

gross slander on the people of the Maritime Provinces. When I first read that address, had I not known that the hon. gentleman was a man of education, and a man who understood the full force and meaning of his language, I would have believed he could not have understood the full import, the full meaning, and the full insult to the people, that are contained in the paragraph I have just read. I wish now to say from my seat in this House, that the people in the Maritime Provinces—the Province of New Brunswick for whom I specially speak—have just as much regard for principle, just as much regard for the right, and just as much respect for what is honourable in political matters as the hon. gentleman, who speaks of them as if they were dirt beneath his knightly feet, himself has for those principles. During the recent elections in the Province of New Brunswick there was never a mention made of a railway subsidy, from one end of the country to the other. I speak with special reference to the Province from which I come, and I speak for the largest and most important constituency in that Province, the City and County of St. John, which I have the honour to represent. In the recent contest in that constituency there was, from beginning to end, but one question discussed before the electors on the public platform, by the different candidates and in the public press, and that question was: Is unrestricted reciprocity, as defined by the hon. gentleman himself, as defined by the hon. leader of the Opposition, as defined by the leaders of the Liberal party, and as defined by Mr. Wiman in the *North American Review*, is that policy of unrestricted reciprocity in the best interests of the country, or is it not? That, Sir, was the sole question at issue. We asked the electors: Are you in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, when the logical results of such a policy must be as they are defined to be by its authors; or are you in favour of attempting to obtain a modified form of reciprocity while still cherishing our British connection? That was the one question discussed on every platform and in the columns of every newspaper in the Province of New Brunswick. I venture to say that the gentlemen who were our opponents in the constituency during the recent contests—one of whom is a gentleman who was for many years in this House, and who held the esteem and personal good-will of the hon. members on both sides of the House—I say that our opponents in that contest will not contend that there was a single side issue introduced; they will not say that the constituency was bribed; they will not say that the people had cash in hand or promises of railway subsidies, but they will admit that the contest was fought fairly and squarely on the question before the electorate, even though their votes were contrary to the wishes of our opponents. In the City and County of St. John the majority for the successful candidates was so large that it is simply idle talk to speak about cash in hand and railway subsidies. In the county represented by the hon. member on my right (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland), who came back with a majority of nearly 2,000 votes, it is idle to speak about the offer of bribes and railway subsidies. Taking the Province as a whole, the popular majority, fairly and freely given by the people, amounted to over 5,000 votes, the largest popular majority ever obtained in the Province by any political party. In view of

Mr. HAZEN.

these facts, I need say but little in repudiation of the slanderous statement the hon. gentleman has published in the other provinces concerning the Province of New Brunswick. In order that I may show the proper lesson to be drawn from the result of the election in the Maritime Provinces, I wish to read a statement of a leading Liberal in my constituency: the statement of a gentleman who is a personal friend of my own, but who, I regret to say, does not see eye to eye with me on political questions.—I speak of Mr. Allan Jack, the Recorder of the city of St. John. That gentleman was one of our strongest opponents on the platform during the recent campaign, and on the 27th day of March, he wrote a letter to the *Toronto Week* giving his views on the elections in the Maritime Provinces. That letter concluded as follows:—

“ Upon the whole, and entirely outside of party considerations, the result of the elections in the Maritime Provinces may be regarded as significant proof that the various sections of Canada are becoming more consolidated, and that some description of British connection with the Dominion is strongly desired.”

That, Sir, is the fair opinion of a gentleman who was one of our most active, vigorous and able opponents in the campaign. I ask you to place it side by side with the letter addressed to his constituents by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and to take your choice as to which statement you will approve of. Now, Sir, I feel I have taken up the time of the House for too long a time in dealing with this matter, for it may be considered outside the four corners of the Address, but I feel it my duty as one of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces to avail myself of the first opportunity to show how actually destitute of foundation in fact is this statement which has been circulated by the hon. gentleman in the Province of Ontario. As a young man coming to this House, desirous of forming right ideas on the models of the leaders of parties, I did regret to find that a man who aspires to be the leader of a great party in this country, instead of attempting to solidify the different Provinces of the Dominion, instead of attempting to draw us all together and to make us feel, as we do feel in the Province of New Brunswick, that we are the people of a common country,—I regretted to find that he should endeavour to raise sectional cries and to make reference to certain provinces of this great Dominion, repudiating us and insinuating that those provinces have not the same rights as a part of this Dominion, which our larger provinces have. It appears to me, that true statesmanship in this country should be directed along the lines of healing up any differences that might have existed at the time of Confederation, and of enabling our people (whether we belong to the wealthy Province of Ontario, to the historic and populous Province of Quebec, to the Prairie Provinces, to the Maritime Provinces, or to British Columbia), to be able to say with heart and soul upon all occasions, that we are citizens of this our common country, and that we are proud of the distinction of being Canadians. I am glad to say, Sir, that this is the spirit which is actuating the young men of the Province of New Brunswick to-day: the young men to whom we owe the recent great victory at the polls. These young men are forgetting the battle of Confederation, they are forgetting the differences of the past, and they are realizing that