

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Last Wednesday the people of Atwood were favored with a visit from the champion of Unrestricted Reciprocity, Sir Richard Cartwright. He was accompanied by the Reform nominee, James Grieves, of Mornington. Wm. Shearer filled the chair, and in a few words of welcome introduced Mr. Grieves, who addressed the audience on the questions of the hour. He is a pleasant speaker and is possessed of considerable mental force; a prosperous farmer and Deputy Reeve of Mornington. Sir Richard Cartwright was next introduced, who spoke for about two hours and laid the policy of the Liberal party in the best light possible especially Unrestricted Reciprocity, of which he is the originator.

THE SENATE.

At the meeting of the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario, representing the best class of the agriculturists of this province, a resolution was passed favoring the abolition of the Dominion Senate, on the ground that it favors combines. This is one out of many other substantial reasons why this too long tolerated white elephant should be abolished. There are too many leeches hanging to the Dominion treasury apart from squandering thousands of dollars in maintaining seventy-five public imbeciles, receiving an average salary of \$1,100 per annum. The house-keeper receives a salary of \$1,200, while the door-keeper is paid off with the small pittance (?) of \$900. There is altogether too much English red tape system in administering the affairs of the Dominion. "It's English you know." Yes, too much so for Democratic Canadians. If the farmers generally, throughout the Dominion, would only insist on their candidates in the approaching election pledging themselves to work in Parliament for the Senate's abolition it would soon be done. Now is the time to strike. This is not a party question, the leaders of both political parties being favorable to the retention of the Senate. But if the farmers will only put down their feet, and resolutely say the Senate must go, it will go and that in short order. Suppose the farmers of North and South Perth lead the way.

THE SITUATION.

We are on the eve of a general election. The manifestos of the political leaders—Sir John Macdonald and Hon. Wilfrid Laurier—are before our readers who are in a position to weigh each and draw their own conclusions. As will be seen the great question at issue, in fact the only question, is Unrestricted Reciprocity. Now this is a many-sided question, and so complicated that many average intelligent electors are at a loss to understand the real meaning implied. We will explain. *Unrestricted* means unlimited, while *Reciprocity* means free intercourse one with the other; mutual obligations, or agreeing to anything mutually. Hence the political meaning, and which we are to understand it in connection with the present campaign, is "Free Trade between the United States and Canada and a duty on the products of all other nations." Great Britain included. This is the full meaning as defined by Sir Richard Cartwright himself in the agricultural hall last Wednesday. Will the United States agree to the unrestricted reciprocity policy advocated by the Reform party supposing that party is in power? We say, no. Jas. G. Blaine, Secretary of State in the Republican cabinet, has promised no such trade relations with Canada. The government which he is a member of and under whose direction the commerce of the Republic is entrusted, is directly opposed to free trade. Protection has always been a strong plank in the Republican platform. If closer trade relations are to be brought about it must come from the Democratic side of the house, who, while not free trade enthusiasts, are more likely to assent to the proposed policy of the Liberals. The United States has always cherished a protective system of government. Canada has struggled and struggled in vain for better trade relations with the Republic. As proof of this we subjoin an article from *Le Monde*, a French Canadian journal, which says:

"Liberal journals must be entirely ignorant of the political history of the country. They should know that since 1854 the Government of Canada has offered to the United States Government to establish commercial relations between the two countries and that, excepting on one occasion, these offers were made by Conservative govern-

ments. The first offer was made in 1865, before the Elgin treaty was abrogated, when Sir John Macdonald and other Canadian ministers went to England to procure Imperial Government influence in having that treaty renewed. In January, 1866, desiring to renew reciprocity, the Canadians sent four delegates to Washington, who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman of which, however, imposed as conditions of the treaty an increase in the Canadian excise duties, and absolute free trade in natural and manufactured products. These conditions the delegates refused to accept and returned to Canada. In 1868 Canada offered to admit certain natural products of the United States free, or with a reduced duty. Again in 1869 Messrs. Cartier and Macdougall went to England to induce the Imperial Government to obtain reciprocity between Canada and the United States, but although these two delegates also visited Washington nothing came of it. In 1871, Sir John, in negotiating the treaty of Washington, offered to exchange the use of the fisheries for an arrangement of reciprocal commerce. To this the Americans would not consent. Again in 1873 another fruitless effort was made to secure a settlement, and in 1874 George Brown went to Washington to negotiate a treaty, and after considerable work a project was drawn up, which, however, the Senate refused to ratify. In adopting the National Policy in 1878, the Government inserted in the statutes a permanent offer of reciprocity in natural products, in case the United States declared in favor of the same. When the fisheries question was being discussed at Washington in 1888 Sir Chas. Tupper wished to settle it by the adoption of reciprocal commercial relations, and now in 1891 comes Sir John's latest offer on the question."

We quote the above not with the object of defending the Conservative views on the question, but merely to show the impracticability of the policy. THE BEE is a warm advocate of any policy that will better the condition of the masses, but in the past such trade negotiations have utterly failed, and at the present crisis we can see nothing better held out to us.

Another phase of the situation. The annexation cry is raised by the Conservative party and re-echoed by the American press. Unrestricted Reciprocity does not necessarily mean political absorption. Great Britain has had free trade with the Republic and every other nation, and its political independence has not been endangered thereby. There is practically nothing in the cry. The people of Canada, Reformers and Conservatives, alike, are strongly averse to annexation. The national, patriotic spirit is too strong in this country to admit of any such thing. We love the United States; we love the motherland better; and we love Canada best of all.

Would Unrestricted Reciprocity discriminate against Great Britain? Most assuredly. This is no reason why we should refrain from bettering our trade relations with other nations, however. If England cannot hold her own with Uncle Sam on the field of commercial competition it is no fault of ours, and because we chance to be a colony of Britain is no reason why we should cripple our commerce with the outside world. As much as we love old England, the primary interests of this country must precede all other interests. "Charity begins at home." Lastly, would Unrestricted Reciprocity prove beneficial to Canada? Most decidedly. Following are the strong reasons against it, as set forth by the Conservative party: The United States has made the greatest commercial progress during the past century of any nation in the world, and that under a strict and even extreme protection policy. She evidently realized the fact that she possessed within herself unlimited though undeveloped resources, which if developed would make her a productive, wealthy and independent nation. The same may be said of Canada. We are practically in the same position as the United States. We have unlimited resources undeveloped, and untold buried wealth. How are we to develop our country? By encouraging home industry and seeking to develop those powers vested in us. It is wonderful what a man or nation can do if thrown upon their own resources.

We must not content being a mere colony of Great Britain, or a dumping ground for the neighboring Republic. We must rise in our might, and by elevating, inspiring and patriotic literature, a true sense of our dignity as born Canadians, and a proper conception of the great possibilities lying before us, build up a nation and people that will put to shame the vaunted pride of older nations, even the great American Republic.



THIS SPACE

IS RESERVED FOR

JAS. IRWIN'S

MAMMOTH

Spring Announcement!



THOS. FULLARTON,
COMMISSIONER IN THE H.C.J.;
Real Estate Agent; Issuer of
Marriage Licenses; Money to
Lend on reasonable terms; Private
Funds on hand; all work neatly and
correctly done; Accounts Collected.
Atwood, Nov. 11, 1890. 42-1y



SPRING

IS COMING!

WE have just received a fine assortment of **Boots** in every design and quality.

DRY GOODS!

New Cottons,
New Cottonades,
Shirtings,
Prints and
Ginghams,
Extra Value.

Fresh Groceries!

RECEIVED EVERY WEEK.

A Call Solicited.

Mrs. M. Harvey.

A. A. GRAY,

(FORMERLY OF LISTOWEL) OF
THE FIRM OF

JOHNSON & CO.

Royal Art Studio,

513 QUEEN STREET W., TORONTO.

Enlargements for the Trade. Solar,
Bromide, Platinum, Opal and Oil Prints.

PORTRAITS

In Crayon, Ink, Water, Oil and Pastel
Colors.

Full line of Artist's Material
kept in stock. Oil and Water Colors,
Canvases, Brushes, Palettes, Crayons,
&c., &c.

SAMPLE OF WORK

On Exhibition at THE BEE Publishing
House, where Full Particulars may be
had and Orders Taken.

READY-MADE

-CLOTHING-

—AT—

J. S. GEE'S

A FEW OVERCOATS

Left that we are Closing out
at a

BARGAIN

J. S. GEE, - NEWRY.