

W. F. MACLEAN'S WEXFORD SPEECH

(REPRINTED FROM THE WORLD OF AUGUST 4.)

W. F. Maclean, M.P., addressed his speech on the events of the recent session of parliament. The meeting was in the hall along side the Wexford church. John Martin was in the chair. Mr. Maclean spoke as follows:

Since old Homer tells of Ulysses weary of the siege of Troy, longing to see the smoke curl up from his own hearth at home, in the same way am I glad after the storm and stress of the last session at Ottawa to find myself here again and among the faces of friends, back again here in Ontario, where men have opinions and are not afraid to express them, and where it is not considered a crime to fight for public rights, for the unity of the nation, for the maintenance of civil and religious equality across a continent.

Ontario Men Told to Sit Back.

The political air at Ottawa is not the same, but stilling. Conservatives from this province are told at the capital that they must not have opinions, that from the Maritime Provinces and Quebec will tell them what to think and what to do and that the only hope of coming into control of the affairs of Dominion is by accepting the views and supporting the views of the Province of Quebec, and by suppressing, nay, by denying, the views and principles that in this Province of Ontario have been held into our body and into our bones. If a member of parliament goes from this riding of South York, or from anywhere in Ontario, and boldly says at Ottawa that he is for the separation of church and state, that he upholds the right of new provinces to make their own school laws free of federal or other outside dictation, he is at once put down as a narrow-minded, bigoted, yellow, and worst of all unconstitutional. Somehow all the Conservatives, or most of the Conservatives, members of parliament, but all the orders, all the telling what you are to do, and most of all what you are not to do, comes from Nova Scotia, where not one Conservative was elected, or from Quebec, where only a few were elected and where only one of these few dared to vote for freedom and to defend for the constitution and what is of still more consequence for the right.

Tupper-Graham Rule.

Ever since the defeat of the Conservative party in 1896, nay, rather since the Tupper-Graham rule, the younger in Canada, that remedial legislation should be forced through parliament restoring separate schools in Manitoba, the Conservative party has been ruled by the Tupper and the Graham. A paper whose owner, Hugh Graham, is to be credited more with other men than with the defeat of 1896, 1900 and 1904, and whose recent escape in connection with Dr. Russell, Andrew Blair and La Presse newspaper in the month of October last, furnishes one of the most grotesque and at the same time most disgraceful episodes in Canadian history, an episode wherein these men undertook to juggle and deal with the Conservatives of this province as if they were pawns in a game. They concocted a scheme to put the Grits out and the Tories in that reads like a crazy man's invention. But it was based on money, on buying and selling, on bribery, on treachery and on keeping the Conservatives of Ontario or the most of the party in Ontario ignorant of the plot. The thing ended in a miserable fiasco, but ended in a number of men who professed to be Conservatives passing into the power of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He has them at his mercy now, and having them at his mercy they are forced to dance as he tells them and to pipe as he plays. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was emboldened to play the game he did on the autonomy bills by reason of the cards he held against the Conservatives of Ontario, and I have never seen such good material so badly handled as has happened since the death of Sir John Macdonald. A little ring of discredited men have managed to keep at the helm, and to dictate any line of action, rather to chloroform every line of action proposed. They do not believe in principles, they do not believe in high-class, open organization, in a great national convention of Conservatives to readjust and review their principles in the light of progress, but are for clique rule by clique methods and insidious attack on those who are for bigger, wider and cleaner play.

Story of the Autonomy Bills.

And I say I would not be doing my duty to you if I did not tell you that this was the state and condition of the Conservative party at Ottawa last spring when Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced his bills giving autonomy, denying autonomy rather, to the new provinces of the west. He proposed in the most brazen way and in a way contrary to all the opinions that the people of Canada outside of Quebec held, and in defiance of his speeches and conduct in connection with the attempt of Sir Charles Tupper to coerce Manitoba in 1894, to coerce in even more drastic way the two new provinces of the west in the matter of education. Separate schools were to be forced on them; right

which I hold the constitution gave them to frame their own educational policy was denied and the great Liberal party, that party which had once professed to vindicate provincial rights and especially provincial rights in the matter of education, that had, leader and following, repudiated coercion in 1894, in 1904 declared for the very opposite.

The Opposition Lost Its Chance.

Yet in the face of this declaration of a policy of coercion at the first reading of the bill the leader of the opposition, I regret to say, had no opinion to offer. Instead of immediately challenging Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his departure from principle, instead of denouncing the measure and seeking to rouse the country from one end to the other, weeks elapsed before anyone knew what the policy of Mr. Borden was or what he intended to do. But there were some of us who made a fight and I have no hesitation in saying that the attack made by your member on a certain Monday on the government measure and on Mr. Sifton in particular was effective enough to have him out of the cabinet on the day following, and the statement made in the house that all the Liberal members from Manitoba and the Territories, some 14 out of a total of 20 members, were behind Sifton in repudiating the drastic character of the educational clauses. Here was a chance if ever there was one. It was lost. Had the attack that some of us had made so successfully on Sifton been followed by another on Fielding in the same way, and I tried to make it, we would have had him and the Nova Scotia Liberals out and Laurier hopelessly involved and forced to abandon coercion. I was treated to a good deal of insult at this time from certain Conservative politicians and belittled, derided or ignored by certain professed Conservative papers, by a class of politicians and class of papers that apparently would sooner see Conservatives fall than that they should win under any move that happened to be made by an Ontario man or in sympathy with Ontario opinion. As I said, the chance was lost.

Sir Wilfrid Makes Promises.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, never so helpless, took heart again, negotiated a new school clause with his western members and solidified his entire following by the most widespread promise of rewards for support ever known in our history. The coercion of Saskatchewan and Alberta was to be bought with seniorships and governmentships, with grants, with extravagances in public money, with offices for those members who were about to testify themselves and therefore dare not seek re-election, and above all, and I intend to go into that very fully in a moment, by the direct promise of an increased pension for members and a pension for ministers if they should see coercion through.

And through it mainly went. Laurier got his forces all repaired, the cheering and the cheering for him was under way again and when at last Mr. Borden made a deliverance it was too late and, worst of all, too weak.

People Expected More of Borden.

It was a constitutional argument he offered, not one of policy, not what was best for the west. He seemed to be surrounded by advisers who thought he should deliver himself in a double way, in a way that could be construed favorably in Quebec, and favorably also but contrariwise in the west. I do not say he did that, he eventually declared against coercion, but when it was too late, and when he did declare earned for himself the opinion in Quebec that he never did, and in Ontario the opinion that the man who hesitates is lost. The people may be moved when a lion roars, not always when a lawyer talks.

And now I want to make good my charge that the indemnities, the salaries, the pensions were the price of coercion. You remember the unsuccessful attempt to force remedial legislation as it was called, separate schools as a matter of fact, upon Manitoba in 1898. And you all know of the successful effort of the session last closed to impose separate schools upon the new Province of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Let us now carefully review, in the light of those two events, these increased indemnities voted by parliament to members, the pensions provided for ministers, the salary for the leader of the opposition and the increased salary for the prime minister.

Both Parties For More Indemnity.

The autonomy bills, as I have already told you, were introduced very early in the session of this year and were only got through after a struggle of four or five months. Long before they were passed and shortly after the Sifton and western bolt, those of us in the house got to hear that the Liberal rank and file of the commons were insisting on an increase in indemnity going with the passage of the bill. We got to know that Sir Wilfrid by himself or someone for him must have promised a reward for putting the bills through, but we also were able to see that the government was anxious to have the grab endorsed by the opposition before it would consent, and wherever you went about the buildings or wherever the question came up for discussion between individuals the hint was always thrown out that the government was supporting a demand for an increase of the indemnity by \$1000 and by insinuating that this increase was the price of their putting the government measure through. Supporters of the government got in among the members of the opposition and pointed out to them what a drain the long session was upon them and suggested that they too move on the line of an increased indemnity for whatever reasons they saw fit to give, but that they themselves were going to insist on it at all events. Round robins were accordingly signed on each side of the house and other steps taken toward a demand for increased indemnity. The reason given by the Liberals to their chiefs was to the effect that they had

voted the autonomy bills through and must have the money and that they had been promised it; and by Conservatives who signed the round robin that the autonomy bills had taken up a lot of time and made a long session and therefore they wanted the additional money. So in the light of what we see today it is well within reason to say that the increased indemnities and salaries and pensions were rewards to those who either had succeeded in imposing separate schools upon the two new provinces, or to those who had assisted in the attempt to force remedial legislation on Manitoba in '98. Let me make this clear by a personal analysis:

The Men Who Got The Grab.

The Liberal members voted the school clauses through and got \$1000 additional for themselves. They took the position at \$1500 a year; they jumped it the first session of a new parliament to \$2500 because of the autonomy bills; they have at least a fair prospect of \$10,000 more each before a dissolution. This costs the country \$200,000 a year for ever. Coercion comes high.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who pretended to fight the battle of the people of Manitoba in '98 as against remedial legislation, but who introduced, as we have seen, the autonomy bills into parliament in 1905, had his indemnity increased from \$1500 to \$2500, his salary increased from \$8000 to \$12,000 and a retiring pension for life of \$6000 a year provided for him.

Sir Charles Tupper, who took charge of the Manitoba remedial in '98 and his son, Sir Herbert Tupper, who issued the notorious remedial order directing Manitoba to concede separate schools, got the one a pension of \$4000 a year and the other a pension of \$4000 a year for life.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell, also a father of the remedial bill, gets a pension of \$4000 a year and an increased indemnity of \$1000, in all \$5000 a year for life.

John J. Haggart, Hon. G. E. Foster and Hon. John Coetzee, all members of the Bowell or Tupper cabinets, who left the Laurier government by reason of the school clauses in the autonomy bills, and who subsequently turned around and swallowed the whole measure, gets a life pension of \$3500 a year and an indemnity of \$1000, in all \$4500 a year for life.

And the Hon. Mr. Fielding, minister of finance, we all know threatened Sir Wilfrid to leave his government if he persisted in a policy of coercion. Mr. Fielding was away from Ottawa at the time the bill was drafted, and his return to the capital was on the eve of the introduction of the bill. It was supposed that all the maritime members were with him, and everybody knows how he fired Nova Scotia in '98 as against the coercion policy of Sir Charles Tupper and that he denounced Mr. Borden, who was then for the first time a candidate, for the speeches he made in defence of the remedial bill. Mr. Fielding is the ablest member of Sir Wilfrid's cabinet and the reputation of being a very poor man. I would be the last to say that the pension had any weight with him and yet the fact remains that in some way Mr. Fielding was persuaded to abandon his record and to join the ranks of the coercionists. His speech in favor of coercion delivered a few weeks ago is one of the curiosities of Canadian politics, viewed in the light of his old deliverances on the same subject. Did he, too, stoop?

Sir William Mulock, Sir Richard Cartwright, the Hon. William Patterson and the Hon. Sir Frederick Borden, all of whom in 1898 opposed remedial legislation, but who this year voted for the imposing of separate schools upon the new provinces, have pensions of \$3500 a year provided for them when they retire, and seasonal indemnity in addition of \$2000 as long as they remain in the house or senate, concurrent with a ministerial salary of \$7000 a year besides.

What have these pensions have wrought in the minds and records of all these Liberal ministers who once swore against coercion?

Of those remaining to whom money was voted there are only Messrs. Scott, Blair, Fitzpatrick, Fisher and R. L. Borden. Of these Fisher, Scott and Fitzpatrick all favored the remedial bill and separate schools. Mr. Borden, the leader of the opposition, defended the remedial bill in '98 when he was a candidate for parliament, and only opposed the school clauses in 1905 because he thought they were unconstitutional. He gets \$5000 a year "additional indemnity." So that the remarkable fact is presented to the people of Canada that everyone with the exception of Mr. Blair, to whom the money votes apply, Laurier, Borden, ministers and ex-ministers were friends in the past or in the remedial legislation of '98 or of forcing separate schools upon the provinces of the Northwest in 1905. So also that the solid mass of the Liberal party in the house and of some of the Conservatives who voted for increased indemnities were friends in the past or in the present of the educational coercion of the Northwest. Not one man who has a record of straight opposition to coercion is recognized in the pensions or salary scheme. I am, therefore, speaking well within the mark when I say that all this money that parliament voted was voted as a reward for the betrayal

of the educational rights of Manitoba in 1890, or Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1905. Those who care to look farther can find the historical parallel. But there is still more to be said. This salary and indemnity grab was engineered after a consultation or conference between representatives of both parties, and as far as can be learned there is not one man who took part in the conference or conference who had not been a friend either of remedial legislation in 1898 or in 1905, and what is more, practically every man who took part in the conference either of Liberals or Conservatives, is a direct beneficiary other than by way of indemnity out of the four hundred thousand dollars a year that has been appropriated forever for this purpose. Not only is a system of separate schools forced upon the new provinces, but the men who wrought this iniquity have voted themselves over \$400,000 a year for life or forever in salaries, pensions and indemnities as a recognition of their treacherous and unconstitutional act, and it is also notorious that the parties of the representatives of the two parties who joined in the conference which decided to push the grab thru the house is a direct beneficiary thereof other than by way of increased indemnity.

Mr. Maclean's Personal Views.

And now, having discussed the special features of the indemnities on a great public question let me give my own views in regard to these payments. I have no objection to the prime minister of Canada getting \$12,000 a year. I also believe that provision should be made for a modest retiring allowance to ministers of the crown. In my judgment, \$1500 a year ought to be at the disposal of any minister of the crown after reasonable service, who on retiring from the door of any ordinary citizen of Canada.

As for the payment to the leader of the opposition the government, too, must take the responsibility there. I said in the house that I thought it was contrary to the constitution, but when Mr. Borden, by silence, admitted that he acquiesced in the vote it was not for me to cry down at the time what he and the government had agreed to do concerning himself. My protest is on broader grounds, on grounds that I present to you, electors, who have chosen me as your member, and present to you now, the proper time. As to the matter of indemnities, that to my mind is largely a domestic question, if I may so term it between the member and his constituents and between the member and the government of the day. If a man thinks time will not cover his expenses in representing his fellow-citizens, he ought to tell them so, and ask them for their approval to have it increased. And as between myself and my fellow-member, if he says to me that \$1500 will not pay his expenses, I have no right to prevent him in getting what he thinks is fair payment. But it is the government of the day that should assume the responsibility of settling this question. They have to assume the responsibility of all other public expenditure and they ought also in this matter. They should not ask the opposition to share in the responsibility, and the opposition is foolish where it consents to be so involved.

Why He Did Not Take the Money.

And therefore while I, as a private member, decline to do the allowance that members think they are entitled to, I have no hesitation in saying that I refuse to assume any responsibility for the salary grab that was made in the closing days of the session. I don't think it was my duty in this case to make any special protest in the house, as some of the papers are trying to make out. I had a more important point to make, and at last I have succeeded in making it, and it is this, that coercion was carried by collusion in connection with indemnities and that the members of the government must take all the responsibility. Coercion and the salary grab were interwoven that I saw fit on my own account and for reasons which you can now divine to refuse to sign any round robin asking for increased indemnity, and when it was passed saw to turn over the money to hospital purposes when it came into my hands. It was money got in barter for the freedom of the west, the price of people sold into the slavery of the Province of Quebec. If I did not speak out in the house, I had a conscience that the proposition was not mine in any shape or form, and I reserved my right to define my own position in my own way to a job that by joint arrangement was being rushed thru the house in the dying hours of the session. Many a protest made by me in the past has met with a contemptuous scorn. I do not hand over to the Globe or the Liberals or to those who profited by the grab to say how I shall oppose it and when I must file my protest against it. A fighting man likes to choose, when he can, his time and fighting ground. It is not me who am on trial; but the men who concocted and accepted these benevolences themselves. The people of Canada will yet pass judgment on all these men, who, when delivery of the rights of the people of the west to Quebec was being placed, agreed to accept money from the conquerors for the time it had taken them to carry thru a law to that effect.

A Blow at Opposition.

And now let me come to another phase of the present peculiar situation in the Canadian parliament and which has arisen out of this attack on the rights of what should be free provinces, and on this wholesale distribution of indemnities, salaries and pensions. Not only are the Liberals determined to force the government of the country, to pass the laws, to administer all our public affairs, but they are attempting a revolution in our constitutional system by endeavoring to control the opposition and dictate its organization. They seek to make the op-

position and its chief an appendage, a mere tail of the government machine. They have, so they say, provided him with a salary, and the man or party who vote or provides the salary is generally considered to be master. The government has undertaken to be his guardian angel to provide a salary for him, they have afforded him special recognition, and what is a constitutional departure, they are undertaking by the most active kind of manipulation to name and maintain a chief of the opposition by the picking a chief of the opposition of the Liberal party, so far as they can judge and provide, who will be as well disposed as possible to them, their legislation and their past, and to compel the crown to recognize when a change takes place the man they've designated by salary. If the Liberals of the Province of Quebec can manage it, never will a man come into the premiership who has been pronounced and a consistent opponent of their educational coercion of the Canadian west. We have got coercion and now the opposition is to be manipulated from a coercion point of view. Concurrent with this there is another marked change, and that is of government by arrangement between parties between interests. Nearly everything now is arranged beforehand.

Opposition Should Be Independent.

I must protest against this making the leader of the opposition what is practically an appointee, certainly a payee, of the government of the day. It is not good for opposition to have a leader paid by the government. Let the party pay a leader if he must be recouped, and he ought to be recouped. But many a good leader has served many a worthy cause without money. A leader must be like Jacob, who must serve for the hope of Rebecca. Those who signed the American Declaration of Independence used these famous words: "and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance upon the Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." They were not looking for indemnities. To serve the state without reward is, or ought to be, still the highest ambition. The greatest things in art, and the greatest services to mankind were done without salary. Perhaps the last redeeming thing in our political life is that there is one man who is willing to labor and to wait. Now he is to disappear and at a time and in a way that must make us pause. Furthermore, an opposition should have more than one leader. It should not be so highly organized as to be a machine of one man power. An opposition should be free, should be open to all, each one free to fly his own kite in the hope that someone will fly one that will catch the people's eye. To organize it under one man is to destroy it. A government must be organized and dominated by one man; an opposition should be organized with the greatest freedom and open to all strengthening and shaping influences. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has decided to organize the opposition, to pay its leader a salary, to indicate as far as he can what man is to succeed him when his government has got out. I said in the house that this was the privilege of the crown and I declare to you today that this making the opposition into a machine with only one head and that head recognized by a government salary is in the beginning of an unhappy change in our public affairs. A opposition under the wing of the government is the end of party government.

In conclusion, I did not take the additional indemnity of \$1000 because I am convinced it was voted as a reward to the supporters of coercion, not because the sessions are longer, or that I have not the slightest doubt.

Things the People Should Know.

Some men will say when they read what I have said to you to-night that I am attacking Conservatives; I do not know that I am. I know that it is high time that the Conservatives of Ontario and all the people of Ontario should know what surprising and unwelcome things took place at Ottawa in this last session, what serious changes have been made in the government of the day, and that the Conservatives of Ontario should know that in some way men who also profess to be Conservatives are, especially at Ottawa, ashamed of the views of Ontario Conservatives on the greatest question that concerns our public affairs. We do not deserve the term of being either bigoted or narrow-minded. And I do not think Ontario Conservatives need be ashamed of the views that some of us have upheld at Ottawa during the session as are as right as they are eternal but that later will triumph thruout Canada.

Letters of Encouragement.

Mr. Maclean closed by reading the following letter received yesterday, one of many that he had of late, and saying that letters of this kind did more to strengthen him than anything else. Here is the letter:

Stouffville Aug. 2.

W. F. Maclean, M.P., Toronto.

My dear sir: I would be glad to receive a copy of the report of the select committee of inquiry into the telephone system of Canada. I am much interested in municipal and government ownership. The federal government's move in this direction is a distinct tribute to the mould of public opinion over the money to hospital purposes when it came into my hands. It was money got in barter for the freedom of the west, the price of people sold into the slavery of the Province of Quebec. If I did not speak out in the house, I had a conscience that the proposition was not mine in any shape or form, and I reserved my right to define my own position in my own way to a job that by joint arrangement was being rushed thru the house in the dying hours of the session. Many a protest made by me in the past has met with a contemptuous scorn. I do not hand over to the Globe or the Liberals or to those who profited by the grab to say how I shall oppose it and when I must file my protest against it. A fighting man likes to choose, when he can, his time and fighting ground. It is not me who am on trial; but the men who concocted and accepted these benevolences themselves. The people of Canada will yet pass judgment on all these men, who, when delivery of the rights of the people of the west to Quebec was being placed, agreed to accept money from the conquerors for the time it had taken them to carry thru a law to that effect.

Your valuable service to Canada as chairman of the people's rights is of inestimable value and is fully appreciated by the folk minded. On the other hand, we have men of your fearless stamp and independence of thought and action in parliament, and may you long be spared to help to serve your country in its profound wish.

Pardon this outburst of commendation, but I believe in expressing appreciation, when public men serve well their constituents. Yours very truly,

Mr. Maclean announced that he would hold a meeting on the other side of the city at an early date whereat he would discuss the relation of the two parties in Canadian politics to the great corporations and corporation lawlessness.

Wrapping Papers

In All Grades and Qualities

MADE BY
THE E. B. EDDY CO., Limited, : Hull, Canada
For All Trades and Users.
SEND YOUR ORDERS DIRECT OR TO THEIR
TORONTO BRANCH: 4 to 8 FROM T STREET WEST

Coal and Wood

HIGHEST QUALITY AT LOWEST MARKET PRICE.
ORDER FROM NEAREST BRANCH OFFICE.

735 Yonge Street.
342 Yonge Street.
200 Wellesley Street.
Corner Spadina and College.
163 Queen West.
Corner College and Ossington.
139 Dundas Street.
Toronto Junction.

DOCKS.
Foot of Church Street.
YARDS.
Subway, Queen Street West.
Corner Balfour and
Dufferin Streets.
C.P.R. Tracks.
Vine Avenue.
Toronto Junction.

The Conger Coal Co., Limited

Head Office, 6 King Street East.

Telephone Main 4015.

THE ELIAS ROGERS CO., LIMITED
Established 1856.
Celebrated Lehigh Valley Coal.

P. BURNS & CO'Y
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL
COAL AND WOOD MERCHANTS
TORONTO, CAN.
LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONES MAIN 131 AND 132.

Office and Yard: Princess-st. Dock—Telephone, Main 190. Office and Yard: Corner Front and Bathurst-sts.—Telephone Main 440. Branch Offices:

426 1/2 YONGE STREET—Telephone Main 828.
672 QUEEN STREET WEST—Telephone Main 139.
504 QUEEN STREET EAST—Telephone Main 134.
429 SPADINA AVENUE—Telephone Main 210.
1312 QUEEN STREET WEST—Telephone Main 711.
274 COLLEGE STREET—Telephone North 1179.
124 1/2 QUEEN STREET WEST—Telephone Main 1400.

COAL AND WOOD

At Lowest Market Prices.

W. McGILL & CO

Head Office and Yard Branch Yard Branch Yard

Cor. Bathurst and Farley Av. 429 Queen St. W. 1143 Yonge St

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.

Phone North 1135.