impossible to perceive any. In this connection it will be our system of education, the support of our clergy, our institutions in general, that would be menaced; and we would risk losing that which has cost us fifty years' struggles and sacrifices.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION.

These two words recall matters of a quite different nature, whether we refer to Quebec or Ottawa. From the moment when it is a question of the financial administration of the Mercier regime, one cannot avoid thinking of the anarchy that reigns in the beyond all proportion with the revenue and deficit upon deficit. Financial administration at Ottawa signifies: surpluses of four, of three, five and six millions of revenue over the expenses; construction of immense public works; order and economy in the expenditure of public funds.

WHAT EXPERIENCE SHOWS.

The Liberals wish to replace the Conservatives at Ottawa. Sensible people among the Liberals say: May Heaven save us from such an infatuation, for we know what would happen with the contents of the Federal strong box! It would soon close on emptyness! Canada already knows by experience the result of a Liberal administration at Ottawa. The Mackenzie regime has been known in history as the era of deficits. In order to show the relative value of the two administrations, let us place the table of revenue and expenditure from 1868 to 1889 inclusive:—

Year	Revenue	Expenditure
1868	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1869	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1870	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1871	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1872	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1873	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1874	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1875	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1876	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1877	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1878	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1879	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1880	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1881	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1882	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1883	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1884	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1885	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1886	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1887	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1888	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000
1889	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000

by Mr. Shehyn at the last session—a speech which has just been published, and which any person can procure. At page 13 we come upon two small tables, which throw a sad light on the financial administration at Quebec. These tables have been prepared by the Treasurer himself. It is himself who presents them. And these tables constitute the most crushing accusation against the Mercier Government. Mr. Shehyn commences by giving a statement of ordinary receipts for three years—

1888, 1889, 1890.	—
1888 Ordinary receipts.....	\$ 3,738,338 39
1889 " " " " " " " "	3,627,332 26
1890 " " " " " " " "	3,525,485 79

\$10,902,656 98
Let us hasten to state that we do not accept these figures. We will show in an instant that they are inexact. But we take the tables just as they are presented by the Treasurer, and each person will be convinced that the statement above indicates a progressive decline of receipts. Three millions seven hundred, three millions six hundred thousand, three millions five hundred thousand. A falling revenue! Let us examine the expenditure. Mr. Shehyn furnishes us this statement:—

1888. Ordinary expenditure.....	\$ 3,365,033 80
1889 " " " " " " " "	3,643,618 64
1890 " " " " " " " "	3,831,673 96

\$10,790,323 95
This statement shows clearly the disagreeable fact of an increase in expenditure. Three millions three hundred thousand, three millions five hundred thousand, three millions eight hundred thousand. An increasing expenditure! So it is Mr. Shehyn himself who pompously announces it.

Since 1887 the receipts have diminished each year, and each year the expenditure has increased. All the world state that we have invented nothing, by looking at page 13 of the speech on the budget, delivered by the Treasurer on the 5th December last. On one hand a diminution of revenue, on the other increase of expenditure. Can this be called good administration? Is it not on the contrary the most abominably careless administration that is possible to imagine, and it is admitted by the Treasurer himself. Now, let us rectify that which ought to be rectified. Mr. Shehyn has given up his little tables in order to fabricate another surplus, by taking three years operations, instead of confining himself to the transactions of the year 1889-90 where he was obliged to admit a deficit. Taking the total of the three years, then, Mr. Shehyn says: "The amount of the ordinary expenditure is less than the receipts and shows a surplus for the three years of \$12,333,43." But in the figures \$10,902,656 of receipts for the three years, Mr. Shehyn persists in including \$500,000 of arrearages for tax of the commercial corporations tax and of the province of Ontario. This sum must be subtracted. It is the Treasurer himself who imposed this rule at page 303 of the debate of 1887, where he says: "In financial year in question we have received \$54,110.86 of arrearages of interest on the subsidies granted by the Federal Government for the construction of the railroad from Quebec to Ottawa." This sum is a receipt on which we cannot properly count for another year; it must be eliminated from the ordinary receipts.

We therefore subtract this \$500,000 conformably to Mr. Shehyn's own opinion:

Ordinary receipts of 1888, 1889 and 1890 mentioned by the Treasurer.....	\$10,902,656 98
Less \$500,000 of arrearages.....	500,000
Total receipts.....	\$10,402,656 98

Now, we have on many occasions main-