

Brand Books Office

THE REVIEW

VOL. 7.

RICHIBUCTO NEW BRUNSWICK, THURSDAY MARCH 5, 1896.

NO. 18

We Are With You UNION BLEND TEA,

is for sale at

HENRY O'LEARY'S AND W. W. SHORT'S. RICHIBUCTO.

Try It.

THE GREAT NORTH SHORE ROUTE!

The Best, Safest,
Quickest Route by which
each purchaser 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.

Bill Nye's Dirge.

When Artemus Ward vanished the
London Spectator placed upon his tomb
a few verses whose tender echoing music
may well serve as Nye's dirge:—
Is he gone to a land of no laughter,
The man that made mirth for us all?
Proves death but a silent hereafter?
From the sounds that delight or appal?
Once closed have the eyes no more duty,
No more pleasure the exquisite ears?
Has the heart done o'erflowing with
Beauty,
As the eyes have with tears?
Nay, if aught can be sure, what is surer
Than that earth's good decays not with
earth?
And of all the heart-springs none are
purer
Than the springs of the fountain of
mirth.
He that sounds them has pierced the
heart's hollows.
The place where a tear chose to sleep:
For the foam-flakes that dance in life's
shallows
Are wrung from life's deep.
He came with heart full of gladness,
From the glad-hearted world of the
West,
Won our laughter, but not with mere
madness,
Spoke and joked with us not in mere
jest;
For the man in our hearts lingered after,
When the merriment died from our
ears,
And those that were loudest in laughter
Are silent in tears.

6 Lines On K. and L.

I find the people around here prefer Dr.
Chase's Kidney-Liver pills to any other I
have in stock. They are a wonderful pill.
Send three dozen at once I am nearly out.
P. S.—Send by post, J. W. Ireland, Gour-
dock.

MR. McNERNEY'S SPEECH.

Delivered in the House of Commons
on the Budget.

Nothing affords me greater pleasure
than to listen to the broad Doric accents of
the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMil-
lan); and considering, as I have been led
to understand, the early opportunities that
hon. gentleman enjoyed, he appears to me
to be a wonderful speaker, indeed. But,
Sir, the most mellifluous accents and the
most nicely worded phrases begin to pall
upon one's ear at 11 o'clock at night, and
we have been listening to them for nearly
three hours. I wish to add that with
many of the statements of the hon. gentle-
man, I have not much fault to find; but

there are some of his statements so obvi-
ously fallacious, that I must enter my pro-
test and my dissent to them, before I go
any further. The hon. gentleman has
said that there was no time in the history
of the United States of America when that
country was more prosperous than during
the time when they had the lowest tariff.
Now, Sir, I think that a man must have
read American history in vain who can
coolly and deliberately make such a state-
ment as that. Every one of us who has
read the history of the United States, and
who is acquainted with recent events in
that country, must certainly come to a
conclusion opposite to that at which the
hon. gentleman has arrived. We all re-
member that when the reform tariff party
headed by President Cleveland, gained a
recent victory in that country, what a
panic seized upon the industries of the
United States. Banks failed, business
houses collapsed, industries of every char-
acter underwent a terrible depression.
Coxey's army, representing the highest
possible type of depression, marched al-
most across the continent to Washington.
At no time in the history of the United
States had that country come to such a
deplorable financial pass as during the time
when the party pledged to the reform of
the tariff, held power for the last time in
Washington. Why, Sir, the United States
had been rapidly paying off their national
debt under protection, but we find now
that, under the reform tariff policy of
President Cleveland and the Democratic
party, the gold surplus in the vaults of the
United States treasury has almost entirely
disappeared. Only the other day Mr.
Carlisle, the Secretary of State, had to
make a bond issue of two hundred million
dollars in order to bring back to the
treasury the gold that had been taken from
it during the depression. I claim there-
fore that the hon. gentleman is obviously
wrong when he states to the House that
at no time in the history of the United
States was that country so prosperous as
during the time when the tariff was lowest.
Again, the hon. gentleman has stated what
appears to me to be obviously wrong, that
the farmers of this country derive no bene-
fit at all from the National Policy, and
that they are the only class in the country
who derive no benefit at all from it. I
am prepared to show that there is no class
of the population of this country that has
derived greater benefits from the protec-
tive tariff than the farmers of Canada,
which I will endeavor to show later on
from the few notes I have prepared on
that subject. Does my hon. friend from
Huron think it fair, in discussing a ques-
tion of this nature, to compare farm prices
in 1878 and previously, with farm prices
in 1896? When he shows, as he easily can,
that the prices of farm products have in
that period fallen to a certain extent, does
he think that that points a moral, or that
it makes a conclusion in favor of his argu-
ment? I rather think not. My hon.
friend, with his knowledge of farming,
knowing the large amount of agricultural
implements and the low price at which
they can be bought, with the cheapness of
labour, with the large farming areas that
have been lately brought under cultivation
and which have access to the markets of
the world—my hon. friend should know
that it is no argument whatever for him
to say that because the value of the farm
products are less to-day than they were 20
years ago, therefore the farmer is not in a
prosperous condition. I will endeavor
to show that the farmers derive more
benefit from the National Policy than any
other class of the population of Canada.

Some hon. members. Oh, oh.
Mr. McNERNEY. I have made my state-
ment, and if I fail in demonstrating the
proposition laid down, it will be so much
better for hon. gentlemen opposite. I
state the proposition, and I will at the
proper time undertake to prove it. I ap-
prehend, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget
debate offers an occasion for the discussion
of the financial standing of the country,
that it is rather a stock-taking time, in
which we look at the means we have on
hand and judge so far as we are able of the
result of the plunge we may take into the
future. But the hon. gentlemen on the
Opposition benches have during this de-
bate entered into a discussion of nearly
every subject under the sun. They have
talked about the divisions that have taken
place in the Government ranks. One hon.
gentleman even dropped into poetry on
that occasion, and with him the wish was
father to the thought when he said that
when the brains were out—meaning that
the hon. gentleman who had left the
Cabinet were the brains—he thought the
Government would die. The hon. gentle-
man was quoting, I think, from a very
wonderful production by the greatest poet
of any age. But he should have finished
the quotation. The hon. gentleman was
quoting from the great play of Macbeth,
and like Macbeth, the hon. gentleman's
wish was father to the thought, that when
the brains were out the man would die.
The hon. gentleman should have con-
tinued further in the wonderful scene in
which Macbeth sees Duncan rise before
him, and with a stricken conscience, being
the cause of his death, he says:
The times have been that when the brains
were out,
The man would die, and there an end,
But now they rise again—
And push us from our stools.
The hon. gentleman will find that the re-
constructed Government, like the ghost of
Duncan, will trouble him in his dreams,
and push him from the fancifully erected
throne that he has established for himself.
I wish during the remarks I intend to
offer to the House to direct my attention
to the different subjects which I think
legitimately come within the four corners
of this discussion. For what I have to
offer I do not claim any particular origi-
nality. The statements I have to put before
the House have often been placed on
"Hansard" and delivered in this Chamber
but like many an old story, I think it is
well that such well known truths should
be dinced into the ears of the people, and
now particularly, when the two great
parties in this country are going to ask a
verdict from the electors of Canada. But
I intend proceeding on the main lines of
the financial state of the country, to in-
stitute a comparison between the regime
of hon. gentleman opposite and the regime
of the Government which I have the
honor to support; and in doing that I
wish to call the attention of the House to
the public debt, to the interest paid on the
public debt, to the public credit, the annual
expenditures, to the several deficits we
have had and to the trade returns for
the different years since 1873. I wish to
institute a comparison between the periods
from 1873 to 1878, and from 1878 to 1896
and I think I shall conclusively show to
every unbiased mind, to every fair-minded
man in this country, as I shall show to
every fair-minded man who reads what I
say, that by the record, and by their fruits
we should judge them, the party of hon.
gentlemen opposite stands condemned be-
fore the bar of public judgment, and the
party of my friends stand before the bar
of public judgment deserving of the ver-
dict of the people of Canada. We have
heard very much about the public debt,
and I admit that for a population only
amounting to about five millions we have
a large debt; but not a debt larger than
the resources of this country, than the
hopes in the great future of this country
justify. But how has that debt been in-
curred? To hear hon. gentlemen speak,
one would imagine that all that debt was
incurred by the Conservative party. That
is very far from the truth, and still in
every schoolhouse in the country where
hon. gentlemen opposite get an opportu-
nity of addressing the people they constan-
tly ring the changes upon the immense
debt of the country and upon the fact that
the Conservatives have incurred this tre-
mendous debt in Canada. The debt down
to June 30, 1895, amounted to \$253,074,
927. That debt was made up in the fol-
lowing way. The provincial debts we as-
sumed in 1867 amounted to \$77,500,000.
In 1870 we took in Manitoba, in 1871
British Columbia, in 1873 Prince Edward
Island, and with the readjustments made
during those several years we assumed the
debts of the provinces amounting to \$20,-
452,340. In 1884, 1885 and 1886 there
were further adjustments, adding \$11,477,-
808 to the debt. So that the total public
debt arising from the provincial debts
which we had assumed at Confederation
and the readjustments that took place sub-
sequently amounted to \$109,430,148,
leaving otherwise incurred a debt of \$143,-
644,779. Of that we incurred for the pur-
chase of the North-west Territories \$6,-
043,294, for the Intercolonial Railway
about \$50,000,000, for the Canadian Pa-
cific Railway \$63,000,000, for our canals
and river improvements \$42,000,000, or a
total of \$161,043,294, exceeding the
amount as given before by about \$18,000,-
000 paid out of the accumulated surpluses
of the different years when the Conserva-
tive party have been in power. I wish to
compare the increase of the debt. The
debt increase from 1890 to 1895 was \$15,-
544,880, and to hear hon. gentlemen op-
posite speak one would suppose that no
improvements had been carried out of any
nature that was for the benefit of the
people. Of that sum there was expended,
as follows: On canals, \$11,819,378; In-
tercolonial Railway and connecting roads,
\$4,919,781; for the Canadian Pacific
Railway, \$754,142, or in all, \$16,993,301.
In railway subsidies we paid during the
five years \$5,867,748. And, Sir, I claim
that the improvement to the country, in
affording cheaper and quicker transporta-
tion both for freight and passenger traffic,
amply justified the increase in the debt
during that time.

But, let me come to a comparison be-
tween the years while hon. gentlemen op-
posite were in power, and the years while
this Government have been in power; a
comparison with regard to the increase of
the national debt. I wish to compare the
years from 1873 to 1896 with the years
from 1873 to 1878. On the 1st of July,
1873, the net debt of Canada was \$99,848,-
461, but on the 1st of July, 1878, that debt
had increased to the then enormous figure
of \$140,362,069, or an increase during the
years from 1873 to 1878, of \$40,513,608
being a yearly increase during that period
of \$8,102,721. Now, what are the facts
with regard to this matter, between the
years 1878 and 1896. In these eighteen
years the increase of the national debt has
been \$112,712,858, or, during the eighteen
years, an annual increase of \$6,261,825, as
compared with a yearly increase during the
Liberal regime of \$8,702,121. In the last
six years from 1890 to 1895, we have added
to the debt, an increase of \$15,544,880, or
an annual increase of only \$2,590,814, as
compared with an annual increase of over
\$8,702,121; between the years 1873 and
1878. Sir, having finished with the debt,
and having, as I think, conclusively shown
that on the record, as far as our debt is
brought before the public, the Conserva-
tive party stands in a much better position
than the Liberal party of this country;
having proved that, I wish to proceed to
the next subject I have to deal with,
namely, the interest on that debt.
In 1887-88 the interest paid on the pub-
lic debt per annum was \$8,891,288, and
the average interest from that time down
to the year 1895 was \$8,784,542. The per
capita interest paid in 1887-88 was \$1.90,
while the per capita interest paid in 1894-
95, was \$1.83, or a reduction of 7 cents
per capita between the years 1887 and
1895. The per capita interest paid in 1873
was \$1.31, and in 1878 it was \$1.58, or an
increase between 1873 and 1878 of 27 cents
per head of the population. Therefore,
whilst from 1887 to 1895 the per capita
payment of interest decreased 7 cents per
head, the increase per capita during the
years of the Liberal regime from 1873 to
1878 was 27 cents. The rate of interest in
1878 was 3.68 per cent., but the rate of
interest in 1890 was only 2.89 per cent.
Having left that branch of the subject,
I come to speak of the credit of the country
and, after all, the debt of a country cannot
be large, when it can, as this country has
done at a recent date, put a loan upon the
market at such a wonderfully fine figure.
The credit of Canada stands pre-eminently
fine in the markets of the world. In
1894, the present Finance Minister put a
loan of £2,500,000 sterling upon the Lon-
don market, and that loan was taken up
at 3 1/2 per cent., and very much more
than the amount of the loan was sub-
scribed by the capitalists of Great Britain.
Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen on the Opposi-
tion side say: We admit that it is true,
but the price of money has fallen in late
years throughout the world, and it is not
due to the Conservative party that the
credit of Canada is higher now than it was
some years ago, but it is rather due to the
cheapness of money at present. That argu-
ment finds its answer in this statement,
that almost immediately after our Finance
Minister had placed that loan of £2,500,-
000 upon the London market, the United
States, with a population of over sixty
millions of people, and with all the re-
sources which hon. gentlemen in opposi-
tion are never tired of advertising—the
United States put a loan of sixty millions
upon the market, and, Sir, what did they
get for it? That United States loan was
taken up at 3 1/2 per cent., while ours went
at 3 1/2 per cent.

Let us compare the loans that have been
put upon the market during the Liberal
regime in this country, with the loans that
have been put upon the market by the
Conservative Government, and I will do
that in order to establish a fair comparison
between the credit of the country during
the years from 1873 to 1878, and the credit
of the country during the years from 1878
to 1896. In 1878, Sir Richard Cartwright,
then Finance Minister, floated a loan in
London at 4 1/2 per cent., and, in 1894, Mr.
Foster, the present Finance Minister
floated a loan at 3 1/2 per cent.
Mr. MacDonald (Huron). Would you
allow me to ask you a question. How
were these bonds of the United States to
be paid?
Mr. McNERNEY. It is true that the
United States bonds that were issued at
that time were on the face of them to be
paid in silver.
Mr. MacDonald (Huron). Hear, hear.
Mr. McNERNEY. I thought the hon.
gentleman (Mr. MacDonald) would laugh,
but the hon. gentleman has laughed too
soon. Sir, the hon. gentleman should not
forget this, that while upon the face of it
the bond was payable in silver. President
Cleveland and Mr. John Sherman, at that
time the greatest financial authority in
the United States, and leader of the Re-
publican party in opposition to the Presi-
dent, both these gentlemen made state-

ments—President Cleveland under his own
hand—that these bonds would be redeemed
in gold. It was, therefore, known to
financial men throughout the world that
the United States would redeem these
bonds in gold, and it makes little or no
difference, consequently, whether upon the
face of them, they stated they were to be
paid in silver, because, if the credit and
the standing of the United States in the
financial markets of the world were to be
maintained, the bonds would have to be
redeemed in gold, as was stated by Presi-
dent Cleveland and by John Sherman, the
leaders of the two great parties in that
country. I think, therefore, the hon.
gentleman (Mr. MacDonald) cannot take
much comfort out of the interruption that
he made.
Now, Sir, in 1879, Canada 4 per cents
were worth from 89 to 91 per cent., and in
1895, Canada 4 per cents were worth from
110 to 112, or an increase of 21 per cent.
in the values of these bonds. Similar
bonds of the United States increased, dur-
ing the same period, 13 per cent.; similar
bonds of the colony of Victoria increased,
during the same time, only 10 per cent.;
and similar bonds of New South Wales in-
creased, during the same time, only 13 per
cent., as against an increase of 21 per cent.
in the 4 per cent. bonds of the Dominion
of Canada. Now, Sir, having shown, as I
think, conclusively, that the credit of this
country has not only been maintained, but
considerably advanced by the Conservative
Government under the present Minister of
Finance, I propose to take up the annual
expenditure. We are told by the Finance
Minister, from what he knows and esti-
mates, that the expenditure to the end of
June, 1896, will amount to \$37,000,000,
and the estimated revenue to \$37,000,000.
So that we shall have no deficit for the
present year. In 1878 we had an expendi-
ture of about \$24,000,000, so that there
has been an increase in the annual ex-
penditure since 1878 of \$13,000,000 a year.
That has arisen fairly, I think, from in-
creased interest and sinking fund, \$4,600,
000; increased subsidies paid to provinces,
\$830,000; additional amounts spent on
railways canals and post offices, \$4,000,-
000; an amount spent on the Experi-
mental Farm, which did not exist in 1878;
an additional amount spent on the Ad-
ministration of Justice of \$205,000; the
government of the North-west Territories
for which there was no expenditure in
1878, \$258,000; additional fishery bounty
and protection, \$280,000; the inspection
of food, \$19,000; the inspection of steam-
boats, \$12,000; Indian management,
\$450,000 additional; penitentiaries, \$135,-
000; superannuation, \$156,000; militia
and defence, \$480,000; and mounted
police, \$166,000; or, taken altogether,
\$11,594,000. Add to that an increased
expenditure for improved lighthouse ser-
vice, geological surveys, immigration, Do-
minion lands, Dominion police and legis-
lation, and you will find that you have
made up the total amount of \$12,000,000
of increase in the annual expenditure from
1878. Now, Sir, let us compare the in-
crease in the expenditure from 1873 to
1878 with the increase from 1878 to 1896.
The Liberals, when they came into power
in 1873, found the expenditure \$19,174,-
000. When they left office in 1878, they
left the expenditure at \$24,488,000, or an
increase in the five years of over \$5,000,-
000, or an increase of over \$1,000,000 a
year. Let us compare that with the Con-
servative record from 1878 to 1896, and
what do we find? The Conservatives
when they came into power in 1878, found
the expenditure at \$24,488,000. In 1896
it had increased to \$37,000,000, or an in-
crease in those eighteen years of \$12,512,-
000, or two-thirds of a million dollars a
year, as compared with an increase of over
\$1,000,000 a year during the time the
Liberal party were in power. Now, I
would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite
a question which they have been asked
before, but which they have never yet
answered. They were asked the same
question the other evening by the hon.
member for Pictou, the ex-Minister of
Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper);
they were asked it last year by the hon.
Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart); I
asked it two years ago in a speech which I
made on the Budget; and from that time
to this it has never been answered, either
in this House or in the country. The
question is: upon what particular items
would the hon. gentlemen, if they got into
power to-morrow, economize and reduce
the expenditure of the country? Before
they talk of economy, which is at all times
a very popular cry in the country, and
which may be a misleading and unfair cry,
let them state to the House and to the
country, if they wish to get an honest ver-
dict from an intelligent people in their
favour, on what particular items of ex-
penditure they intend to economize when
they do get into power. Will they econo-
mize by reducing the fishery bounties paid
to the hardy fishermen on the coast, as
part of the award which was got at Hal-
fax?
Mr. Forbes. By a Liberal Government
Mr. McNERNEY. I care not by what
Government it was obtained. It was not
obtained by a Liberal government. My
hon. friend is wrong there again. It was
obtained by a Conservative Government
on Conservative plans.
Mr. Forbes. No.
Mr. McNERNEY. My hon. friend is per-
fectly ignorant of the matter if he says it
was obtained under a Liberal Government.
The gentleman who was defeated in
Northumberland the other day always
took the credit of having obtained that
award. He said he prepared the plans for
it.
Mr. Forbes. Does the hon. gentleman
know the year in which it was obtained?
Mr. McNERNEY. I do not know exactly
the year. Will the hon. gentleman tell
us?
Mr. Forbes. Yes, by the Liberal Govern-
ment which was in power in 1878.
Mr. McNERNEY. In 1878?
Mr. Forbes. In 1877.
Mr. McNERNEY. The hon. gentleman
had better stick to one figure or the other.
He first said 1876, then 1878, and
now he says 1877. The hon. gentleman
reminds me—or rather he does not re-
mind me—of a witness I once knew who
when he came on the stand, was bound to
stick to what he said in the first place.
He was asked the height of a horse, and
he answered that it was seventeen feet
high. On cross-examination he said the
horse was seventeen hands high. "But
you said seventeen feet," the cross-ex-
aminer told him. "Did I say seventeen
feet?" he asked. "Yes." "Well," he
said, "if I said seventeen feet, by George
I will stick to it." If the hon. gentleman
said 1876 he should stick to it, and not say
1878, and then go back to 1877. The hon.
gentleman perhaps thinks that he knows
more about this than any other gentle-
man in this House, but that does not
count. We may form an estimate of what
the hon. gentleman knows from what
knowledge he shows, not from what he
thinks he possesses. If hon. gentlemen
opposite get into power, would they re-
duce the militia expenditure? The hon.
leader of the Opposition and the hon.
member for South Oxford have both com-
mitted themselves in favour of largely in-
creased militia expenditure for the present
year, so that in that item they cannot very
well effect a decrease. Will they decrease
the amount expended for the postal facili-
ties of the country? They ought to know
and they do know, that the country is in-
creasing in population and improving in
intelligence.
Mr. McShane. Not increasing in popu-
lation.
Mr. McNERNEY. There my hon. friend
is wrong again. If the hon. gentleman
would read the census returns, he would
find that the population of the country
very largely increased during the last
decade.
Some hon. Members. No, decreased.
Mr. McNERNEY. Well, I cannot ac-
count for the wonderful lack of knowl-
edge and information evinced by these
hon. gentlemen. They will hardly under-
take to reduce the amount granted as
railway subsidies to the different railway
enterprises in the country. They will
hardly undertake to reduce the grants for
public works, immigration, lighthouses or
the expenditure on the Experimental
Farm. Let me again call the hon. gen-
tlemen's attention to their record in re-
gard to expenditure. A few years ago a
number of Liberal Premiers from the
different provinces of Canada met at Que-
bec under the leadership of Mr. Honoré
Maurice, and there committed themselves
to a resolution, each and everyone of
them, which was subsequently subscribed
to by the hon. leader of the Opposition.
That resolution would have taken out of
the exchequer of this country every year
\$1,721,476. Mr. Peters, the Premier of
Prince Edward Island, who has laid a direct
tax on every acre of land in that provin-
ce has boldly stated that of that increased
amount he would obtain from Prince
Edward Island over \$70,000 a year. Now
I would refer to what was said all through
the West on that wonderful mission
undertaken by the hon. leader of the O-
pposition and some other gentlemen who
accompanied him. I should like to refer
to what these gentlemen said at different
places along their line of travel as to the
way they intended to reduce the expendi-
ture. At Medicine Hat, Mr. Laurier said:
I am not a Puritan or a saint, but sim-
ply a man, and I do not hesitate to say to
you, that in the west you need public
works.
(Continued on Page 6.)

Children Cry for
Pitcher's Castoria.