ffer the people and that our
t likely to get "de coon."
ause.)

G. E. FOSTER,

ne and Fisheries, who was
ived, said: Mr. Chairman,
men, I am surprised and I
at seeing the very large and
nce which has assembled
ten to the discussion of the
resent time—surprised, be-
ave thought, after having
pers from the city of St.
tain other parts of the pro-
inswick, that the cause of
nment and of the party
d very little hope of sup-
tion of the country, and
ferent audience would
and yet I am not sur-
have had some experience
e of St. John in the elec-
h have been so happily
knowing that this audi-
lled together under the
oung Men's Liberal Con-
the city and county of St.
it to be carried on in an
nd I should have known
een representative and

e of the best signs of the
country our men and wo-
forego home pleasures and
her together in audiences
to public discussions, so
on interest in the country
ntly pursue these inter-
elation to those whom
d I take it as one of the
times that this large
together independent of
ndependent of mirepre-
apers, so that they may
ces of those who ad-
their words and judge
manner the truth of the
made. You have had
t one of the minis-
n who has had to
most important depart-
nt time in the Dominion
not had a very long ex-
been a very thorough
at service, and I stand
that there is no minis-
who in an equal space of
active and done more
e hon. minister who has
have men living here in
who never set a foot in
who have, nevertheless,
irculated bitter and un-
erence to the conduct of
he interior, but you have
onsible minister of that
you the history of its
have listened to him and
formed your judgment,
xperience and from the
ntenances of those before
repared to say that the
y different aspect from
means of the statements
led to believe it were,
is that now you have
of the minister him-
of the matter—(Ap-
venture to assert what
ly true that, though in
e he has disproved the
ments, that still tomor-
y same statements will
(Dr. H. What? In The
y and month after month
andals will be repeated
ld manner *ad nauseum*.

ention for the few mo-
s you to take up some
which are perhaps of
reat to you inasmuch as
discussion, and I will
riefly as is consistent

e maritime provinces—
Brunswick within the
meetings at which the
gathered together to
nd a spokesman of their
m P. E. I.—who when
tform in the town of
message to the people
pay heed to his mess-
unsel, because, said he,
as the mouthpiece and
. Edward Blake.
eral conservatives have
think that independence
young man or in an old
best recommendation to
an could come before it
own motion and by his
ot say to it in the first
to listen to me while I
n my own experience,
wledge of the matter,
I am here as the
tatenant of some par-
ould think that that
we prize in this coun-
person addressing an
at the arguments ad-
sult of his own experi-
prevent him saying he
mouthpiece of any par-
rs.)

mouthpiece of Mr.
de a great many state-
t give you a few of
ong criticize them by
said they were "going
liberal party were go-
He said that Sir John
etched forth his long
nd had seized the bal-
e. Have you heard
being seized lately
maritime provinces?
t of the franchise act
nds upon thousands
the great body of the
en carried out under
onsible judges. Has
e raised in the mari-
e that these judges
bitrarily closed these
or has it not been all
me provinces the fact
een made up with due
of all and that due
n to the people to
e then, is there before
nt as that made by
man says the ballot
by the hand of a
well for him to point
t occurred. Has that
e you to think this
es.
d that the C. P. R.
n the dollar. It has
ster of the interior
000 the C. P. R. has
in hard cash and has
minder land at $1.50
leader of the op-
ted over and over
worth from $2 to
ntrast these various
r yourselves which
ith the facts of the
ue was returned to

omise, for it is the
value. Mr. Davies
this Canada of ours
expenditure of $38,-
oks which he ought
right hand would
the highest ever

reached in Canada was that of last year, which was not $38,000,000, but $35,000,000. Three millions is but a trifle in the imagination of the mouthpiece and lieutenant of the Hon. Edward Blake. (Applause.) Mr. Davies undertook to show that the time had come when shipping of the maritime provinces especially was almost driven from Canada because of the terribly wicked things being done by, and the terribly wicked policy of the liberal conservative government, and yet Mr. Davies failed to crack this nut, which I respectfully offer him before he proceeds further in his attempt to establish his proposition. From 1868 to 1873 during the time a liberal conservative government was in power there was an increase in the built tonnage of Canada of 87 000 tons, which at Mr. Davies' estimate of $45 per ton, shows an increase during that period equal in value to $3,915,000. In 1873 the government which Mr. Davies supported came into power and from that time till 1879 no wicked tory bare rule in this broad Dominion of ours, and no N. P. held its blighting and terrible sway under the canopy of this Canadian heaven, yet would you believe it that from 1873 to 1879 there was a decrease during that period in the built shipping tonnage of 85,000, which at the value of tonnage assumed represented the sum of $3,800,000. What was it that caused that vast depreciation in those five years while in the preceding six years there had been such large increase? It proves conclusively that Mr. Davies has not established his proposition, and it shows that it is not tory rule and the N. P. which has caused the decrease in the shipping, but a much deeper reason than that given by the gentleman who is the lieutenant and the mouthpiece of Hon. Edward Blake. (Laughter and applause.) Some time ago, it may have been five, six or seven years, I remember passing down the streets of St. John one evening just after dusk, and seeing some lighted lamps on a wagon, and going over to see what it all meant, I found a gentleman haranguing the assemblage and I was told he was the lightning calculator. I listened to his calculations and was very much impressed with the rapidity with which he added up his sums. But this would be nothing compared to some calculations which are contained in a verbatim report of Mr. Davies' speech at Moncton, which was revised by himself, where he says that from 1854 to 1866, when the reciprocity treaty was in force between these provinces and the United States, our trade advanced from $17,000,000 to $32,000,000, and Mr. Davies solemly stated before his audience that this was a gratifying circumstance, that there was no limit to which that trade might not be carried, and that if reciprocity had been continued no reason why that trade should not have increased from 1866 to the present time in an equal ratio. Now, as the increase during the 10 years of the reciprocity treaty was 400 per cent., if Mr. Davies' calculations were true we should have a trade under reciprocity from 1866 to 1876 increasing to $410,000,000, and we should have had, according to the lightning calculator, at the present time a trade that would amount to $1,200,000,000—that is something which surpasses the imagination of the most imaginative man to conceive.

Mr. Davies said that the government at Ottawa had parcelled out 25,000 square miles of the public domain to their followers and supporters. The minister of the interior has shown you by the public records that it was only 5,000 instead of 25,000 miles that were parcelled out, and he showed you that they were not parcelled out to friends and supporters, but that they were disposed of according to law and under the regulations prevailing in that department, and that the men who received them paid full value for them.

Mr. Davies took occasion in his speech to deny any responsibility of the liberal party for any expenditure between 1873 and 1878, which added to the public debt. Where are the expenditures upon the great canal system? Where are the expenditures upon the railway systems of this country? Surely they spent some money in those services. I am glad for our sake that Mr. Davies, who is the mouthpiece and lieutenant, admits that for the building up and development of the public works of this dominion, the Liberal Conservative party and they alone can lay claim to the gratitude and good will of the country which has been so much benefitted by these public works. (Applause.)

Mr. Davies undertook to say in so many words that Sir Leonard Tilley in 1878 declared in St. John that $22,500,000, per year was as much as should be expended for all time to come in this Dominion, and yet it would appear that the liberal conservative party have greatly increased expenditure beyond that amount. What Sir Leonard Tilley did say was: "that if he (Sir Leonard) and his party had been in power they would have expended from 1873 to 1878 not more than $22,500,000 for carrying on the public services of the country, and Mr. Davies if he had been honest enough, and had referred to *Hansard* would have seen that on a certain day Hon. W. B. Vail arose in parliament and quoted exactly what Sir Leonard Tilley did say, which is as I stated before. Now, Mr. Davies is a great free trader and he hates protection with all the virtue of his manly soul and this he tells us. Yet in the very next breath he tells us that we cannot have free trade in this Dominion, because we have to raise so much money for the public services and requirements of the country. Yet you never see in a free trade country a great statesman rising and saying that the expenditure being almost twice as great as under protection, therefore they must give up free trade. Does not any man know that in England—the freest of free trade countries—the taxes are nearly twice as much as in Canada. Yet you never hear a member of the liberal party there say that the expenditure has risen so high that they must resort to protection. Yet here in Canada our free traders say that we cannot have free trade because so much money has to be raised to meet the public services of the country.

Mr. Davies has invented a new theory and it is that the Indians revolted from a certain cause, and that that cause was that they were starved, yet in the very next breath he charges the government with extravagance in its expenditure of money on the Indians. I had always thought that the Indians did not revolt from starvation. I thought a few half-breeds did revolt and that it was these half-breeds, headed by Louis Riel, who incited the Indians to pillage and murder, and that they were successful to a certain degree in getting some Indians to rise; but Mr. Davies with his brilliant genius finds another reason and that reason is that when they went to Gov. Dewdney to get something to eat besides pork, he said, "Eat the pork or be d—d." Let us call upon these people who make this assertion to prove it, for I am here to state tonight that Gov. Dewdney never uttered any such words as those placed in his mouth by these gentlemen.

Mr. Davies says we are spending $500,000 a year on immigration, and yet the public accounts and the reports of the immigration department would have shown Mr. Davies, if he had looked at them, that in 1885 we only expended $310,000 and that next year we were by the estimates to spend only $200,000 upon immigration.

Mr. Davies says that our taxes now in the Dominion of Canada are nearly double or at the least, if not that amount, far greater than the taxes in the United States, and yet when we come to contrast the taxation raised last year in Canada and that raised in the United States of America, we find the former to be $5.40 and the latter $6.42 per head.

Mr. Davies says that the present government is opposed to a reciprocity treaty yet he cannot bring one single utterance of a single member of the government that goes to prove his assertion, and he says that if he and his party are returned to power they will make a reciprocity treaty—that they are bound to have it. I hope President Cleveland of the United States will put his house in order so as to be ready for the grand assault Davies is going to make upon it in order to get this reciprocity treaty.

Why they are going back to power is to him for two reasons certain, one is that Haldimand has spoken and the other that Chambly has likewise given voice to the same effect. Now as to Haldimand. Haldimand spoke before that day; Haldimand spoke in 1867 and gave a liberal majority of 367; Haldimand spoke again in 1872 and then elected a liberal by acclamation; Haldimand spoke again in 1874 when a liberal was elected unopposed; in 1878 Haldimand again spoke and returned a liberal by a majority of 166; in 1882 Haldimand returned a liberal by a majority of 126, and lo! Haldimand speaks again and does the same again—a few weeks ago when she again elects a liberal, but it is by a decreased majority—115.

Don't you see, the Dutch have taken Holland, sure. (Laughter and applause.) But there is a sad aspect to this, which is that that kind of variety will only take five years more, when the acclamation will be the other way in Haldimand. It takes more than one swallow to make a summer, and it takes more than one election to show how the people of this great country stand politically. You can take this as a surer sign: Go over the elections of of 1873 and the effects of the by-elections, and you will have a better idea of the subject. In 1873 they had a majority of 60 or 70 given to them by the people, they had then a great opportunity to show how they could rule the country, but you will find that from 1873 to 1878 in by-election alone they lost no less than 20 seats and the conservatives gained 20 seats, thus making a difference of 40 votes from 1873 to 1878. In 1878 they went to the country and were defeated by a majority of between 60 and 70, and from 1878 to 1882 the liberal conservatives made a net gain of four seats and they lost four, and in 1882 the people again pronounced in favor of the liberal conservative party and they again went into power with a majority of between 60 and 70, and from that time down to this, notwithstanding the by-elections which have taken place, the parties stand as they did in 1882. You can take that as the voice of the people, as being clearly authoritative and as showing the trend of what public sentiment is in the matter. So much for Haldimand.

The next is that Chambly has spoken and they are going back to rule.

Now, as I said in Moncton, so I say here, the last man on earth who should say they were going back to rule because Chambly had spoken, was Mr. Davies. You know that in connection with the Riel matter, Mr. Davies voted against his leader and by his vote said that the government of Canada did right in allowing Louis Riel to feel the penalty of the law, and yet before Chambly had spoken and when Prefontaine was seeking the suffrages of the people, we had him coming before the people of Chambly saying: I am here as the instrument you may make use of to avenge the cause of Louis Riel against the hangman. He was elected upon that issue, and upon that issue alone, and thereupon Davies throws his cap into the air and his principle to the winds, and says we are going back to rule, Chambly has spoken. . . . . .

We have numerous utterances from the opposition papers which prove that before Riel was hanged they were of the opinion that he should hang, and raised the cry that if ever a man deserved hanging it was Riel, and hanged he would be if he had not been a Frenchman, and the Barrie *Examiner*, one of their principal papers in western Ontario, raised the cry of race and said, "Sir John knows enough to keep himself in favor with the French people in Quebec and will not hang Riel."

This cry was re-echoed and repeated by the whole opposition press. The Toronto *Globe* before the 17th of November last said that Riel should be hanged and twenty-four hours after Riel was hanged those very papers howled against the government because they had the audacity, the tyranny, the cold-blooded tyranny, to allow the sentence of execution to be carried out against a poor, abused, insane man. These very same newspapers which had before said that Riel should be hanged, hope that tomorrow will secure a victory for the opposition in the province of Quebec, whose sole issue is the condemnation of the government for the hanging of Riel. So much for our opponents seeking to profit by the cry of race and religion.

I next wish to speak to you upon the question of the fisheries and reciprocity. It has been stated by Mr. Davies and repeated again and again in the newspapers that the present government is opposed to reciprocity. Now, listen to me for a few moments while I place before you the record of the present government on the reciprocity question. I am here to make the assertion that there never was a period in our history, in which any government's record can be quoted as opposed to a fair reciprocity treaty with the United States. On the contrary, it has been the avowed wish of every government to enter into proper reciprocal relations with the people of the United States. So far back as 1845 attempts had been made to secure reciprocity and in 1849 Canada passed legislation in favor of reciprocity on the assumption that the congress of the United States would do the same. The bill passed the parliament of old Canada, but it did not pass the congress of the United States. In 1852 negotiations were begun which resulted in securing a reciprocity treaty, both Canada and the United States reaping great benefit to their trade, In 1866 that treaty was terminated, not because the Canadian government or Canada wished it to terminate, but because the United States were determined that it should terminate, and although in that year a deputation was sent from Canada to the United States in order, if possible, to continue the reciprocity treaty, that country would not listen to it and the treaty lapsed. In 1868 the government of Canada placed a clause in their customs law which made it possible for our government at the very moment the United States would lower their duty upon raw material or admit them duty free into their country, to reciprocate. In 1869 the liberal conservative government sent Sir John Rose to Washington to negotiate, if possible, a reciprocity treaty. He negotiated a draft treaty, but the United States would not accept the treaty and the matter fell through

In 1871, Sir John Macdonald was in Washington as one of the British commissioners who negotiated a reciprocity treaty, as far as the fishery affairs were concerned, but although the British commissioners again and again urged the American commissioners to enter into a full reciprocity treaty much upon the lines of the treaty of 1854, the United States commissioners flatly refused to negotiate such a treaty, saying that the whole opinion of the United States was against reciprocity, and the congress and government of the United States would not ratify it. In 1874, when Mr. Mackenzie's government was in power, he tried to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and he sent the Hon. Geo. Brown down to Washington to spy out the land.

Mr. Brown went down and spied out the land and came back, bringing with him as he supposed clusters of grapes from Eschol, which, however, proved illusive. He said to Mr. Mackenzie the time is ripe for action and we will get a reciprocity treaty, and Mr. Mackenzie sent him to Washington, he drafted a treaty, but congress refused to ratify it, and though often pressed from 1874 to 1879, Mr. Mackenzie in parliament refused to take a single step towards attempting to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. He said Canada had taken steps toward that end again and again and she ought not to move now until the United States shows by some signs that she is willing to have reciprocity.

So until 1879 no step was taken, when in that year the liberal conservative government coming into power a clause was put into the tariff act—a clause which gave them power whenever the United States was willing to allow our raw products to go into their country at a lesser rate of duty or free then Canada would do the same. So far the U. S. have not consented to do so. That invitation has been held open ever since, and time after time resolutions have been framed and brought forward in the congress of the U. S. by persons interested there in reciprocal trade and yet time after time these resolutions have met defeat and at no time have the U. S. shown themselves to be willing to enter into such a treaty.

When the late treaty was about to expire an arrangement was come to with respect to the fisheries by which their privileges of fishing should for six months be continued and that the President should on the meeting of congress recommend the issuing of a commission for the purpose of securing a satisfactory basis for a treaty. Such recommendation was duly made. How was it met? It was met by a distinct refusal. Senator Frye moved an amendment which was carried and which stated in express terms that no such treaty was desirable. Such shortly is the history of the reciprocity question. But, says Mr. Davies, did not President Arthur at one time suggest a reciprocity treaty which Canada did not accept. Mr. Arthur, as President of the U. S., made no offer of reciprocity to Canada. He simply recommended in his message that a committee should be appointed by congress to look into the fishery rights of the U. S. alone, not a mixed commission to join a commission from Canada or Great Britain in order to negotiate a treaty, and how did congress treat that? It allowed the communication to be read in Congress and it never by motion or resolution took one step towards carrying out the recommendations made by President Arthur. Therefore I state that no man can rise and declare that any member of the lib-con government at any time has declared by word or sentiment that the government was opposed to a fair measure of reciprocity with the United States of America. The government is anxious that a fair measure of reciprocity with the U. S., and Canada should take place as being advantageous, not only to the trade of Canada but to the trade of the U. S. as well. But unfortunately it takes two parties to make a bargain like a reciprocity treaty, and it is not possible for one alone to bring about that treaty. That shortly is the history of the treaty negotiations between Canada and the U. S. Effort in that direction has been made, but up to the present it has had no favorable result. Why? Because of the position assumed by the U. S.; a position not favorable to a large measure of reciprocity. So far all well. But says Mr. Davis, I arose in parliament and moved resolutions regarding this matter and stating that we should have a treaty. Yes, but where and when did he do that, do you think? He took care everytime he moved that resolution to do so when the government had made a motion to go into supply, and when his resolution would have been almost tant-amount to a motion of want-of-confidence. If Mr. Davies had been honest in his endeavor to get a fair expression of the opinions of parliament, he would have moved it separately and let it have been heard on its merits; but I believe this as well, that we do not further the cause of the reciprocity treaty for the Dominion of Canada by going around and saying that the natural market of the maritime provinces is that of the United States, (hear, hear) or by saying that we are ruined if we do not get a reciprocity treaty. Like Mr. Ellis of the *Globe* who gave as his contribution to the Americans his opinion that the annexation sentiment in this province is rapidly growing, and that if the U. S. will just wait a little while the nut will fall from the tree and they can pick it up without any effort on their part. I do not think such statements as those to which I allude help towards the consumation so much desired. I think that Canada is big enough and has dignity enough to stand in this position and say, if you will come with us we will try and make a profitable arrangement for each side; we will meet you as we always have met you more than half way, but if you refuse again and again Canada will not spend her time in tears but she will carve out a policy of her own, and doubtless develop a trade and a future for herself. (Applause)

Now, sir, the difference between the party in power from 1873 to 1878 and the party in power from 1878 down to the present time is this, that while both of them have been equally desirous of having a fair measure of reciprocity, yet the party from 1873 to 1878, when failing to get the desired treaty, did not then endeavor to get a policy which would keep Canada for the Canadians. (Applause) The party in power today failing to get a fair measure of reciprocity said:—Then we will develop our own country, we will by the establishment of great public works, railways, canals, etc, see if we cannot better the condition of our people, we will endeavor to establish our own industries to supply the wants of our people, and so from the Atlantic to the Pacific we shall have our own industries developed, we shall thus give an impetus to our trade and develop the resources so great among us; we will have markets of our own if not elsewhere, and we will show whether we are able to live alone and at the same time in peace and amity with the great nation by our side

Now, you will naturally expect, that I should say a word with reference to the fisheries. Mr. Davies said in his Moncton speech:

"I charge this malfeasance in office upon the department of marine and fisheries, upon the government at Ottawa and I say that the fisheries which would be a source of enormous wealth this year have been so dealt with by them as to deprive our fishermen of the advantages they would have otherwise secured. We are, if we have all these fishing rights, I am afraid not able sufficiently to maintain them. Our duty in maintaining our right to the inshore fishing was, I think, very plain, for I believe the government ought last year to have stood upon our rights, for I am of the opinion had we done so and tried at that time to keep the Americans out from the inshore fisheries the U. S., etc." . .

He also said: "They also deliberately abstained from preventing Americans from fishing in our waters." You will notice that the word Mr Davies uses is "deliberately," and by that he means that we intentionally sacrificed the interests of the maritime fishermen, for in another part of his speech he says: "The American fishermen have fished around P. E. Island within a mile and a half of the shore, with perfect impunity and no attempt was made to drive them out."

"The cutters and cruisers have not made a single seizure except one so far, and we said "why was this done. It was done because no orders had been received from Ottawa that they should carry out the treaty of 1818."

Now, I hold that no more reckless statement could have been made by any public man upon the platform As Mr. Davies has said that no such orders have been given, I am here to state that the orders from the department at Ottawa have never been published in the public press and are only known between the department and the captains of the cruisers, and Mr. Davies did not know what they were for he had no means of knowing and he does not know now. He does not know one single word of the orders that have been issued, and when he says that the department of marine and fisheries have been guilty of malfeasance he is deliberately falsifying the records. He goes even further than I should think the recklessness of Mr. Davies would impel him to go. I am here to state briefly that when the cruisers went out orders were sent them to carry out the treaty of 1818 according to law, and these orders have never been cancelled or varied in any particular. The cruisers have been upon their beats and they have carried out their orders as far as possible.

And when our record is laid before parliament it will be shown that our fisheries have been as fully protected as they have ever been. Everything has been done that could be done to carry out the provisions of the treaty of 1818, and today our coasts are as well protected as ever they were. Of course the American fishermen have a perfect right to fish just outside the three-mile limit and they may be there when one of our cruisers goes out upon its beat. The American vessel magrun in and get a draft of fish during the cruiser's absence. It would be almost impossible to prevent this unless we had cruisers upon every five or six miles of the coast. But it is not necessary for us to do that for our orders to the cruisers have been so effectively carried out, that I am able to state here that there has been no continued fishing by the Americans within the three mile limit. Nor could they do this with impunity, as charged by Mr. Davies. (Loud applause.) The orders that have been given by the owners to the captains of these vessels were that they should avoid fishing within the three mile limit. This has helped to the result of observing the three mile limit. Our Bay of Chaleur has not had one single sail of American fishermen drop a line over its whole length, and I can say when the record is placed before parliament it will appear that the government has been strict and has given orders that the treaty should be fully enforced in Canadian waters. (Applause.) I am not going to detain you very much longer. I had hoped to say a word about the treaty with Spain. I will just touch it so far as to say that while parliament were complaining that Canada does not try to negotiate treaties with other countries, the high commissioner of Canada has been allowed the privilege of helping to negotiate a treaty, and as a result of that treaty Canada on and after the 15th of this present month will be included in the most favored nation clause.

As far as this treaty is concerned, I could take the different articles and show the very great reduction which is allowed to the people of Great Britain and Canada as the result of its negotiation. But as that treaty has been published in the *Canadian Gazette*, I presume you can see it there for yourselves. I will go no further than to say, that while some people have been clamoring for the extension of our trade and saying that the government were unwilling to take steps in that direction, the government has been doing its work quietly and as a result of these negotiations a treaty has been entered into which will be productive of much good to the merchants of this country. It is stated by some people that we are going rapidly down in the way of ruin and bankruptcy. I will just touch that point and will then conclude. It is reported that on our right and left hand the evidences of depression are to be seen. Is it true? If it is, it might be well for us to know it, for it is not best if our country is going down to be under a false impression. But if it is going to destruction or ruin it is better that we should know it, and if Canada is going headlong into a position of bankruptcy and ruin, it is well that we should know it. But if she is not, it is not right for people to make such statements. Why is it said that this country is threatened with bankruptcy and ruin? Upon what does such a report rest? Why is such a statement made, for it is not in the interests of merchants, mechanics or artizans. It is made for the sole purpose of driving the government out of office. When you contrast 1878 with 1875, either in your business or home life, do you find that there is impending calamity? No. You find it is not true, for you find by an examination of your earnings and spendings that your prosperity is as great today as in any preceeding year. And I believe that your experience will not accede to the cry that Canada is going to ruin. (Loud applause.)

But there is another test, and that is the credit of the country now. If there is a man who wishes to borrow money from me (and if I am a money lender) he comes and asks me for a loan, I look into his financial standing and if I loan him the money I charge him a rate of interest according to the nature of the security and other considerations. Then if that is so between man and man, how much more so is it between a country and men. The affairs of a country are public, its financial status and its record may be read from the blue books and when a country goes to the money market and asks for a loan of millions, you may be sure that that country's credit is scanned with keenness and with great diligence. That being so, how does Canada stand with regard to her credit in the money markets of the world? Why, sir, I find that the Canadian 4's of 1868 are now valued at $116; the 4's of 1874 9 now stand at 106½; the 3½'s of 1884, which were put on the market at 91, have risen to 100, and the 4's of 1885, which were put on at 101, have now risen to 106, and today it may be proudly stated that the credit of Canada, of her stocks and bonds, stands as high in the British market if not higher than that of any other colony connected with Great Britain. (Applause.) That does not appear as if we were on the way to direct ruin financially. Another gratifying fact in this connection is, that the first loan at 3½ made by any colony was made by the Dominion of Canada. I noticed that Mr. Stockton, at Moncton, made a statement which, epitomized, amounts to this: You are paying less interest, are you? Why, because you give bigger discounts—take the 3½ p. c. loan—what did it amount to? I find, says Dr. Stockton, that in order to get that $25,000,000 loan, some $2,500,000 was paid to the brokers in the London market in order to have it negotiated. What do you think of a statement like that? You would think what he paid upon the loan, but it really amounts to this: When the loan is put upon the market, tenders are invited for the taking of it, and when they come in it is found that the loan is taken at 3½ p. c. at the value of £91 upon the £100; that is the loan runs for a period of years and during that period 3½ p. c. has to be paid and we receive at the time of making the loan £91 for every £100, and so the difference between the £91 and the par value, when that is added to the brokerage and commission, makes this amount of some $2,500,000 upon the $25,000,000. Is that a thing unheard of? He stirred up a very bad nest for himself when he started making comparisons between the loans made by the present and previous governments. Let me take you back a little way to the time when Sir Richard Cartwright was the finance minister in the Dominion of Canada. Let me take his loan of 1876, which was paid for at the rate of 4 p. c., while the loan of 1884 was got at 3½ p. c. Did Sir Richard Cartwright get £100 for every £100 of his loan? No! He went into the market and offered 4 p. c., and for every £100 he got less than £90. So it seems that this same thing has been going on in other days, that it is nothing new and it also appears that under other governments the brokers commissions have been given and that the money has been realized after deducting a certain discount, and so far as I can see there is this difference, that in the one case the loan is at 3½ and in the other at 4 per cent., but still the fact remains that Sir Richard Cartwright got less by £1 on the £100 than did Sir Leonard Tilley. The 1885 4 per cent. loan got a premium, that is for every £100 which we have to pay at the end of the time we have received £101—I think that is a little better than formerly? (Applause.) That is the 4 per cent. in 1876 went at a discount of 9 per cent., and the 4 p. c. of 1885 at a premium of 1 per cent, and no sinking fund was required in 1885, while it was with the other.

I have not now time to carry out the parallel between the various other loans, but I say that there never was a time when money was got cheaper in the London market than today. We got a premium on the loan of 1885, and when we only asked for £4,000,000 there was £12,000,000 offered to us—that is some three times the amount asked for by us. So we do not think as far as our credit is concerned that we are rushing so very swiftly to ruin as some people would lead us to imagine.

Mr. Stockton is a very wise man and when he attempted to show at Moncton that there was a trade balance against us on comparing the two administrations, he took the three most favorable years under the Mackenzie regime and the three most unfavorable under the present administration and so proved his little problem; but if he will take the average of the two administrations he will find a difference in favor of the present administration of some $5,000,000 per year in the period in which the liberal conservative party has been in power. (Applause.)

In 1878 the post office savings banks had placed in them savings of the people amounting to 2¾ millions. From 1878 to 1885 savings increased until we have in these today eighteen million dollars. What does that all mean? That the people are thriving steadily and putting their money in the savings banks, and that they are successful. It means that their earnings are increasing. Although the expenses of living go on and although we have been expending money at the same time for the development of the business of the country, our people are more successful and have more faith in the country and its resources than they had some years ago. The liberal conservative party started out in 1868 with the belief that this country would be a great country and had a bright future before it and in all the years from that to this they have not lost faith in the future of this country, but have gone to work, making all needed improvements and expenditures. The country has grown under its influence and felt the benefits of his plans. It has not only planned improvements, but executed them. What a people of five million have accomplished in the extension of its railway system, is a proof of their ability to execute. The party which has conceived these plans and executed them is the liberal conservative party. It has not only had faith in the resources of the country, but it has shown its faith by building works much needed in the public service. It has had the boldness to execute its plans and the boldness was never better shown than when in 1881 the whole phalanx of the opposition was pitted against the building of the grandest and best public work this Dominion has ever had a hand in rearing—the Canadian Pacific Railway. (Loud applause) Today, as we look abroad over this country and see our unrivalled canal system, loaded with our vessels that come from every part of the continent—when we see this long line of railway, stretching from ocean to ocean with its growing traffic, it cannot be successfully contradicted that the government has by its works justified its faith in the future of the country now and appeals to the people to support it for what it has done. They ask you not to support them for negative principles, but for plans executed and carried out by them which have brought prosperity and well being to our common country. (Loud applause.)

HON. J. S. D. THOMPSON,

minister of justice, who was received with long continued plaudits, said:—

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen—I am exceedingly obliged to you for the cordial way in which you have received the mention of my name by the chairman, and I cannot help thinking that in some respects a cordial reception at the hands of the people of St. John one that I had not a full right to claim.

It is true that in my own province we have always been taught to believe that the people of the province of New Brunswick were more nearly related to us than the people of any of the other provinces of Canada. We looked upon them as our cousins before the union of the provinces took place at all, and we have been taught to believe since by every episode in public affairs that our interests lie side by side with yours and that we are in every respect people of a common country whatever differences may divide us from the people of the provinces in the west. But, sir, where I have recently visited places in the province of Ontario, as has been intimated to you by the Hon. Mr. White, and where I took part on several occasions in the discussion of public affairs, I have been repeatedly told by the opposition press that this Nova Scotian ought not to have been at large at all—that this country had gone out of the union, that this country had declared that Nova Scotia is the place for Nova Scotians and that the Nova Scotian ministers ought to be sent home by the first and fastest train. (Laughter.)

Well, I had hardly crossed over the border line between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick when I was gratified by receiving a paper published in your city by which any alarm that I might have was entirely dispelled. I found in a recent issue of the St. John *Globe* the report of an interview which took place with my friend, the premier of the local government, who has the repeal question in charge and the repeal contract on hand—(laughter)—and I was glad to be able to note that notwithstanding in the month of June we were all supposed to have shaken hands with you and bidden you good-bye for ever and had got rid of the iron heel of despotism which was supposed to be placed upon our necks at confederation, that notwithstanding all that, repeal has been put off and I am still at large. We were led to suppose in Nova Scotia when the local elections took place, notwithstanding that the local elections had nothing to do with federal questions, notwithstanding that the local government had nothing to do with the question of confederation, notwithstanding that the local government were accepting office under the constitution and not against the constitution—we were led to believe in Nova Scotia that some greatest demonstration in favor of disruption of the union would take place, some disruption take place in which the British constitution would be called to interfere and Nova Scotia sail out of the union, and standing alone, enter into the United States—prices go up and money flow in and everything go merrily and happily. But what will be the feeling of alarm when they read there what Premier Fielding has stated in that interview; we did not raise this question for Nova Scotia alone—but he did raise it, and we thought he had raised it and settled it on the 15th June—but we raised this question, and we must endeavor to secure the cooperation of New Brunswick and P. E. I. We were told we would be happier than before when we stood alone and now it appears we are to induce you and P. E. I. to come out too. All this would take time, we did not want time then—but it appears it wants time to drive into the brains of New Brunswick people the fact that they want repeal. And the statement is made a little farther on that the public men in New Brunswick and P. E. I. are altogether too timid on this question. That appears from the circumstance that when Premier Fielding went and made the same invitation in P. E. I. he was flatly told by the liberals, as he was told in this province that he might go but they had not packed yet and were not ready to start, and the answer made was that the liberals were altogether too timid and were naturally and properly cautious and did not look favorably at this question of repeal but that if the people were for repeal the public men would follow or make way for others who would correctly represent public opinion. So we are still lingering on the borders of this confederation, we are still your neighbors and we intend to remain so. It appears that Premier Fielding intends to allow us to remain until he can induce these people to go with him and until he can remove from their positions on N. B. and P. E. I. those public men who are not ready to go with him and who he thinks are too meek and cautious for him. As long as I am permitted by the kindness of the premier of Nova Scotia to be still with you and still a fellow countryman, as I avow, I hope to do for many years to come. (Applause)—while I have that opportunity, I feel it incumbent upon me to avail myself of the invitation of the liberal conservative association here to come with my colleagues before you and give an account of the trust reposed in us as members of the government of Canada.

It has been correctly stated in the press that we have a duty to perform here, that grave complaints have been made against government of Canada and that in appearing before you tonight we are to some extent upon our trial. It is correctly stated that we are as it were tonight upon our defence. I have no objection whatever as one member of the government to meet fully any of the charges which have been brought against the government of the day for maladministration and I intend to take up some of those charges in detail and to show that they are utterly baseless and groundless?

One of the most prominent charges made is the charge that the government of this country has been false to the country and extravagant in the administration of the affairs of the country in relation to the civil service, and statements have been recently made in the press here and in other parts of the provinces to the effect that in regard to superannuation of the public servants we have wilfully abused the powers which parliament conferred upon us for the purpose of bestowing pensions upon favorites and for the purpose of dispensing with the public services of men who were able to continue in the discharge of their public duties, and that these individuals have drawn enormous amounts from the public treasury. It is proper I should discuss it before you, for this reason, that while the leader of the opposition has been challenging us year after year and from meeting to meeting and appealing to the people on the platforms of his own province on the questions of the day, and while challenging the government everywhere you can yet read speech after speech which he has made, and speech after speech made by his lieutenants and find no statement of his policy other than the single suggestion which he has thrown out that he would, if placed in power, introduce a radical change as regards the superannuation of the public service. It is somewhat remarkable, and I must mention here at the outset, that during the five years when he had an opportunity of doing so, when he was backed by a majority of 70 or 80 in the house of commons, he did not introduce this measure of the reform of superannuation of the civil service. (Cheers.)

It is somewhat remarkable that he has never on the floors of parliament made the suggestion which he brings forward upon the platforms of this country. He charges that we have abused the system of superannuation and that we have extravagantly administered that branch of the public service. One of the principal liberal organs of this country has come out with the statement that the public officials have received enormous sums of money from this service, and no doubt that statement has been repeated in the press from place to place. That statement shows that a number of persons who are named in that list have drawn out of the public treasury $331,859, while they have contributed to the superannuation fund less than $10,000. Now, sir, in connection with that charge of abuse of the superannuation fund, which Mr. Blake has undertaken to prove to his party as being corruption, will you believe me when I tell you that while the individuals who have drawn that $331,000 have only contributed $10,000, the officers who were superannuated by Messrs. Blake and Mackenzie drew $155 500 of that money. (Applause.) So that while through the press we are called upon to meet the statement that we have enabled a few individuals to draw $331,000, we are able to show that our opponents squandered more than half that sum in five years, while we only spent the same amount in 12 years. (Applause.)

Let me take up another item of the civil service, and I do so with the greatest pleasure, because it has been discussed in your own press recently. It has been stated on every platform that we have been guilty of extravagance in adding to the number of public servants and that when Mr. Mackenzie went out of office in 1878 there were but 480 civil servants, there were in 1885, 1,180. In other words, that means that we have increased by nearly seven hundred the staff of the civil servants. Now, I am glad to say that in republishing that statement in the city of St. John the opposition press had been a little more reasonable and a little more cautious than the opposition in other parts of Canada and have simply given the statement without making comments upon it. But it is a statement that calls for refutation because we are liable to be and deserve to be condemned if we have increased the civil service by such a large number. Now, what will you think when I tell you that in order to make that comparison our friends of the opposition press have taken for the year 1878 simply the regular civil service staff while they have taken for the year 1885, not only the regular staff but every man in the employ of the government—engineers, foreman of works and the like—in order to make a favorable comparison between the years. If you take the list of the regular organized staff of the civil service in 1885 and compare it with the staff of 1878, you will find that the charge against us is exaggerated to the extent of 555 public servants. (Applause.) Or in other words, that there were 478 connected with the staff in 1878, 480 in 1879 and in 1885 there is not the increase they say of 700, but less than 150, and they conduct all the largely increased duties which the development of our public service and the extension of every branch of the public service from the one end of Canada to the other has thrown upon them.

Let me take up in your presence for a few moments a statement which has been made very frequently, that we have increased the burdens of the people by the extravagance of our management and that we have increased enormously the debt of this country, and that we should be condemned. I admit at the outset that we have increased the liabilities of the people of Canada. But, sir, let me ask you if when these provinces were confederated any one of the four would have been willing to enter the union if they had learned that the public works of the country would not be extended, no new works developed, nor public commerce extended, nor our fisheries protected?

Why, sir, our people knew it would have been impossible to go on without increasing the debt.

We had the best men in these two provinces struggling in vain to complete the I. C. Railway; and one of the strongest pledges made by our brethren in the western provinces was that this gigantic work should be completed for the development of our commerce, and soon after confederation was entered into that task was accomplished. That necessitated an increased expenditure in the public service and the net debt, which is today $196,000,000, notwithstanding statements to the contrary, has only increased $120,000,000 since the union was consummated.

Now, let me ask your consideration for a few moments. To what extent are we responsible for that? Our opponents were in power five years, and in this five years they increased the public debt of Canada $40,000,000; they increased it by a larger sum than that, but to keep my argument clear I shall speak in round numbers, and we increased it some $80,000,000. This shows the yearly increase of debt under them was $8,000,000, while under the present administration the rate of increase was but some $5,500,000 a year. But let me call your attention to one of the circumstances that our opponents leave our of sight altogether in making this charge against us, and that is in increasing the indebtedness of Canada by $80,000,000, we have taken $27,500,000 from the provinces themselves and transferred that sum to the liabilities of Canada, so that instead of expending that $27,500,000 we have simply transferred from one