POOR COPY

Miramichi Advance,

CHATHAM, N. B. - - - NOVEMBER 4, 1886

The Liberal Meeting at Chatham.

A LARGE AUDIENCE.—ENTHUSIASTIC RECEPTION OF THE SPEAKERS OF THE EVENING.—ALL CLASSES REPRESENTED AND ALL ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE TORIES MUST CEASE TO RULE.

The Liberal Association of Northumberland County acted wisely in securing Chatham Skating rink for their meeting of Thursday 21st ult. The Rink, when properly arranged, seats perhaps, four thousand people and, for this occasion, seats for about two thousand were put in. The threatening weather of the day and the smart rain which set in as evening approached, prevented many country people from leaving home, and it is probable that many more living in town, did not venture out fearing that the rink would be uncomfortably cold,—as it really was—during the evening. The fact that, notwithstanding these drawbacks, over twelve hundred ladies and gentlemen—twice as many as the Masonic Hall is capable of holding—gathered to hear Messrs. Davies, Alward and the other speakers of the evening, is abundant evidence of the popularity of these gentlemen, the hold the liberal cause has on the public heart and the interest which our people, generally, take in public affairs.

A temporary platform had been erected on the main floor of the rink, opposite the principle entrance. This was nicely covered all around with carpeting and over it were such mottoes as "Welcome," "No Duty on Breadstuffs," "Revenue Tariff—no monopolies," "Liberal Reform" etc. The stenographic reporters of the ADVANCE, Messrs. Fry and Everett of St. John, occupied a special table at the left front below the platform and seats were reserved immediately in front for ladies, and gentlemen accompanying them.

The chair was occupied by Wm Kerr, Esq., President of Northumberland Liberal Association, and among those on the platform were Hon. L. H. Davies, Dr. Silas Alward, D. C. L., Messrs. J. P. Burchill, Nelson; A. K. McDougall, Alnwick, Richard D. Wilson, Derby; Thos. Holmes, Blissfield; Scott Fairley, B. N. T. Underhill, R. H. Grindley, Blackville; W. V. Barbour, St. John, Thos. Troy, Douglastown; Patk. Hennessy, E. P. Williston, Jas. Brown and C. S. Ramsay of Newcastle; and J. B. Snowball, B. Stapleton, Patk. Connors, Jas Edger, E. Strang, R. Flanagan, Jas. Pierce and D. G. Smith of Chatham.

In calling the meeting to order Mr. Kerr said that a few months ago a Liberal Association had been formed in the County of Northumberland. The object the Association had in view was the furtherance of Liberal principles in the county, and in order to accomplish that object they had invited Hon. Mr. Davies, of P. E. Island, and Dr. Alward, of St. John, who had kindly consented to address the electors. They, with J. B. Snowball, Esq., ex-M. P. for Northumberland, and Mr. J. P Burchill, would address the meeting. He alluded to the fact that during the last local election campaign both political parties had held meetings in the Masonic Hall, where the best of order prevailed, and he asked for a continuance of the same at the present meeting. He then called upon

J. P. BURCHILL, ESQ.

who, on coming forward, was received with marked expressions of favor. He said:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: I assure you it is to me an unexpected pleasure to be called upon to address so large and representative an audience as that which has so heartily greeted me to night. The majority of this audience, I presume, have gathered together for the purpose of hearing one of the leading statesmen in the Dominion of Canada, and also a prominent speaker and member of the great liberal party from the City of St. John. These gentlemen will address you upon the Dominion politics of the day, a subject with which they are most familiar.

I am sure that the electors of Northumberland County will nobly respond to the call of the Liberal party—a call which from the very nature of things cannot but come to us at no distant date. (Applause.) In view of such call the liberals of this county, as you have been informed by our chairman, have formed themselves into an association, for the purpose of advocating and disseminating the principles of liberalism. Ere many months shall have passed we shall be called upon to cast our ballots in favour of one or other of the political parties, and it will be for the electors then to say whether they will continue the administration of the affairs of this county in the hands of the present ministry or transfer it to the hands of the liberal party.

Looking over the administration of this country's affairs for the past few years, I think the majority of the electors of this Dominion will come to the conclusion that it is high time the power of wrongfully administering their affairs should be wrested from the hands of the Tory administration. Enthusiastic applause.) If we compare the condition of the country now with its condition at the time of confederation, the result of the comparison will, I think, be a great inducement to cause a change to be made in the management of the affairs of this country. The condition of affairs at the confederation of the Provinces was this:—We were not suffering from any great debt, neither were we suffering from over-taxation; we were enjoying reciprocal trade with the United States, but to-day our condition is that, under the administration of the tory party, we have been plunged headlong into debt; our national debt amounts to some $300-000,000; they have caused discontent all over the whole of this great Dominion; they have caused rebellion in the west and secession in the east; they have, by their policy, built up a Chinese wall around us, and have denied that reciprocal trade to us which is so necessary for the material benefit of this country. (Applause.)

I think the young men lately placed upon the electoral list by the recent franchise act will show by their votes that the policy of the Tories has not been such a one as was or can be productive of good: it has caused many of our young men, and of our young women too, to leave their country, and they will come to the conclusion that it is time the administration of affairs was rescued from the hands of the Tory government.

Look at the matters of scandal that have arisen under their regime. Almost every second day we hear of some great scandal that has been committed, and the question may well be asked, will the Liberal party change all this? I am not prepared to judge as to these scandals, but I am prepared to say that I believe that the Liberal party will, if they succeed to power, set themselves industriously to work to remedy some of the evils, at least, under which we now groan. They will use all the influence they can command in the endeavor to obtain a reciprocal treaty. They will endeavor to adjust the tariff so as to make it bear more justly and evenly upon all classes in this broad Dominion. (Applause.) They will exert all their powers in the endeavor to stop the scandals so frequent under the Tory administration—scandals which are a disgrace to a country like ours.

I do not desire to consume any more of your time and will leave the discussion of the important questions at issue to-day in the hands of the gentlemen who at some inconvenience to themselves have so kindly undertaken to address you. I will only say this, speaking for the Liberal party of the county of Northumberland; I ask you and the Liberals of this County, when the opportunity comes, to rally around the old Liberal flag. I want you to show and to make it understood that Northumberland county is a Liberal county to-day, notwithstanding the statements to the contrary; I want it understood that Northumberland County has been represented by Liberals in the past and shall be again (applause) that she is Liberal to-day and it is for you to say in the coming election that she shall be represented by a Liberal in the next Parliament. (Enthusiastic applause.)

J. B. SNOWBALL, ESQ.

who was next called upon by the Chairman and was received with loud and prolonged applause, said:

Mr. chairman, ladies and gentleman: I was surprised to hear my name announced on the list of speakers for to-night, as I had no intention of speaking when I came here. I with you are certainly glad to welcome to our County Hon. L. H. Davies and Dr. Alward, gentleman who are capable in every respect of placing and explaining before this audience the principles of the Liberal party of Canada. As they are comparative strangers to the county I will inform them that it is my strong impression that the County of Northumberland has always been a strong liberal county (Applause). I admit that this county has not always been represented in Parliament by a Liberal, but when it has been represented by any other than a Liberal, I maintain that the honest and just sentiment and feeling of the electors has not been represented. I will merely make an apology and then leave the platform to be occupied by the speakers whom you have yet to listen to. I have been repeatedly asked by many of my friends how it was that at the last general election I forsook my friends and the Liberal party by not again offering, and in answer to that question I say there were many reasons why I took the course I did. I felt my time was so much occupied that I could not properly attend to your business. I never had so much private business to attend to as at that time and I felt if I was returned by you to parliament again I could not properly attend to your business there. While I was proud of the vote and support you had always given me, still as my business was growing so fast I felt I could not if elected properly attend to the duties of a representative. I also felt that the party then in power would be returned by the people at the polls and that I could do more good by attending to my business than by going again to Ottawa. Since that time things have changed We find that the people are groaning under the oppressive burdens inflicted on them by the tory party, which they cannot stand much longer. At the last election the Tory party made all sorts of promises, but I would ask you how many of them have been fulfilled? Hardly any. During all the time the Tory party have been in power they have been promising prosperity to the people, and declaring they were going to advance the people's interests in every way. They said at the time of Confederation that they were going to build up this country, but I ask have they done so? I was at the time of Confederation a strong supporter of that measure, and, therefore, must bear a part of the blame following its adoption, but not all, for our party has been in power only a few years since then, and I do say that beyond the completion of the I. C. R. the government have not done anything to improve our country. (Applause). We in the province of New Brunswick have been suffering under heavy burdens. Our shipping is depressed and our lumber trade is gone, with nothing to replace them, and, therefore, we have a right to feel that we have not been as justly dealt with as we should have been. (Applause.)

I do not like to make rash promises but while some think that when a member of parliament for this county I did nothing, still there are many who think otherwise, and this being so I would say when the time comes for you to seek my public services I will go into the fight, and when I do that I mean business. (Applause.) If when the coming battle is entered into you choose me as your standard bearer, while I will not say positively that I will come forward, yet if I am the choice of the liberal party I would say that if it is within the region of possibility my time will be at your service. (Applause.)

SILAS ALWARD M. A., D. C. L.

Dr. Silas Alward followed Mr. Snowball, and was received with great applause. He said:

Mr. Chairman, electors of the County of Northumberland, ladies and gentlemen,—

During the summer months it did seem as if we would have an election this fall; it did seem as if the leader of the Conservative party was desirous to accentuate the completion of the C. P. R. by an appeal to the people and by asking for a continuance of power. The question now arises whether in the light of subsequent events the election will take place in the near or in the somewhat remote future. (Applause.)

LATE ELECTIONS.

The elections that have taken place recently are of great significancy. The four last elections have been altogether in the interest of the Liberal party (Enthusiastic applause.) The first that came off were those in Nova Scotia. Ministers of the Crown hastened down to the province by the sea to win back, if possible, its wavering allegiance, and you, ladies and gentlemen, know with what result. They then sought, and vainly sought, to hold Chambly: they next made a grand fight in Haldimand—the first election that took place under the new Franchise Act, where they received support and succor from the Indians—and you likewise know with what result—(applause;) and the elections that took place the other day, in the historic Province of Quebec, must have for them a

SIGNIFICANCY MOST UNMISTAKABLE.

With all the larger Provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick one in sentiment, and with the right little, tight little island of Prince Edward, which, my friend Mr. Davies assures me, is soon to come in as a wanderer to the true fold, we will have with Manitoba, where the elections will take place within a few weeks,—nearly the whole sisterhood of Provinces

MARCHING UNDER THE LIBERAL BANNER

to storm the last stronghold of Toryism on the banks of the Ottawa. (Applause.) I say whether those elections will have such a significancy for the premier of Canada as to lead him to defer the elections until the expiry of parliament by effluxion of time, is a question extremely doubtful, but we, of the Liberal party, are prepared for either fate. We go into the contest with a strong assurance that the tide has turned and that the last stronghold of Conservatism will fall beneath the repeated blows dealt by a united party (Applause.)

To-day there are four ministers of the crown in the neighboring Province of Nova Scotia trying, vainly trying, to bring back the allegiance of that Province to Conservatism. We lately had three of these hon. gentlemen in the city of St. John. Their defence of the present administration was, I thought, an exceedingly weak one—it was an appeal *ad misericordiam*—and I believe that this appeal will not avail them in the coming election in this Province or in the neighboring Provinces of Nova Scotia and P. E. Island. (Applause.)

They charged the liberal government when in power, with being a party and a government that had done nothing for the country—that theirs was a do nothing policy—and that their record of legislation was an exceedingly barren one. They (the present government) took to themselves all the praise for the completion of the C. P. R. They did not accord any consideration to the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie and the party he led for their labors in regard to this great undertaking. But, ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to you and ask: Did not the liberal party do great and valuable service in connection with the prosecution of this great enterprise? When Mr. Mackenzie accepted the seals of office in 1872 he found the Dominion committed to the impossible task of completing that great work within ten years from the time British Columbia was brought into the Union in 1874.

What did Mr. Mackenzie first do? He sought a modification of the terms and having done that addressed himself to the execution of that stupendous work and during the five years that he and the party he led held the seals of office—what did he do in the prosecution of this work? He filled the prairies of the North West and the defiles of the Rocky Mountains with surveying parties and I would ask you to remember, that the North West was then very different from what it is to-day—it was then almost a *terra incognita*. He

EXPENDED $3,300,000 IN MAKING ACCURATE SURVEYS

of the country which proved of the utmost value to his successors in office, (Applause.) He entered upon the construction of a line of railway connecting Thunder Bay with Winnipeg, and during those five years he completed and equipped 228 miles of that line at a cost of

LESS THAN ONE-HALF

it had cost his predecessors in office to construct the I. C. R. per mile. He completed and equipped at a cost of $1,500,000 the Pembina branch, giving the prairie province connection with the railway system of the United States. Not only had he pushed the line out into the Northwest, but when he laid down the seals of office he had nearly completed the line to Portage la Prairie. In all these works he had expended $10,000,000 without adding

ONE SINGLE CENT TO THE TAXATION

of the people of this Dominion. (Enthusiastic applause.) What I ask you was the scope and design of his policy? It was to open the prairies to immigrants so that they settling upon the fertile lands of the great Northwest might bear with us the burden of its construction. I leave it for you to determine which was the wiser policy, that of Alex. Mackenzie or this of his successors in office? (Applause.) I say they do Mr. Mackenzie an injustice when they give him no credit and take all to themselves for the completion of the C. P. R.

The evening the ministers spoke in St. John, they seemed to be exceedingly solicitous about the interests of the Maritime Provinces. They professed to be great advocates of reciprocal trade relations between these provinces and the people of the United States, but, ladies and gentlemen, I think I can prove to you, that they are inimical to Reciprocity under almost any terms. During the eight years they have held office, what I ask, have they done towards securing it? Why, they have done nothing even according to their own admission. They say it would be unworthy of a great people to go on bended knee, and, in a boudsman's key, ask our neighbors of the United States to open up reciprocal trade relations with us. Did you ever hear of anything so absurd, or preposterous? They said the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie had failed in attempting to negotiate reciprocity; that the Hon. George Brown had gone to Washington on the same mission, and had met with a refusal from the authorities of that people and therefore Canada should not make any further efforts for reciprocity till the United States had shown a disposition to re-open the question; but we all remember, when the present government came into power they were to accomplish what their predecessors had failed to do. They promised at that time that they were going to bring back prosperity to this country and by their national policy compel the Americans to sue for reciprocal trade relations. They claimed they were the party of progress, and therefore with them there could be no failure; but during these eight years they have not

PUT FORTH ONE SINGLE EFFORT

in the direction of bringing about a consummation so devoutly to be wished. But then these gentlemen say that under the tariff of 1879 Canada made an offer of reciprocity, and the offer is still in force, which they are pleased to designate a standing one. What? A standing offer in a statute? I ask is there anything official or diplomatic in a statute? How is it with you in your private transactions? I appeal to you as common-sense men, and ask when you wish to barter with your neighbor or desire to make an exchange with him, do you not go and ask upon what terms he will treat with you? That most undoubtedly would be the course you would adopt. Do you think it would be sufficient to make an entry in your day book, that when your neighbor came to you and made an offer that he was prepared to trade with you, you would exchange with him? No. There must be some open avowed communication between yourself and him. So with nations as high contracting parties. There must be something official, something diplomatic in their treatment of each other. The mere insertion of such an offer as these gentlemen say was placed in the statute of 1879, was not, and is not, an offer of reciprocity at all. Now let us see what were the terms of this much vaunted offer? I propose to read it to you that you may judge for yourselves whether it was a genuine offer of reciprocity, or whether it was not put forward as a sham, a delusion and a snare. The terms are as follows;—

Resolved, That it is expedient that any or all of the following articles, that is to say; animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour of meal or any other grain, butter, cheese, fish, (fresh, salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this act, upon the proclamation of the governor-in-council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation, when imported into Canada.

And that they say is an offer to the people of the United States of reciprocity. Did you ever hear of anything more absurd? What are the leading staples enumerated in this resolution? They are potatoes, oats, butter, cheese, fish and lumber, all of which we have in abundance and desire to export, and articles which the Americans do not send into our markets and still they say

THIS IS AN OFFER OF RECIPROCITY.

Why, suppose, the Americans, in order to show the absurdity of this proposition, should insert in their tariff a provision that whenever the people of Canada would take the duty off kerosene oil, peanuts, oranges, cottons, and bananas they, the people of the United States, would do the same. What would you think of such a proposition? (Laughter.) You would think it perfectly absurd, for we have to import these articles and do not have them for exportation. But still, ladies and gentlemen, the Government of Canada call this resolution of 1879

"A STANDING OFFER OF RECIPROCITY"

with the people of the United States. Out upon such nonsense? (Loud applause.) One has only to look at the statute and the articles enumerated in it, to see how ridiculous it is. It shows on its face it was placed there to hoodwink the people of this country, and serves to show the government of the day are

OPPOSED TO RECIPROCITY.

(Enthusiastic applause.) Further than this, my friend, the Hon. Mr. Davies, who is here to-night, in order to test the sincerity of the government on the question, rose in his place in parliament on the 20th day of March, 1884, and moved the following resolution;

"In view of the notice of the termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken, at an early day, by the Government of Canada, with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new treaty, providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries; and that in any such negotiations Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its government."

This was moved in consequence of a message sent by President Arthur to the Congress of the United States on the 5th day of December, 1883. This message, which I shall read to you, invites Congress to open up the whole question and reads thus:

"The fishery industries, pursued by a numerous class of our citizens on the northern coasts both of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, are worthy of the fostering care of Congress, whenever brought into competition with the like industries of other countries, our fishermen, as well as our manufacturers of fishing appliances and preparers of fish products, have maintained a foremost place. I suggest that Congress create a commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries and the means of opening to our citizens under just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

Now that message was sent to congress, mark the date, on the 5th December, 1883, and on the 24th March, 1884, my friend, the Hon. Mr. Davies, moved the resolution, which I read in your hearing a few moments ago. I ask how did the Government deal with that resolution? They voted it down by the solid phalanx which they had behind them. But they say that the resolution was moved at an inopportune time; that it was moved when the house was about to go into committee of supply, and therefore it was a virtual motion of want of confidence. I contend that had the Government been honest and sincere, had the leader of the Government then risen in his place and said to the Hon. Mr. Davies, "The Government of Canada have this matter under serious consideration at the present time, if you persist in your resolution it will tend to embarass their movements"—if he had shown by speech or action any sincerity in the question, any desire to open trade relations with the United States, I am sure my hon. friend, Mr. Davies, would have

WITHDRAWN HIS RESOLUTION

and would have given to the government of the Dominion every assistance in his power to effect the desired object. (Applause.) If they had been honest and sincere in this matter they could have easily taken hold of the question at that time and might possibly have carried it on to successful completion. I asked you to mark the dates—that is the time the message was sent by President Arthur to Congress, namely the 5th Dec., 1883, and the date of this resolution namely, 28th March, 1884. Now they turn around and say that no action was taken on the part of the United States Senate or the House of Representatives in pursuance of the President's suggestion. True, no action was taken, and for very good reason, because they saw the resolution moved by the Hon. Mr. Davies

VOTED DOWN

by the Government of the Dominion, and consequently such a consideration would be entirely useless. (Applause.) Then further, ladies and gentlemen, their policy, falsely called national, is opposed to reciprocity. Their much-vaunted policy and reciprocity cannot go hand in hand. They have built up a Chinese wall of exclusiveness by which they have raised enormous revenues, enabling them to run riot and revel in corruption year after year—(applause)—and they are now facing enormous deficit after deficit, and consequently must needs keep up their protective policy in order to gain a revenue by which to carry on the affairs of the country—(applause) so that their policy is opposed to such trade relations as will necessarily lessen the sources of income; and further than this, their organ, —or rather what was their organ until the Haldimand election—the *Mail*, has been for years the

OUTSPOKEN OPPONENT OF RECIPROCITY.

In 1884, when the *Mail* had the confidence of the Government of Canada; when it was their organ and mouthpiece, and was largely subsidized by it, what did it say in its issue of June 2nd of that year, and again I would ask you to mark well the dates.—It said:—

"Canada has done quite enough—all that she can or will, for the present, do in the affair of reciprocity. Any proposition that the United States may have to make will, of course, be entertained. We do not look for an early precipitation of negotiations, and we believe that THE PEOPLE OF CANADA AT PRESENT WANT NOTHING SO LITTLE AS THEY WANT RECIPROCITY. The national policy is not a failure. If it has failed, the rumor of the failure has not reached us."

That was the outspoken expression of the organ of the Conservative party on the 2nd June, 1884. Under the same date it goes on to remark:—

"Mr. Goldwin Smith is of opinion that there is in Canada a large body of opinion in favor of closer commercial union with the United States. We have yet to make that discovery. * * * *

"Our own national policy has taught us that we can do without a reciprocity treaty. It has employed capital and labor and erected a great number of new industries. It is the desire of American manufacturers to relieve our business men of the necessity of doing so much business. It is not the intention of our business men to entertain that view. It is the notion of some other Americans, not uninspired, perhaps, by Mr. Goldwin Smith's continental policy, that political union should follow a commercial union. WE DO NOT THINK WE WILL ON OUR PART TOLERATE THE EXPERIMENT.

"We are not fond of offering advice to governments, for we do not think that governments should be dictated to by the press. But we advise caution. The advocacy of reciprocity is just now confined to three classes of persons: 1st, those Americans who want our markets; 2nd, those Canadians who hate the national policy and the federation; 3rd, those who wish for annexation. In our opinion these classes are very imperfect exponents of Canadian national or commercial feeling. THEY COME TO US ASKING TRIBUTE AND NATIONAL HUMILIATION; OUR ADVICE IS TO THROW THEM INTO THE WELL."

That was the advice the organ of the Tory party gave in 1884, and now they say they are the advocates of reciprocity, and have always been.

On the 4th of June, 1884, the same paper said:

We have taught England that the Imperial interests in Canada are well worth a strong support, and we have learned for ourselves that reciprocity is not essential to our national welfare.

The other day you may have seen in the press what was said to be the draft of a proposed treaty sent out from the colonial office to the authorities at Ottawa. It went the round of all the leading newspapers, and you saw that it was based principally upon the terms and provisions of the treaty of 1854. The conservative ministers denied the authenticity of this proposed treaty. They said it was a forgery—at least some of them said so—but a great many believed and still believe in the existence of the draft of that treaty, and that the conservative party would not or were unwilling to accede to the terms of that draft treaty.

On the 9th of this month a correspondent of the Boston *Globe* sent out from London the communication which I will presently read to you. He states that the draft treaty has gone from the Colonial office to the authorities at Ottawa, and that it was not favorably received by them; he then goes on to say that this was the answer of the ministers of the crown in Canada to the Colonial authorities:

"The Ministers of the Crown having read the draft submitted them by the Colonial office in reference to a Reciprocity Treaty between England and the United States, affecting the interests of the Dominion of Canada, by which a settlement of the existing dispute between the United States Government and Canada as to the fishery rights should be effected in accordance with the recommendations contained in the several paragraphs of the said draft, submit their objections to the provisions therein contained, and suggestions as to desirable modifications.

"The Ministers of her Majesty's Dominion Government have carefully considered the draft, and while aware that some arrangement such as proposed would be beneficial to all parties concerned, removing as it doubtless would, obstacles which mar the commercial relations of the two countries at present, beg to submit the provisions of the draft in view of the present policy of the administration, are such that they could not consistently be submitted by the Government to the House of Commons for ratification, even though the proceedings should progress thus far between the two high contracting parties.

"As must be known, the Canadian Government in 1878 entered upon a new era in the adoption of a protective system, having in view the best interests of Canadian manufactures. That policy, then encouraged, has proven commercially of the highest interest to the business community of the country. Their interests and those of this Government are identical.

"To-day manufactories which have been established for years are running with full work, and employ large numbers of operatives in the manufacture of different lines of goods embraced within the schedule. It is considered that while among the articles so enumerated and submitted to this Government, those which are the products of the land might without danger to the commercial interests of Canada be admitted free into each country, yet there are contained within that schedule many articles which the Canadian Government would not care to admit in the interests of the manufacturing community.

"Being therefore fully aware of the deep interest manifested by her Majesty the Queen, through the Imperial authorities, in her Canadian colony, and that the proposed draft is the outcome of that consideration, the Canadian Government feel their deep obligation to Her Majesty for the interest thus displayed. It should, however, be considered in this connection, that the will of the people as expressed in the marked degree at the polls in 1878, by the election of a Conservative Government to power, and the confidence reposed in that Government since that time on account of successful carrying out of the policy then inaugurated, shows clearly that the feeling of Canadians would be opposed to the ratification of such a treaty as that proposed in detail by the draft forwarded to this Government for consideration."

That, says a correspondent of the Boston *Globe* was the answer of the Canadian government to the proposed draft. When Parliament meets this winter, if Sir John Macdonald, does not dissolve the house in the meantime, my friend the Hon. Mr. Davies, will have the opportunity of asking the leaders of the government then and there, whether there was any draft treaty and whether the answer as reported by the correspondent of the Boston *Globe* was the one sent forward by the government. Ministers of the crown say they are in favor of reciprocity, yet their very conduct belies their professions, for

THEY VOTE DOWN

in Parliament resolutions having for their object the opening up of the question. They allow their organ to denounce those who favor it, calling them annexationists, and cranks, and advise that they should be thrown into the well. Father even than this do they go, for we find when a draft of a proposed treaty comes forward (assuming that there was such) they send an unfavorable answer to it, and yet all the while they claim they are the friends of reciprocity. The voice may be the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau. (Enthusiastic applause.)

The people of these Maritime Provinces have all along felt the hand of Esau and will continue to feel it until they arise in their might and drive from power the men who have thus

SHAMEFULLY FALSIFIED THEIR PROFESSIONS.

(Loud applause) and whose every act in this matter belies the spoken word, So much for their desire to gain us reciprocity.

The gentlemen who spoke in St John a few evenings ago, said that gross charges of corruption had been preferred against them, all of which were groundless; that charges of grave scandals had likewise been brought against them not only in the House of Commons, but in the press, and throughout the country, which also were groundless. Gentlemen, I stand here to-night and advisedly reiterate the charges which have been made, and I do so knowing full well how serious a matter it involves; and also recognizing the gravity of preferring such charges against any man, or any body of men. Now if I can bring facts and arguments to maintain my position, you will give them the consideration they deserve; but if I am without facts then I ask you as honest men to dismiss my arguments at once from your minds.

In the first place I charge the Ministry of the day, with nepotism, or the appointment of relatives to office. (Applause.) This has been denounced by the greatest and ablest statesmen of every age, and every country.

Secondly, I charge them with gift, taking, which has likewise been denounced by the ablest and greatest statesmen of all countries and of all ages, (Loud applause.)

In the third place I charge some of the ministers with perverting the sacred trust reposed in them by taking advantage of their official position to promote their pecuniary interests. (Loud applause.) And I think, before I am done I will make good one and all of the charges I have thus made.

Before I proceed to speak of their nepotism, or appointment of relatives to office I will read to you what has been the view entertained of this matter by some of the greatest statesmen in the world. What did Jefferson say on the subject on the 25th January, 1810?

"The public will never be made to believe that an appointment of a relative is made on the ground of merit alone, uninfluenced by family views; nor can they ever see with approbation offices divided out as family property."

He further states:—

"Officers appointed to transact public business should be such as are best fitted for the positions, not because they are the relatives of those dispensing the patronage. I therefore laid it down as a rule of conduct for myself never to give an appointment to a relative."

(Prolonged applause.)

What did the pure minded Sumner, Massachusetts' great statesmen, say on this subject in the powerful speech delivered in the U. S. Senate on the 31st May, 1872? On that occasion he remarked; 'Nepotism is an abuse which nobody can defend.' (Enthusiastic applause.) No doubt many of you know that it was a single act of nepotism, on the part of a Lord Chancellor of England, which led to his deposition from office, and final downfall and disgrace. I refer to Sir Richard Bethel, Lord Westbury, who when he was Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain and having the dispensation of certain patronage, appointed his son an office, which appointment brought such obloquy upon him as forced him to retire from public life in disgrace. Thus do the people of England regard the offence of nepotism. But how is this offence regarded by the Conservative government and our ministers in Ottawa?

ALMOST EVERY MINISTER THERE

has appointed a son, son-in-law, brother brother-in-law, father in-law, the father of a son's wife, cousin, or relation of every degree, even to the third or fourth generation to office. (Laughter and applause). And their name is legion. One of the ministers has foisted no less than three brothers upon the public service, and the Minister of Customs has, Heaven only knows, how many relations of his own appointment feeding today at the public crib. (Laughter). Time would fail me to tell their names or the positions they fill. After extracts I have read from Sumner's speech, and the sayings of the great Jefferson, what possible excuse can these gentlemen offer for their conduct? Is the public service to be

CONVERTED INTO AN ALMS HOUSE

for the needy relatives of our ministers? Are we to be burdened with taxes to support needless officials, whose only title to office is their relationship to a Minister of the Crown?

I now come to

GIFT-TAKING

an offence alike indefensible. The following is the calm, judicial utterance of Charles Summer, that great model statesman. In the speech already referred to he remarks:—

For a public man to take gifts is reprehensible. He further said:—

"There have been throughout history corrupt characters in official station, but whether in ancient or modern times the testimony is constant against the taking of gifts, and nowhere with more force than in our scriptures, where it is said; "Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons; neither take a gift, for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise."

You all remember what an old patriot once said: "I fear the Greeks bearing gifts." So we in this country fear contractors bearing gifts. (Applause.)

Take the case of Lord Brougham, His admirers in Glasgow subscribed £500 as a testimonial for his public services. He declined it, saying: "No public man could consistently accept such a gift." What did the great Washington say when he declined a testimonial? "If I accepted this should I not henceforward be considered as a dependent?" What did John Quincy Adams say as to the gift taking? "No public man could take gifts without peril.'

Now let us look at the present ministry at Ottawa. We will commence with the Premier, Sir John Macdonald. (Hear, hear.) When he was Prime Minister before his downfall in 1872, a testimonial of $30,000 was offered to and accepted by him; and who were the principal subscribers to that testimonial?

CONTRACTORS AND JOBBERS

who had claims against the government, and who were coming before him day after day for a settlement of these claims and an adjustment of extra charges for services alleged to have been done. Why, ladies and gentlemen, even corporations subscribed to this testimonial fund, but they may be excused on the ground that they have no souls. (Laughter and applause.)

Take the case of the Northern Railway—a bankrupt concern—that out of its exhausted exchequer took $2,500 to subscribe to that testimonial to Sir John, and at that very same time it was seeking to get the Government of the Dominion to compromise certain obligations it was under to them—(applause,)—and in the following session a bill was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald by which it was proposed to cancel these obligations for a very much smaller sum than Mr. Mackenzie thought the corporation was able to pay, and he consequently opposed the bill and succeeded in defeating it. The next year Mr. Mackenzie was in power and he succeeded in

GETTING $500,000 MORE

when he settled with this corporation than the amount it was proposed to be settled for by Sir John A. Macdonald. Comment is unnecessary. But Sir John Macdonald is not the only minister who can be charged with gift taking. There is the case of the minister of public works, Sir Hector Langevin. Contractors were constantly going before him for the purpose of settling and adjusting claims for services performed or extra services alleged to have been done. This minister accepted a

TESTIMONIAL OF $20,000,

made up largely by contractors.

Then we have the case of one of the crown ministers from New Brunswick likewise receiving a gift—the handsome gift of a house nicely furnished, and valued at something like $10,000. The subscribers to this testimonial were principally government employees and contractors. What I ask can be said in defence of these gentlemen viewed in the light of the extracts I have just read as to gift-taking by public men? I claim to have made good the charge I started with, viz., that I could prove to your satisfaction, these men were

UNWORTHY OF YOUR CONFIDENCE

and had proved recreant to the solemn trusts committed to their charge. (Applause.)

And in the third place I charge some of the ministers with having used their official positions to promote their personal advancement and pecuniary interests.

We know that a public office is a public trust; it is a sacred trust. For the time being, your representative in parliament is the trustee of your interests. I ask what is the primal, the grand underlying principle of trusteeship? That the trustee shall not use the property of his ward to advantage himself. So the representative who uses his position for the furtherance of his own interests, pecuniary or otherwise, not only forfeits all claim to your respect, but subverts the foundations on which rests all good government.

If this be wrong in a representative, it is doubly so in a

MINISTER OF THE CROWN;

because he wields greater power. He not only exercises the power which was conferred on him by the people but the delegated power reposed in him by the representatives of the Commons. Now let us see, whether I cannot substantiate the charges I have made under the third head of my arraignment of their conduct. What I am about to say, I say advisedly, for I come prepared with facts and figures and fortified with extracts from blue books and the pages of Hansard. I know full well how serious is the charge and the necessity of making good my position.

During the closing days of last session

THE SUM OF $1,700,000

was placed in the estimates for the purpose of assisting and subsidizing certain local railways. These railways numbered something like thirty, all told, in the different Provinces of the Dominion. Among these was a line of railway which, judging from the grants, subsidies and subventions with which it has been burdened, must be a particular favorite or pet. I refer to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, a line extending about 170 miles northeast from the City of Quebec.

In the first place it was the subject of a land grant of 5,000 acres per mile. Then the local government of Quebec granted a subsidy of $5,000 per mile. Next the Dominion Government gave a bonus of $3,200 per mile. The city of Quebec came to its assistance with the handsome sum of $458,000. Then the Dominion Government last session supplemented all these aids with a further subvention. All these grants and aids were passed over by the company to a construction company, who it is supposed made and is still making handsome profits out of this enterprise.

And who, think you, is a prominent member of this Construction Company? None other than the

HON. MR. CARON, A MINISTER OF THE CROWN.

At page 1,622 of the Hansard of 1886, where you will see this matter discussed, you will find Mr. Blake asked the following question and received the following answer:

Mr Blake—I would like to know whether the Minister of Militia is himself a member of the Construction Co.?

Adolphe Caron—I am. (Loud applause.)

And he is a member of the crown profiting as a member of a Construction Company from the aid granted by the government of which he was a member, and upon which he both voted at the council board and in the House of Commons as well! (Applause and laughter.) There is also the case of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway Company, which has been the recipient of favors from the Dominion Government in the shape of subsidies, of which Company the Hon. Mr. Chapleau is a director. (Applause.) Nor do I stop here, you have all heard of the

INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY,

which up to quite a recent date has been almost entirely owned by the Hon. Mr. Pope. Of course Mr. Pope, as Minister of Railways, does not own a dollar's interest in this line. (Laughter.) That interest has all been passed over to, and is now owned by, his son-in-law, W. B. Ives, M. P. for Richmond and Wolf. (Laughter.) He (Mr. Ives) is now the largest stockholder in the company. (Laughter.) Mr. Pope is not only a representative of the people in the Commons, but he is a minister of the Crown, and further still, Minister of Railways. (Loud laughter.) And he as Minister of Railways, is negotiating with the C. P. R. for a sale of the International for the purpose of giving that great Corporation an outlet to the sea. The International received a subsidy from the Dominion Government. Just fancy what a state of affairs this case presents. It is plain Mr. Pope is interested in the International. I forget, his interest stands in the name of a member of parliament, his son-in-law, Mr. Ives. (Laughter.) Mr. Pope goes to Mr. Pope, M. P., and asks him to use his influence as a member of parliament to get a grant for this railway. Mr. Pope, M. P., goes to the Hon. Mr. Pope, Minister of Railways (laughter) and asks him to use his influence as Cabinet Minister to get the subsidy. And the Minister of Railways is to act in all the delicate negotiations between the International and the C. P. R.

Of course he only acts on his official capacity, and without interest. (Laughter.) Now, clearly, what plain Mr. Pope does is not done in his capacity as a member of parliament, nor the influence he exerts over the other cabinet ministers, as Minister of Railways. This you must bear strictly in mind. In all these three different positions he is quite a different person. Mr. Pope is evidently

THE POOH-BAH OF THE CABINET.

(Laughter.)

Gentlemen, can anything be more indefensible than this? Here are three ministers of the crown interested, and deeply interested in great public enterprises, constantly asking and constantly receiving government aid. One hand is extended to beseech and the other to receive. One voice is raised to ask and the other to grant the favor asked. And, mark you, all these gentlemen assist each other in advancing their respective schemes at the council board. A sacred trust is thus shamlessly perverted. Your property they hold and it should be used to advance your interests, but they use it to put money in their purse regardless of your rights and unmindful of your interests. (Loud applause.)

Next let us take the case of members of parliament sitting in the house and voting on subventions granted to railways in which they are interested. There is Dalton McCarthy, a strong supporter of the government, president of an important railway, the subject of parliamentary aid. Also Mr. McIntosh, M. P. for Ottawa, president of the Gatineau Valley Railway Company. But let us come a little nearer home. There is the Bay de Chaleur Railway, which received a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, and this railway is largely owned by Conservative members of parliament and Conservative senators. Come still nearer home to the neighboring county of Gloucester. I find that out of the 20,000