

GET YOUR  
JOB PRINTING  
DONE AT  
THE REVIEW OFFICE.

# THE REVIEW

20th Century  
SULPHUR one day without intense  
heat a bottle of  
**\$1.00 A YEAR**  
STRICTLY IN ADVANCE.

VOL. 5.

RICHIBUCTO, NEW BRUNSWICK, THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1894.

NO. 35

## Sterling Soap!

To the Lady sending us the most "Sterling" wrappers from August 1st, 1893, to August 1st, 1894, we offer the following Cash Premiums, viz:

- FIRST, - \$50.00 in GOLD.
- SECOND, - 25.00 " "
- THIRD, - 15.00 " "
- FOURTH, - 10.00 " "

Don't wait till end of year, but send in wrappers and we will acknowledge and credit you with number sent.

**WM. LOGAN,**  
ST. JOHN, N. B.

**R.A. D'OLLOQUI, M.D.**  
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON,  
KINGSTON, KENT CO., N. B.  
Special attention paid to Diseases of the Eye. Artificial Eyes inserted.  
Telephonic communication with Royal Hotel.

**W. G. KING,**  
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON  
Buctouche, N. B.

**Thos. J. Bourque, M.D.**  
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON,  
RICHIBUCTO, N. B.  
Office—Next door to Mrs. J. W. Harnett's.  
Residence—Dorchester.

**O. J. McCully, M.A., M.D.**  
Memb. Roy. Col. Surg., Eng.  
SPECIALTY, DISEASES OF EYE, EAR AND THROAT.  
Office—Cor. Main and Westmorland Streets  
Moncton, N. B.

**PHINNEY & CARTER,**  
Barristers and Attorneys-at-Law,  
NOTARIES PUBLIC, ETC.  
RICHIBUCTO, N. B.  
OFFICE—COURT HOUSE SQUARE.

**E. GIROUARD,**  
BARRISTER AT LAW  
INSURANCE AGENT.

ATTORNEY FOR PATENTS  
from the Governments of the United States and  
Canada.  
OFFICE, MONCTON, N. B.

**H. H. JAMES,**  
Barrister at Law, Notary,  
SOLICITOR AND CONVEYANCER,  
Referee in Equity,  
JUDGE OF PROBATES.  
BUCTOUCHE, N. B.

**C. RICHARDSON,**  
Barrister,  
SOLICITOR, NOTARY PUBLIC  
Referee in Equity.  
RICHIBUCTO, N. B.

**R. HUTCHINSON, Q. C.,**  
Clerk of Peace,  
VICE CONSUL FOR SWEDEN AND NORWAY,  
LLOYD'S SUB-AGENT.  
Divisional Registrar Births, Marriages and Deaths.  
RICHIBUCTO, N. B.

**Geo. V. McInerney,**  
Barrister, Attorney, Notary, &c.  
Solicitor for the Merchants Bank  
of Halifax.  
RICHIBUCTO, N. B.

**B. S. BAILEY,**  
NOTARY PUBLIC,  
STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE,  
ISSUER OF MARRIAGE LICENSES,  
AUCTIONEER & GENERAL AGENT.  
Weldford, N. B.

**R. Barry Smith,**  
BARRISTER, ATTORNEY, &c., NOTARY  
PUBLIC.  
Office—Brown's Block, Main Street,  
MONCTON, N. B.

**POWELL & BENNET,**  
BARRISTERS AND ATTORNEYS,  
SACKVILLE, N. B.

**H. M. FERGUSON, J. P.**  
ISSUER OF Marriage Licenses,  
ACCOUNTS COLLECTED AND PRO-  
CEEDS PROMPTLY PAID OVER.  
KINGSTON, KENT COUNTY, N. B.

**Jas. Brown,**  
CONTRACTOR,  
AND MANUFACTURER OF  
DIMENSION LUMBER,  
Weldford Station, I. C. R., Kent County

## THE GREAT NORTH SHORE ROUTE!

The Best, Surest, Safest,  
Quickest Route by which  
to reach purchasers in the  
North Shore Counties of  
New Brunswick, is via

## THE REVIEW.

The regular news express  
to the homes of all the  
people, and most direct  
line to the pocketbooks of  
buyers everywhere.

See that your Advertisement is  
ticketed via THE REVIEW.

## MR. MCINERNEY'S SPEECH

### In The Tariff Debate.

In entering the debate at this late stage I do so without the faintest presumption that anything I may say will tend, in any material degree, to elucidate the question now under discussion, but rather impressed with the idea that as many members of this House as possible, and above all as many members of this House as have never yet put themselves on record, should at an early date as possible declare their views on the great principles underlying the resolutions introduced by the Minister of Finance, and the principles underlying the amendment thereto proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, I believe that the question for discussion at this stage—what is commonly known as the Budget—allows, and happily allows, as far as some gentlemen of the Opposition are concerned, a person to go very far afield. It gives one a sort of roving permission by which he can trace the records of the different parties, from the time of their inception in this country, and follow them down through the history of their politics, fiscal and otherwise. It gives us—happily for members of the Opposition—great scope for discussion in that particular. Well, until the gentleman who has just taken his seat, addressed the House, I had not heard very much from hon. gentlemen of the Opposition touching the principles and the question really at issue between us. I have heard very little on those principles; I have heard very little with regard to the details which spring incidentally from those principles. But I have heard much and the House has heard much, ably and eloquently expressed by able men—some of the ablest men of this country—on questions really extraneous to the issue now before us. We have heard much on such questions as the question of reciprocity, the question of free trade, the question of blue ruin and its consideration, the question of extravagance of this Government, the question of combines, and lastly, we have heard much on the question of the tariff, and that being particularly and almost exclusively their cry throughout the country—we have heard them dilate particularly on the extravagances and scandals of this Government. Why, Mr. Speaker, the party of my hon. friends lives on scandals and like the worm, it takes its colour from what it feeds on. But not content with speaking on reciprocity, and on these questions I have alluded to, some of the hon. gentlemen—particularly the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—even went so far as to roam into the fields of poetry, and the way in which they quoted, garbled and misapplied Shakespeare was sufficient, in my mind, to make the bones of the great bard of Avon turn in their grave. Why they were altogether unaware, they seemed to pass by the appeal written on the stone slab above the dust of that great man—and they were not afraid to move his bones. Now, the hon. member for South Grey treated us to a very extensive quotation—a misapplica-

## A BLIND

that gives satisfaction is

## Christie's Venetian Blind

For finish and lasting qualities its equal cannot be found.

Write for prices.

## A. CHRISTIE

## WOOD WORKING CO.,

CITY ROAD,  
ST. JOHN, N. B.

tion of a parody of a certain scene in Julius Caesar, by which he wished to illustrate a certain conspiracy, which he thought took place not very long ago, in this country. Well, I think if we on our part wished to talk about conspiracy and the fall of leaders, while he may say we lost our Caesar, we might retort that they lost their Alexander. And I have heard it said that there was some conspiracy, in which perhaps the hon. member for South Grey may have taken some part, as he was in the Liberal party in the House at that time. But the hon. member for South Grey does not impress me as very much of a conspirator. He has not the bearing of a Cassius, and there is another character in Shakespeare—the one to which the leader of the Opposition likes from time to time to refer—that appears to me to suit most admirably the hon. gentleman who represents South Grey in this House. If he were among the Merry Wives of Windsor he would fill a very big basket, and with the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), as the sleek and slim Prince Hal, would make merry nights in the streets of the Capital. Now, the different speakers have spoken at various times of reciprocity. That is a subject which interests me to a considerable extent, and a subject on which I will admit I have had something to say in the past.

Mr. Davies (P. E. I.)—Hear, hear.

Mr. McInerney—My hon. friend says "hear, hear," but he and his friends are hardly willing to admit that they had something to say on it in the past. They seek to conceal that part of their political history. In speaking of reciprocity, I have not read aright the declarations in Parliament of the hon. leaders of the party to which I belong, if I have not come to the conclusion that the Conservative party is also in favour of whatever measure of reciprocity with the United States can be obtained, consistent with our honour, with protection to our industries and the saving of the interests and rights of the people of this country. But this question of reciprocity has a history. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak on it, one who was not at all acquainted with its history, might take it for granted that if they only were in power, if they only possessed the seals of office, they could at a moment's warning at once satisfy the powers at Washington and induce them to pull down the tariff walls, "the Chinese walls" as they are pleased to call them, and bring about at once a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity. This is what these gentlemen have told the country, and they have told it either with a knowledge of the history of the question or in duplicity. I am prone to believe, from the high idea I have of the character of the leaders of the Opposition in this House, that they did it rather in ignorance of the history of this question than from any other motives. They really believed, I know, for several years that, if they were returned to power they could so impress the governing power at Washington as to bring about a treaty of reciprocity in the best interests of this country. Sir, what is the history of this question and its treatment. We had a reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1860. The merits of that treaty and the results that flowed from it I will discuss by and by. But, Sir, after 1860 that treaty was brought to an end. It was brought to an end at that time, not on the part of the people of Canada, but on the part of the people of the neighbouring republic. Our neighbours came to the conclusion that it was in their interests to have that treaty in force no longer. But, above all things, I claim this—I claim it fairly before the people of this country, I claim it fearlessly in this House—that the sentiment that, above all others, actuated the people of the United States in the abrogation of that treaty, was a sentiment of unfriendliness to the people of this country was an attempt, continued from that day to this, to force the hands of the people of this country in such a way as to drive them into political union with the republic which lies to the south of us. That, Sir, I believe was the idea in the minds of the American people in 1860, when the Reciprocity Treaty of 1864 was abrogated. But, Sir, it must be remembered that in 1860, I think, immediately after the abrogation of the treaty, Hon. Alexander Gait, afterwards Sir Alexander Gait, and Mr. Howland, accompanied by delegates, both from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, went to Washington for the purpose of endeavoring to bring about a reciprocity treaty. But in their negotiation they failed. Then, Sir, in 1863, three years afterwards, Sir John Ross went to Washington in a like manner to enter into negotiations for a reciprocity treaty; and

## 20th CENTURY KANDY KITCHEN,

JAS. S. MUNRO, CHARLOTTE STREET, ST. JOHN, N. B.  
—AGENCIES AT—

- DIGBY, N. S., Gaptill & Young,
- FREDERICTON, N. B., S. J. Morrison,
- MONCTON, N. B., J. J. Jettie,
- SUSSEX, N. B., Mitchell & Fryden,
- BUCTOUCHE, N. B., W. G. King,
- NEWCASTLE, N. B., George Stabler,
- ANAPOLIS, N. S., Mrs. A. A. Bochner,
- HARCOURT, N. B., M. J. Dann,
- DORCHESTER, N. B., Mrs. Thos. Sherrin,
- FAIRVILLE, N. B., Thomas Wilson,
- MOUTH OF KESWICK, Nathaniel Urquhart,
- CHATHAM, N. B., Miss Maggie Staples,
- WEYMOUTH, N. S., C. E. Balkom,
- BATHURST, N. B., M. A. Meslin,
- ROXBOROUGH, N. B., D. Fountain,
- BEAR RIVER, N. B., W. W. Wade,
- INDIANTOWN, N. B., Mrs. Clark,

he failed. In 1874, while hon. gentlemen who are now in Opposition were in power, they sent one of the ablest men that ever belonged to their party, Hon. George Brown, to Washington to endeavor to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity. The offer he made was very broad and very generous, and drew from the people of Canada many complaints. But Mr. Brown failed in his endeavor. Now, Sir, I think it would be well to recall at the present time the previous utterances of hon. gentlemen now in Opposition. While hon. gentlemen may say in this House that reciprocity does not mean unrestricted reciprocity, this was their main battle-cry, and was written on their banner in 1891. Though they may say they have forsaken that policy and gone back on it, I say that in every school-house in the country, when an electoral campaign is on hand, these gentlemen still proclaim the glorious results which they say will flow from unrestricted reciprocity. Now what was the proposal of Hon. George Brown in 1884? He was sent to Washington by the Liberal party on a mission of reciprocity. The proposal he made was a very wide and generous one; it was of such a liberal character that it called forth some unfavourable comment from the press in Canada. The following is a summary of the propositions, and in order that I may not be accused of quoting from documents too unfavourable to gentlemen on the other side, I will say that this is taken from the St. John "Daily Telegraph," one of their principal organs in the Maritime Provinces.

The proposition was that for 21 years there should be a free exchange in animals and their products, in the products of the farm, the forest, the mine and the sea. In addition the following articles were to be struck from the dutiable list of both countries: agricultural implements, axes, boots and shoes, cottons, furniture all kinds of vehicles, iron and ironware, lead, leather, machines, paper, type, presses, railroad cars, steel, tin, and tinned goods. Further, the Atlantic fisheries were to be open to the United States without money compensation; reciprocal coasting was to be granted; the Canadian canals were to be enlarged so as to admit vessels 260 feet in length; the Canadian and American canals were to be free to the vessels of both nations; vessels of all kinds built in either country were to be entitled to registry in both countries; and both countries were to unite in deepening the Lake St. Clair channel, in lighting the waterways, and in propagating the fish.

Well, Sir, these propositions were not adopted; they were not favourably regarded by the people of the United States. In 1877, while the party now in Opposition were ruling this country, in the Dominion Board of Trade, a motion was presented, I think, by the late lamented Thomas White, asking the Government of that day to go down to Washington and endeavor to negotiate a reciprocity treaty in the interests of the people of this country. Well, Sir, nothing ever came of it. As soon as the party of hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power, and from that day down to the present, at different times at various stages in the history of the question, the party now in power has made efforts in favour of a reasonable, a large and generous measure of reciprocity. And they have failed.

An hon. member. No, no.  
Mr. McInerney. I hear somebody say "no." Sir, I have fresh in my mind the reading of a celebrated debate that took place in this House. Hon. gentlemen in Opposition in this House endeavored to draw from the remark of Sir Charles Tupper the declaration that he had at Washington offered to make a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity. And I remember reading that Sir Charles Tupper declared that his offer was not an offer of unrestricted reciprocity, but an unrestricted offer of reciprocity; and he could not understand the intelligence of the man who could not see the difference between these two.

An hon. member.—Nobody could see it.  
Mr. McInerney.—Nobody could see it! None so blind as those who will not see. Now, not very long ago, and since the offer made by Sir Charles Tupper, the present Minister of Finance, with a delegation went to Washington and made an offer of reciprocity to the Government at Washington.

Several members—Hear, hear.  
Mr. McInerney—My hon. friends on the Opposition side say hear, hear. The facts are fresh in everybody's mind. And, having heard the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), in various places and at various times declare that the hon. Minister of Finance had made any such offer as he stated in Parliament, he had made it was an extreme delight to me to hear the Finance Minister last session, in making his closing speech on the Budget, I think it was, prove to any unbiased mind the truth of the assertions he had previously made. I felt, Sir, from his declarations then, I know from his declarations from time to time, declarations made in public and in private by the Minister of

Finance, that he was the spoke-man for his party in that particular case, and that on that question he was prepared, and prepared to enter into negotiations for a reciprocity treaty that will not be repugnant to the honour and not fatal to the interests of the people of this country. Now the question of the merits of this treaty is one to which I will ask the attention of the House for just a few minutes. It has seemed a strange thing to me, that those people in the Maritime Provinces, who opposed the confederation of the British North American provinces, and who did it on a principle, and impressed with the idea that it would be against their interests to enter a union and thereby fall into competition with the upper provinces, the then Canadian provinces, because then they would have against them the -kill and capital and established manufactures of the upper provinces, and who will make use of this treaty against this union even to the present day, cannot see the conclusion that must be forced upon them, if they would accept unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. In such a case they would be thrown practically into competition with sixty millions of people with unlimited capital, with the greatest skill of any people in the world and with manufactures that have been established and kept up by over forty years of protection. But in connection with this question of reciprocity, what strikes me again as peculiar is that while the party in power is charged with not obtaining reciprocity with the United States, the hon. gentlemen opposite, when their party was in power, from 1873 to 1878, were also unable to obtain reciprocity for this country. How can they blame the party in power for not obtaining it when they themselves were unable to obtain it during the five years they were in power, when they sent the ablest diplomats in their ranks—and I say this without wishing to disparage the other able men that ever belonged to the Liberal party in this country, to negotiate for such a treaty? Why did they fail at that time? And why having failed when they were in power, do they now attempt to make capital against this Government and this party because they have failed in doing so? What were the reasons given in 1866 and 1874 by the Americans against entering into a treaty of reciprocity with Canada? They claimed that their national debt was so high, that they had to raise such a tremendous revenue for the purpose of paying the interest on that debt, that they could not afford even to allow the products of Canada to go into that country without paying a duty. Well, Sir, let us face his question manfully and honestly, and if it is necessary to bury it, let us bury it out of sight now and forever. Sir, I cannot understand why a reason that was good in 1874 should not be just as good in 1894; for we know that the American Government since that time have, by the extensive additions to their pension list, added largely to the current expenses of the Government of that country; and their revenue, everybody knows it, is not nearly so buoyant, is not nearly so great, as it was in 1874. Therefore that less buoyant revenue, that larger expenditure, much larger by the additions to their pension list, have placed them in a position of saying now, much more strongly than they did in 1874: We want so much money to run this Government, we must have it off Canadian products the same as we have it off other countries in the world. Now, Sir, I have heard considerable discussion over the Wilson Bill that is now before the United States Congress. Some of the farmers in this country seem to think that they are going to receive great benefits from the Wilson Bill if its various provisions are crystallized into law. I have my doubts about that. I admit that it might be a good thing for this country to have the 5 cents duty taken off eggs which the farmers send into the United States; it might be a good thing for this country perhaps, if the duty on potatoes were brought down from 25 to 15 cents a bushel. I admit that it might be a good thing for our farmers if the duty should be lowered on various other articles; but they are able to export into the United States. But the events of the last few years have proved one thing conclusively to my mind and that is that it is not for the ultimate good of the Canadian farmer that the raw products of his farm should go freely into the United States market. The farmer is a peculiar being. With him, sufficient unto the day are the evils thereof. Far be it from me to say anything derogatory to their intelligence, but I say that the farmer of this country, if he can raise enough from day to day to keep him, is generally satisfied.

Some hon. members—Hear, hear.  
Mr. McInerney—Hon. gentlemen say "Hear, hear!"—in derision, I suppose. It is one of the finest traits, it is one of the finest incidents of agricultural life, that a man is satisfied with little; it is one of the finest features of agricultural life that the

man who lives on a farm and digs his living out of the soil, is satisfied with what the soil will give him. He is not avaricious, he does not want the world and all its belongings—like some hon. gentlemen whom I see on the Opposition side of this House.  
Mr. Mallock—That is a kind of policy you want for the farmer—just let him live and have enough to eat.  
Mr. McInerney—That is the kind of policy that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken wants for the farmers, as I will prove before I get through. The fact of our farmers being shut out from the markets of the United States has forced upon them a spirit of invention, has compelled them to seek new and better methods for turning the raw products of their farm into manufactured articles, and sending them to other markets. That is what this happy necessity has done for him for some years past; it has forced him to make a factory of his farm, it has forced him to turn the raw material on that farm into a manufactured article. A factory is set up on almost every farm all through this country. Everybody knows the proud position our farmers have taken in foreign markets in regard to cheese and butter. Why, Sir, I say it with some degree of pride, though not a sectionalist in any sense of the word, that the country from which I come had the honour, although a factory had only been established there for the short space of eighteen months, of carrying off the gold medal as the highest award for butter at the Chicago Exhibition. Now, that was a grand thing for a county in which the dairying business had only been established for a short time. Sir, I say without fear of contradiction, it has been pressed on my own mind by reasoning out the matter, by observing the course of events, and the results of our tariff position the last few years, that the farmer of Canada, by the simple fact that he could not get his raw products into the markets of the United States, has risen to a higher plane, has become a better man and more self-reliant than he was at the time when he could sell his raw products in the markets of the United States. I make that proposition, and I say that it may not be a proposition, but it is a fact that reciprocity can be easily obtained, and they claim it would be a good thing for Canada. Now, it is necessary that they should show how it would be a good thing for Canada. Putting out of the question altogether, if you will, that grand and dominating idea, the Imperial idea, putting out of the question, if you will, the honour of the people of this country, putting out of the question, if you will, the barren idea, as some people call the sentiment of nationality, that is growing strong and sturdy in the breasts of our people—putting that altogether aside for one moment, I wish to ask hon. gentlemen if they can prove to this House and to this country that this matter of reciprocity is one that would be to the material advantage of the people of this country, that would be to the economical advantage of the people of Canada. I fail to see it, and until it is proved to me, I must confess that I am unwilling to accept that conclusion. Why? We have heard much in the past from hon. gentlemen opposite of the argument, that when it is shown that the imports of the country exceeded the exports, the country cannot be prosperous. The balance of trade argument has been used against this administration from time to time by the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition.  
Mr. Gilmour—No.  
Mr. McInerney—If that argument has not been used by the hon. gentleman from Charlotte (Mr. Gilmour), he is an honourable exception to the Opposition in this respect, and in many other respects.  
Mr. Laurier—No.  
Mr. McInerney—He is an honest free trader, and you are not. The hon. member for Quebec East, so far as I can understand, has no central idea by which this country could be benefited. Then, if we consider the question from the point of view of the balance of trade, what do we find? The hon. gentleman need not think I am quoting from a document prepared by a gentleman opposite to him, but I am quoting figures from a speech delivered by Hon. Benjamin Butterworth in May, 1890. At that time Mr. Butterworth, who was a colleague of Mr. McInerney then representing Ontario, had moved a reciprocity resolution in amendment to the McKinley Bill, and it was to back up his proposition, to endorse and support it, that he gave the figures I am quoting. We find from these figures that from 1864 to 1886, inclusive, the balance of trade against Canada, or rather against the British North American provinces, because at that time we had no Canada such as we

(Continued on page 7.)