



MEN'S AND YOUTH'S NATTY SUITS

We have something very natty in Men's Brown Suits, also Black and Blue. The price runs from **\$12.00 to \$22.00**. We also have some Black and Blue, also Brown, the prices of which run from **\$9.00 to \$11.00**. We carry more stock nicer patterns and sell more suits than any store in town. The reason is this, we have 17 years experience in the manufacturing of clothing, we buy the Best we sell at a living profit, a man once with us never leaves us. We don't fear **T. EATON'S** for one moment, we have **EATONS** skinned a mile, not on cheap goods, but on Reliable honest goods. We have people tell us every day that our Children's suits can't be beat any where. What everybody says must be true. Give us a call.

L. B. McMURDO, NEWCASTLE

Now is the time to get your Supplies for Spring HOUSE CLEANING

Whitewash, Kalsomine, Scrubbing Brushes and Brooms. Whiting, Kalsomine, Alabastine, Liquid Veneer, Metal Polish, Gold Dust, Klenszine, Old Dutch Cleanser, Asepto, Pearline, White Wave, Sapolio, Bon Ami, etc., etc. CHURCH'S ALABASTINE, 40c per pkg.

GEO STABLES. THE PEOPLE'S GROCER.



Have You Seen Our Spring Goods.

If not, call and inspect them. They are here and no finer stock of woolsens was ever shown on the North Shore. They comprise all the latest productions. Now is the best time to leave your order, while the stock is complete.

P. RUSSELL,
Fish Building, Pleasant Street, Merchant Tailor

Ladies' Cash Store

REMOVAL SALE.

Entire stock of
Shirt Waists at Cost.
HOSIERY and UNDERWEAR at prices to suit everybody.
CALL AND SEE.

Mrs. S. McLeod, Newcastle, N. B.

The Union Advocate

from now until Jan. 1st, 1910

FOR 50 CENTS.

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY L. O. L.

Met in Newcastle Orange Hall on
Monday Night With Good
Attendance.

The Northumberland County
Orange Lodge met with no
Surrender, No. 47, here on Monday night.

Officers and delegates present,
besides a large number from the
two Newcastle lodges, Nos. 47 and
125, were:

Blackville — County Master
James H. Dale.

Upper Blackville — Herbert
Morehouse.

Chatham — Homer Matthews,
Alex. Ross.

Loggieville — County Chaplain
J. W. S. Babkirk. County P. O.
Master Jas. W. Johnston, County
Sec. S. R. Weston, Alvin Babkirk,
Stafford Loggie, Archibald McKay,
John White, James R. Johnston,
Wm. A. R. Archer and Everett
Watling.

Reports showed the order in
good condition.

A new form of Report blank
was adopted.

Place of next meeting was left
to Executive. It will likely be
Tabusintac, where a new lodge is
to be organized soon.

After adjournment, the mem-
bers had supper at Russell's res-
taurant, where a very pleasant
time was spent.

The Loggieville and Chatham
delegates came up in a gasoline
launch.

At the Methodist church Sunday
morning the speaker was Rev. Thomas
Marshall, travelling Supt. of Missions
in the Methodist churches of New
Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and
Newfoundland. Mr. Marshall gave an
able address on the Layman's Mission-
ary movement.

For the Boys

BASE BALL GOODS

Bats and Base Balls in a full
range of prices.
Catchers' Mitts from 15c. to
\$1.25—the best line we have ever
shown.

Follansbee & Co.,

Public Square NEWCASTLE

Mr Loggie's Able Speech

**Opposes Higher Duties on Pork and Garden
Products—Shows That Government Has
Reduced per capita Debt While De-
creasing Rate of Taxation, and
Spending a Million a Year More
on Agriculture.**

OTTAWA, April 26.—In the budget
debate today, W. S. Loggie, M. P. for
Northumberland, N. B., made an ad-
mirable speech, as follows:—

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE.—Mr. speaker,
you have not heard from the province
of New Brunswick during this debate
and therefore I wish to make a few
remarks. The hon. member for Centre
York (Mr. Wallace) who has just
taken his seat, has asked that the gov-
ernment should restrict immigration
and he refers to the Japanese as a
people who should not be allowed to
enter Canada to any great extent. The
hon. gentleman should know that this
is exactly what the government have
done, that restrictions are now being
enforced and that during the last year
a very limited number of Japanese
have come into this country. The hon.
gentleman ought to know as well that
the government are using every en-
deavour to have a proper class of im-
migrants come into this country, and
that every precaution is taken that
when undesirable immigrants are
landed in this country they are return-
ed to the place whence they came at
the expense of the transportation com-
pany bringing them to Canada. Any
other plea made by the hon. gentle-
man who has taken his seat is that
the government should increase the
protection to the agricultural interest,
and he cites the protection on hogs,
which he says ought to be increased.
Forsooth there is a duty now of two
cents per pound or four dollars per
barrel, and yet the hon. gentleman
wants to have the farming interests of
Canada protected to a greater extent
than four dollars a barrel on pork.
The hogs that come into this country
are very largely of a class which are
not raised in Canada. The imported
hog products are consumed in the
maritime provinces and in the lumber-
ing operations of Ontario and Quebec
and the Eastern provinces. My hon.
friend would ask that those who are
consumers should pay an increased
tax to the farming interest of this
country. In my judgment it would
be unfair to the consumer to increase
the taxation on that product when we
realize that the producers are already
protected to what I consider a suffi-
cient extent. If there is one item in
the tariff list which seems to me, is
on a protective tariff basis, it is the
item of hog products. That is one of
the items which the liberal party have
continued in force which was in force
under the Conservative party in 1896.
As to the request of the market gar-
deners that they be protected, I think
we will admit that the products that
are imported into this country are
imported at a time at which they can
not and are supplied by our Cana-
dian market gardeners. It is that
true is it reasonable that the consum-
ers should be unduly taxed? They are
reasonably taxed now? They pay
what is a fair tax for revenue purposes.
I think that the government have
acted wisely in not every year tinkering
with the tariff and making
changes. We have framed a new
tariff about each decade, and during
the interim changes of no great conse-
quence have been made. I do not
think that I need refer any more to
the remarks by the hon. gentleman.
But I want once again to congratulate
my hon. friend the Minister of Finance
on the showing that he has brought
down to this House. A year ago he
pointed out to the House that it was
a time for caution and that yet
we should take courage. It seems to
me, from the report laid on the table
by the Minister of Finance, that this is
exactly what the Finance Minister
has done.

The hon. member for Centre York
(Mr. Wallace) tells us that the expendi-
ture was \$85,000,000, that the revenue
was \$15,000,000. It is certainly
an encouraging fact that it is so,
because of the stress, if I may so term
it, it might have been fair to expect
that the Finance Minister would come
down to the House showing a deficit
on the year's transactions. I think,
therefore, that we might repeat what
was said a year ago that perhaps no
Finance Minister has ever done more
to sustain the high credit of the coun-
try than has the present Minister of
Finance. From his statement we find
that the estimated net debt of the
country on the 31st March, 1896, was
upwards of \$225,000,000, and that dur-
ing the twelve and three-quarter years
since 1896, we have added to the net
debt, in round numbers, \$15,000,000.
But, Mr. Speaker, I want you to mark
that the \$85,000,000 is accounted for by
\$22,500,000 expended on the Transcon-
tinental Railway. That leaves a bal-
ance of only \$12,000,000 expended on
the great public works of this country
which would represent about \$1,000,000
each year for the 12 years. Will you
just recall to mind what has hap-
pened during the last five years of the
Conservative regime? During that
five years they expended \$21,000,000
on capital account. During the very
same term they borrowed \$21,000,000;
that is to say they had not sufficient
money in the treasury to pay the
running expenses of the country. They
had to borrow \$5,000,000 for that pur-
pose. But the Liberal party have
expended almost \$100,000,000 annually
on ordinary consolidated account and
the other great public works that they
have undertaken during the past

twelve years have added to the public
debt only \$1,000,000 per annum over
and above the expenditure on the
National Transcontinental Railway.
It seems that the situation is one from
which we might well take courage and
which should warrant us in going on
and completing this great undertak-
ing. We find that in the year 1896,
when the Conservative party gave up
the reins of power the per capita debt
was \$20.82, while in 1900, after we had
expended \$22,500,000 on the Transcon-
tinental Railway, and after the expendi-
ture on other great public works,
we have reduced the per capita debt
to \$16.72, equal to a decrease in the debt
of the country after all these great
expenditures of about 10 per cent.
mean the per capita debt of course.
I have explained already that the net
debt has been increased, but we have
assets for it as I shall tell you later on.
Now, I want to say a word about how
we got this money. Perhaps I should
remind the House here that the mem-
ber for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in
speaking of that the other day used
the following language:—

—which surpluses were got abso-
lutely and solely because of extraor-
dinary taxing powers that the govern-
ment availed themselves of. If the
government had kept the volume and
burden of taxation down to what it
was, or to anything near to what it
was, in Liberal Conservative times,
they could not have amassed such
immense sums of money, and they
could not have had such large sur-
pluses. If a government will tax
sufficiently, it will have large surpluses
and may have large surpluses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the last
five years of the Conservative regime,
they taxed at the rate of about 12 per
cent, more than the present adminis-
tration is taxing. Let me put it in
this way. In 1896 we collected 16.8
per cent, on \$251,000,000 worth of
imports. In 1896 there were imports
valued at \$105,301,000 and the rate
collected in that year was 19.12 per
cent. Our rate is \$2.71 on the \$100 less
on the value of the invoice, or equal
to a difference of about 12 per cent,
on the duty collected. Apply this and
it would demonstrate that if in 1896,
under the Conservative government,
the people of Canada had imported as
many goods as they did last year
under the Liberal regime, the Con-
servative government would have taken
out of the pockets of the people over
\$8,000,000 in extra taxation. If, on
the other hand, last year the Liberal
government had exacted the same
duty as the Conservative govern-
ment before 1896, there would have
been \$9,000,000 more collected in
duties, and then our surplus would be
ten and a half million dollars instead
of one and a half millions. But the
hon. gentleman from North Toronto
(Mr. Foster) and the hon. gentleman
from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) say
that the vital point is that the present
government collects \$10 per head,
whereas in 1896 the Conservative gov-
ernment collected only \$5.16 per head.
My contention is that the vital point
is the rate at which \$10 per head was
collected. If I pay taxes on \$10,000
this year at two per cent, and I am
fortunate enough next year to have
\$20,000 on which to pay taxes at 10
per cent, I pay a less rate but I pay
more money on the whole and I ought
to be glad I am able to pay it because
I have something to represent the
extra payment. And why is it that
at a less rate of duty than formerly,
there is more revenue produced? The
answer is perfectly simple. A mer-
chant will keep in his store just the
goods his customers require, and if
there is a demand for two suits of
clothes now where there was only a
demand for one suit before, the
gentleman will have the two suits, and
the customer will buy them instead of
one.

Mr. BLAIN.—Why not manufacture
them here and pay no duty?

Mr. LOGGIE.—Oh, my dear man,
don't you know we do manufacture
them here? Let me tell my hon. friend
that there is a very small proportion
of clothing imported into this country.

Mr. BLAIN.—The house doing the
largest business in the province or
Ontario imports all their ready made
clothing under this tariff.

Mr. LOGGIE.—I will accept the hon.
gentleman's word but I can tell him
that I know of not one but of dozens
of mercantile establishments that do
not import one dollar's worth of ready
made clothing. The hon. member for
North Toronto (Mr. Foster) advanced
an argument the other day which it
would have been fairer for him to
have carried out to its logical conclu-
sions. He told us that in 1896 we
would find \$18,000,000 charged to
capital account but that was for seven
and a half million acres of land, which,
as an asset, converted into money was
worth \$22,500,000, and he asked us to
take that into consideration. Well, I
will admit that the hon. gentleman's argu-
ment, but had he been fair he would
have explained that the fifty-two and
a half million dollars spent on the
National Transcontinental Railway was
a national asset. Will the hon.
gentleman have the audacity to tell
me that in the National Transcon-
tinental Railway we have not an asset
representing that fifty-two and a half
millions? Does he not know very well

that in a time that money will
be bearing interest and that it is just
as if we took it out of the bank, and
drew our interest on it, as in the case
of the twenty and a half million
dollars, we took it out of the public
lands, is not a fair comparison
to make? The hon. gentleman
(Mr. Foster) is about borrowing
during the interim, but that argument
was answered by the Minister of
Finance who told us that it was a
temporary loan which had been paid
off. If the manager of an ordinary
mercantile establishment borrows
during the year and pays off his debt
he has no explanation to make to his
directors. What he has to explain to
the directors is what he owes and
what he has to represent it. Then
the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) also
insinuated that if the Minister of
Finance had taken care of the sur-
pluses it would not have been neces-
sary for him to go to the London mar-
kets to borrow money. I would point
out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster)
that no one can deny that the moneys
received by the government have been
wisely expended, for although there
may have been some small items here
and there that might not be expended
as we all would like, yet on the whole
there is not a man on the opposite
side of the house who would under-
take to charge that there has been
any improper expenditure of public
money. It is all very well to make
insinuations and innuendoes, but when it
comes to making a charge hon. gentle-
men opposite will not assume that
responsibility. Has this government
not promoted the prosperity of our
great country; has it not deepened
the St. Lawrence, protected our fish-
eries, aided agriculture, assisted in the
building of great railways? It is true
that if we had tied the surpluses up
in a napkin as it were, we could have
reduced the debt, but in growing
times such as these and in a growing
country like Canada it was wise that
we should have applied our expendi-
tures in the days of prosperity to
developing the resources of the coun-
try. But nevertheless we have
reduced the per capita debt, and yet
we have an increase in 13 years in the
net debt of only \$65,000,000, \$22,500,000
of which I call liquid assets that will
bring us a return in good time.
Just one word and I have done. The
hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr.
Edwards) gave us a list of duties levied
by Canada as compared with the
duties levied by the United States.
I quote his words:—

"I submit that it is manifestly un-
fair and unjust to Canadian farmers,
and when we take into account the
fact that the United States sent into
Canada last year 6,428 horses valued
at \$1,251,591 we must see that a por-
tion of that was deliberately taken
out of the pockets of the Canadian
farmers."

If that hon. gentleman were here I
would ask him who pays the import
duties on goods that come into Cana-
da? Who is the hon. gentleman have
the audacity to tell me that the Cana-
dian farmer pays the duty on the
horses that we send into the United
States? And yet that is the logical conclu-
sion of his whole argument, and he turns
round and tells us that on the horses
we sent into the States that the Cana-
dian farmer pays the duty, and that
argument is manifestly unfair. I do
not understand the tariff if that is the
basis of the hon. gentleman's reason-
ing. Perhaps in the case of a few
articles there may be exception to the
rule. If you have no market but
the United States, and are forced to
sell your goods there on commission,
it may be possible in some cases that
the Canadian producer pays the duty;
but in ninety-nine cases out of a hun-
dred the Canadian farmer pays the
duty on the goods imported into this
country, just as the United States
farmer pays the duty which his gov-
ernment levies on goods imported into
that country, and it is unfair for the
hon. gentleman to argue that it is
unfair to the Canadian farmer to
allow horses to come into this country
at a lower rate of duty than they have
to pay on going into the United States.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR, the Minister
of Customs tells us that the Canadian
farmer has to pay the duty on Cana-
dian barley going to Germany.

Mr. LOGGIE.—I have no doubt that
the Minister of Customs will answer
for himself. Now I want to say just
one word in regard to the hon. mem-
ber for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards).
Why is it, he asks, that there is a
reduction of \$35,000 in the estimates
of the Department of Agriculture for
1899-1900? And then he makes some
innuendoes or insinuations as to the
cause of this or that or the other
thing? If the hon. gentleman will
read the budget debate of a year ago
or if he studies the budget debate of
this year, he will probably get the
answer, but I want to tell him this:
In 1898 how much do you think the
Conservative government expended
on the agricultural interests of this
country? No less a sum than \$210,000.
And how much did this government
expend on agricultural interests in
1899? \$1,250,000, or more than \$1,000,000 in excess of what was expended
in 1898; and yet the hon. gentleman
has the audacity to ask why the esti-
mates for 1899-1900 for the Department
of Agriculture are cut down to \$35,000.
Now, Mr. Speaker, the figures are
up, and I thank the House for the
attention it has given me.

ATTORNEY GENERAL TO PROSECUTE.

Attorney General Hazen will con-
duct the prosecution in the Sunbury
Circuit Court on the 11th inst. of
John Endini, the Italian, charged
with the murder of John McKay at
Minto, Sunbury county, last fall.
Samuel Adams, the horse thief brought
back from Dorchester penitentiary for
horse stealing, will also be tried.