

THE LIBERAL CANDIDATE
For York Co.:
FRED. P. THOMPSON
For Sunbury:
DR. GEO. E. DAY.

Note for Thompson and cheaper flour.

NOMINATION DAY.

The Herald does not believe in underestimating the strength of its opponents. To do so is to induce over-confidence and this is likely to mean defeat. Therefore, when it says that the proceedings on nomination day were distinctly favorable to Mr. Thompson, the liberal candidate, it gives what it believes to be by no means an exaggerated view of the case. The remark was common on the streets that every one in town was in favor of reciprocity. Of course this was not strictly true in the sense that they were all liberals, for THE HERALD recognized some gentlemen from the country, who have always been with the conservatives, and are with them now; but it is quite true that four-fifths of the country people in town on Thursday were avowed supporters of the liberal party and will vote for Mr. Thompson next Thursday. The course of the conservatives in refusing to stay at the court house and discuss the issues of the day face to face with the liberals, and their unwillingness to allow the liberals to use the city hall in common with them, was accepted by most people as indicative of a fear on their part to face their adversaries in an open discussion. The meeting at the court house was undoubtedly a larger and more representative one than that at the city hall. It is true, that when the former was over, a number of Mr. Thompson's friends went up to the latter's meeting, and at the close of the city hall speeches the crowd there was quite large; but a large proportion of it was made up of liberals.

Mr. Thompson's speech was a very fine effort. He presented the case for unrestricted reciprocity from a business man's standpoint, and an admirable presentation it was. He was accorded an enthusiastic reception. Hon. Mr. Blair, who followed, was very effective and his ringing speech produced a fine impression.

The honors of the day were clearly with the liberals and would have been more so, if the meeting had been a joint one.

Vote for a policy that will keep the boys at home.

FARM PRODUCE AND RECIPROCIITY.

An amusing incident occurred in this city the other day. A Sunbury conservative was in town and he was denouncing unrestricted reciprocity, because it would admit Chicago beef and that meant a whole procession of calamities. His listener heard him out and then answered: "I am a liberal conservative and you are a traitor to one party. The very thing you are saying will ruin the country is what Sir John says we want—reciprocity in natural products." The Sunbury man was puzzled. He evidently felt like the colored man, who when his parson said there were two roads, one leading to everlasting destruction and the other to eternal perdition exclaimed: "In an intimate friend of Sir John Macdonald's."

But the best argument is worth a little serious notice. At the very outside it can be only for a little time that the United States will be an exporter of farm produce. The Washington department of agriculture has already issued a note of warning on the subject, and the best authority on the question on the continent, C. Wood Davis, of Kansas, says that in five years the United States will have no exportable surplus of produce. Our farmers need not fear Chicago beef. Then only over will have to compete against an accidental surplus, and there will be none of these after a year or two. Besides with better prices for horses, butter, eggs, poultry, mutton, fruit and everything else, beef will cease to be a very important item and will take its proper position in New Brunswick agriculture, as a by-product. With unrestricted reciprocity New Brunswick would become a great dairy country; although there is no doubt that one of its greatest industries would be potato growing, for which it is so admirably adapted. Potatoes growing as a by-product has demonstrated, one of the most profitable businesses for a farmer to follow. When hay is admitted duty free with the United States the market for the produce of our hay farms will become of the utmost value to our intervals farmers.

Vote for Thompson and cheaper oil.

HE WANTS DELAY.

It is with no intention of speaking disrespectfully of a gentleman, who whatever else he may be is premier of Canada and as general a soul as lives, that we say that this election is simply a case of Old Tomorrows getting in his work again. Sir John foresees, as every one else does, that unrestricted reciprocity must come within a very little time; but when it does come the power of the combines will be broken and that means the downfall of the conservatives. A younger man than the premier would seize the opportunity to guide Canada in its new departure, throw the monopolists over and take the leadership of the people; but Sir John is too old. In his manifesto he says to the electors that this is his last appeal to them, and he wants the present condition of things to continue while he holds the reins of power. He feels unequal to the leadership of a new party and the inauguration of a new policy. We can sympathize with this, for the old Tory chieftain has been a fighter in his day; but the country must not be held back even by him. If his eyes are not keen enough to mark the course which Canada should steer, if his arms are not strong enough to throw the helm over and change the course of the ship, there are eyes and arms equal to the task, and he can safely leave the deck to younger men. He clings to power with the tenacity of old age. Perhaps he has deceived himself into a belief that Canada without him would be a helpless wreck. Men can do deceiving themselves. But this dominion is greater than any man in it, and not even the exit of the veteran Tory leader will bring about disaster.

Vote for Thompson and against monopoly.

THEIR ONLY ARGUMENT.

The conservatives have abandoned all their cries except one, and that they are making with redoubled energy. Driven from one position to another, they have no recourse left but to cry out that they are loyal and that every one else is a traitor to his country. A few persons may be misled by that sort of talk, but they surely must be very few. They tell us in effect that the premier of Ontario and half the people of that province, the premier of Quebec and three quarters of that province, the premier of New Brunswick and half the people of that province, the premier of Nova Scotia and half the people of that province, the premier of Manitoba and half the people of that province, half the people of Prince Edward Island, and half the people of British Columbia, that in short Mr. Laurier and more than half the people of Canada are disloyal. They claim so much that they make themselves ridiculous. If all these political leaders and two million and a half of our people are disloyal, is it not a surprising thing that we have had to wait until February to find it out? It is not likely that if this host of traitors they are said to be, that some one of them at some time and in some place has not said something that could be cited in proof of their disloyalty? Is it not surprising that none of the newspapers which express their views have ever contained a disloyal sentiment? The only answer, which these questions call for, is that the whole disloyalty bugbear is an election device, employed solely because the parties using it are utterly worsted in the matter of argument.

A vote for Thompson is a vote for retrenchment and reform.

THEY WILL WANT TO BUY EVERYTHING.

The Farmer argues that unrestricted reciprocity will "destroy our local market for the purpose of enabling the American buyer more readily to take our agricultural produce and ship it to foreign countries. Go softly brother. You are on awful thin ice. Right over against your argument against unrestricted reciprocity is a column called a political catechism, in which you advocate this very thing. The little quotation above reads very much like something your friend Mr. Temple might evolve. Unrestricted reciprocity will "destroy our local market" because the dreadful Yankees will come in and buy everything. Most farmers in York would sell up their farms for such destruction. We suppose what the Farmer means is that under unrestricted reciprocity American buyers will go out to the farms and buy the produce there, and it will not be necessary for York county farmers to stand around Phoenix Square all day to sell their produce. If that is something, it is something your friend Mr. Temple might evolve. Unrestricted reciprocity will "destroy our local market" because the dreadful Yankees will come in and buy everything. Most farmers in York would sell up their farms for such destruction. We suppose what the Farmer means is that under unrestricted reciprocity American buyers will go out to the farms and buy the produce there, and it will not be necessary for York county farmers to stand around Phoenix Square all day to sell their produce. If that is something, it is something your friend Mr. Temple might evolve. Unrestricted reciprocity will "destroy our local market" because the dreadful Yankees will come in and buy everything. Most farmers in York would sell up their farms for such destruction. We suppose what the Farmer means is that under unrestricted reciprocity American buyers will go out to the farms and buy the produce there, and it will not be necessary for York county farmers to stand around Phoenix Square all day to sell their produce. If that is something, it is something your friend Mr. Temple might evolve.

A vote for Thompson is a vote for better times.

ABOUT FARRER.

THE HERALD presents its compliments to the Farmer and suggests that it ought to be able to discuss a great issue like that now before the people without descending into personalities. It changes this paper with publishing a statement which the editor is "well aware is entirely untrue." The reference is to the Hon. Mr. Farrer's statement that the Toronto Mail is a conservative paper and that Farrer, who, while its editor, wrote letters showing how Canada could be coerced into annexation, is also a conservative. The only answer we have to make is that the Mail is and always has been conservative. It never was in sympathy with the liberals. For a short time it advocated commercial union, then dropped it and took up Dalton McCarthy and the equal rights movement, finally slipping into its old place in the Tory ranks. The proprietor, Mr. Rioridon, is a conservative; its manager, Mr. Bunting, is a conservative and an intimate friend of Sir John Macdonald; its late editor, Mr. Farrer, was brought from New York by Sir John Macdonald to be the exponent of his views, and has always been an intimate friend of the premier. There are not wanting persons who now suggest that this wonderful "unearthing" of a plot, in which Farrer is implicated, is a put up job between him and Sir John Macdonald.

A vote for Thompson is a vote against annexation.

Mr. Thompson carries out the threat made three weeks ago and tries to buy this constituency, it would be almost a pity to let him take his money home again. It is one thing to buy a constituency; it is quite another thing to deliver the goods. We most strongly urge upon every man who has a dollar of the money which Mr. Temple threatened to spend, even though it is morally certain that such money really belongs to the people, and is a part of what they have paid in needless taxation. But we urge with equal earnestness that they vote for Thompson any way they can. If Mr. Temple offers \$50,000 in this election, he would be only paying back the principal of what the city and county gave in aid of his railway, and which in equity and fair play he ought to have paid back when he sold the road. Nevertheless, it is better not to touch his money; even though you do afterwards vote for Thompson. Let him keep his dollars. He may find a good chance to invest them in railway schemes in the state of Maine, where he has already put considerable. Vote for Thompson and get your reward in better times. Say to Mr. Temple's canvassers that York is not for sale.

ARGUMENT NOT NECESSARY.

It is no longer necessary to argue for reciprocity. The conservatives admit its desirability by putting it upon their banners. They are not hesitating in so doing, but they have done it, no one need take the trouble to contend any longer that reciprocity will be a good thing. This is admitted all round. The conservatives in using the reciprocity argument are like pirates who hoist a legal flag so as to approach their prey. When they get near enough, they drop the old legal monopoly with N. P. inscribed upon it will be unfurled, and the plunder of the people will be renewed.

Argument in favor of reciprocity is, we repeat, not necessary. The liberals affirm that it will be the utmost benefit, the conservatives admit it. The whole country was York. The only way to get it is to vote for the liberal candidate.

Vote for Thompson and reciprocity.

The electors ought to be on the lookout for all manner of deceitful canvasses. Before this date and the election, the conservative managers are likely to invent some plausible story to frighten voters into a belief that the country will not be safe if the liberals are successful. We give timely warning so as to prepare the electors. It is safe to distrust every new story put in circulation between to-day and Thursday night.

THE U. S. TARIFF WILL NOT BE ADOPTED.

The pretence that the United States and Canada would have to assimilate their tariff because of unrestricted reciprocity is very absurd. The alleged reason is that unless this is done goods will be imported into Canada and taken into the United States. How could this be prevented by raising the Canadian tariff? If the tariff of Canada were twice as high as the tariff of the United States, it would not prevent the smuggling into the United States of goods imported into Canada, if anybody wanted to smuggle them. There will be no "pooling of customs receipts by the countries and a subsequent election. If an article is imported into Canada from, say France, and pays 30 per cent, it cannot be taken from Canada to the United States without paying the same duty as it would have paid had it been imported directly into the United States. Let us suppose, for example, that the United States tariff on velvets is 60 per cent, and Canada makes its tariff 60 per cent. Also, then the tariff in both countries would be the same, yet if velvet were imported into Canada from Europe, the fact that it had paid 60 per cent here would not entitle the importer to take it from Canada to the United States without paying further duty. He would still have to pay the 60 per cent duty which the United States charges on \$100 per cent. Hence the argument that the tariffs of the two countries must be assimilated has no foundation in reason.

Do the Conservatives claim that the N. P. can help York? They do not. Who will help? The combines and the bootlers only. Vote against Mr. Temple, omnibism and booting.

A SHORT CATECHISM.

Who are the friends of reciprocity? The liberals only.

Do not the conservatives claim to be friends of reciprocity? Some of them do; but their interest is supposed to be entirely in favor of the N. P. and this is opposed to reciprocity.

Will the conservatives if successful try to negotiate a reciprocity treaty? Perhaps so, for reciprocity in natural products.

Will they be successful? Personally the United States government will not entertain any such proposition.

Who says so? James E. Blaine, secretary of state.

Did any one else say so? Yes. Sir John Macdonald said so in parliament in 1884.

Then the claim that the conservatives can bring about a treaty for reciprocity in natural products is a sham? Of course it is. Just as their claim in 1878, that there would be no increase in the tariff, was a sham, and their claim in 1883 that there were millions of dollars in the United States waiting to be invested in Canada was a sham, and their diabolical cry in 1887 was a sham, and their diabolical cry in 1887 was a sham.

Vote against the men who disfranchised thousands upon thousands of our best citizens.

UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCIITY.

What is unrestricted reciprocity? The London Spectator, in explaining it to the people of England, says that it is the same arrangement as exists between that country and France and it asks desirably what would be thought of the man who would suggest that this treaty would lead to the annexation of the two countries. The paper thinks that this simple fact disposes of all the balderdash indulged in by those who call unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States treason and prejudicial to the interests of the British Empire. And so it does. The case of the restrictionists will not stand examination in the light of facts. It is a tissue of transparent absurdities.

Who added millions upon millions to the Canadian debt? The conservatives. Vote against their candidate Mr. Temple.

In the ballot Mr. Temple is described as a "gentleman," which means that he is a business man. If he were running an election in the State of Maine, he would be described as an investor in railways. But some may say, did not Mr. Temple invest in a railway here? Yes, he invested \$50,000 which the city and county gave him, on the understanding that he was to pay it back again when he sold the road. He also invested \$200,000 which the province gave him, and it is owing to those investments that he is now able to run the election as a "gentleman." How would it do for the people of York to see a candidate who is a business man in active life? That's what Mr. Thompson is.

Who almost doubled the taxes of the people? The conservatives. Vote against their candidate, Mr. Temple.

The Farmer says that under unrestricted reciprocity a small army of tax collectors would have to go the rounds every year. Mr. Laurier, leader of the liberal party, says that unrestricted reciprocity would not render any change in the present method of collecting taxes necessary. As between Mr. Laurier and the Farmer we may be excused if we accept the opinion of the liberal statesman. It knows what it is talking about. Our esteemed contemporary has not bent his great mental energies sufficiently to the task to be able to deal with the problem on its merits.

The success of the liberals is the success of the people; the success of the conservatives is a victory for the combines.

The Farmer takes the cake on the loss of revenue question. It figures it at \$18,000,000. Did not our contemporary mean \$180,000,000? In a matter of this kind it is a pity to stick at a trifle. We collect from imports from England and the United States less than \$17,000,000 altogether. Yet by some mysterious process we are to lose from these two sources more than we get. We are sure our contemporary made a mistake and must have meant \$1,800,000,000, or perhaps it was \$18,000,000,000.

Has the N. P. done anything for York? No. Then vote against the man who supports it, Mr. Temple.

Advices from all parts of the county are very favorable to the liberal candidate, and unless all signs fail, Mr. Thompson's election by a splendid majority is assured. Owing to the terrible condition of the roads a few meetings had to be abandoned, but nearly all engagements of this nature have been kept punctually, the electors have turned out in force and there has been wonderful unanimity of sentiment on the question of reciprocity.

A vote for Thompson is a vote for more economical government.

One of the farmer's lies in the campaign is the statement in which the Farmer has followed the lead of the Gleaner.

NOMINATION PROCEEDINGS.

Liberal Meeting at the County Court House—The Speeches.

Nomination proceedings opened quietly in the county court house on Thursday morning. The terrible condition of the country roads reduced the attendance somewhat, but later on in the day the streets became animated, and a large and interested gathering assembled to hear the speeches. The nomination papers were filed promptly after twelve. Thomas Temple was nominated by The Hon. Colter, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

The Hon. F. P. Thompson was nominated by: John Anderson, (Dumfries), W. Wilson, M. P. F., G. I. Gunter, G. W. McLaggan, J. R. Crockett, W. R. Logan, C. E. Duffy, C. H. Lagrin, E. H. Allen, W. C. Crockett, Gregory & Gregory, Richard Bellamy, (Southampton), G. A. Hughes, W. A. G. Blair, (Kewick), J. McKee, (Bright), J. S. Neill, Wesley Vanwart, W. McFarlane, M. Tennant, D. Jordan, C. H. Thomas, J. R. McConnell, W. H. Vanwart and others.

need the opportunity. Free trade with the United States, the policy of the liberal party, I know will weigh with the electors when recording their votes on the fifth of March next. (Applause.)

The Hon. A. G. Blair in response to numerous calls said— He had not anticipated this opportunity of discussing the momentous issues of the day. He would have preferred a free discussion by both parties, as the practice always has been, but which the conservative candidate would not agree to on this occasion. The city hall might have been used for that purpose, but he had been informed the conservative party were not willing. The people have a great issue before them and the weight of the respective arguments could have been considered by the electors if there had been a free discussion. The inference is that they the conservatives are not willing to stand side by side with the liberals on the public platform. The liberal party is appealing to the calm judgment, the sober sense, and the intelligence of the electors. They are not appealing to passion, sentiment or prejudice nor do they raise personal charges against Mr. Temple. They have not attempted to charge their opponents with disloyalty. Mr. Thompson can treat with courtesy and respect the personal charges brought against him. His record as a business man will answer for him. The admirable address by both parties has more than justified the wisdom of the convention in selecting Mr. Thompson. As a presentation of the case from a business standpoint Mr. Thompson's address was unanswerable. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

There has been a change of base in this respect, and an important change, for on the 13th of December last, a despatch from Ottawa to Lord Kintford recommended the sending of a commission to Washington to negotiate a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with such modifications as the changed condition of the two countries rendered necessary and such extensions as the commission might deem to be in the interest of both countries. The government then must have been cognisant of the fact that the national policy was to be altered. (Applause.)

It is an historical fact that between 1849 and 1854 a strong sentiment in favor of annexation sprang up in British America. This was due largely to the feeling that the adoption of free trade ideas in England would work harm to the colonies. Manifestoes were issued in St. John, Montreal and perhaps elsewhere, pointing out that annexation was the only recourse left to the British provinces. In 1854 the reciprocity treaty came into force and the annexation sentiment died out at once. Everybody knows this, who is at all conversant with the history of this country. Free trade between two countries never yet developed a desire for political union. The latter is only sought as a means of obtaining the advantages of the former. People all the world over are alike. When times are good they are contented and do not worry themselves over political problems. You can see proof of this in the United States, and especially in the city of New York. The people have been so occupied with business that they have put up with a frightful amount of bad government. Give our people plenty of business and they will never think about changing their political condition. Our system of laws and government is ever so much better than our neighbors', and no man would want to change it merely for the sake of change. But if times keep hard and trade is kept in unnatural channels the people chafe and fret, and begin to wonder if any change would not be a good one. A prosperous people are always a contented people, and a contented people are always loyal.

The election of provincial secretary Gibson in Hamilton by a majority of nearly seven hundred is a significant sign of the times. A few months ago the Tories carried the constituency by a majority of 86. This tremendous overturn is directly due to the fact that the election turned upon unrestricted reciprocity. The Hamilton Spectator, conservative, said the day before the election: "The interests in the two contests are the same. The man who gives his support to Mr. Gibson places himself in opposition to the national policy."

The election of provincial secretary Gibson in Hamilton by a majority of nearly seven hundred is a significant