THE HERALD SUPPLEMENT.

FREE TRADE!

Mr. Blair at Harvey.

A POWERFUL EXPOSITION OF THE LIBERAL POLICY.

Failure of the N. P.

IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Reciprocity the Need of the Farmer and Laborer.

A QUESTION THAT RISES ABOVE ALL PARTY ISSUES.

(Stenographed by Frank H. Risteen.)

The most case-hardened conservative could not but take note of the contrast between the meeting held by Mr. Jordan and Mr. Vanwart, in Harvey and that which was addressed, on Tuesday evening last there, by Mr. E. H. Allen and Hon. A. G. Blair. There were not over a dozen voters at the former gathering and the meeting only lasted about an hour, while the audience that came to hear the free-trade advocates was representative of every part of the parish and completely filled the hall. Mr. David Glendenning, a wellknown conservative, occupied the chair.

MR. ALLEN

delivered a most forcible and earnest address. Sir John he said had stolen the chicken of reciprocity from the opposition hen-roost, while at the same time he was standing fast by the great N. P. It was impossible even for that adroit leader to successfully maintain a policy for Quebec and Ontario and another one for the maritime provinces. There could not be much doubt as to which section of the dominion would receive the preference at the hands of Sir John. The national policy was his platform in 1878 and it is his platform to-day. But while the conservative leader occupied a shifty and evasive position, the liberal party were united and were prepared to stand or fall on the platform of unrestricted reciprocity from one end of the dominion to the other. Dealing with the loyalty cry, Mr. Allen said that wrapping ourselves up in the Union Jack and reposing gracefully in our homes would not earn bread and butter for our families. It was not true that annexation was the watchword of the liberal party; it was true, however, that both Sir John Macdonald and Sir Leonard Tilley in the past had favored it. (Great applause).

Mr. Allen then spoke in eloquent terms of attorney general Blair, than whom New Brunswick had no abler son, and was cheered to the echo by the audience. He referred to the revolution in sentiment against Mr. Temple and the government that had taken place in Stanley and along the river. This election was one in which the great farming classes of the county were vitally interested, and they were showing all along the line that they appreciated the situation. They see that while the Aroostook farmer gets $2.25 or $2.50 for his potatoes, the York farmer can only get $1.65, because of the tariff of 62 cents a barrel on potatoes. The best the York farmer can get for butter is 16 and 17c. a pound, while they would get 24 if the 8c. a pound American tariff was removed. If that duty was taken off the farmer would not only have an illimitable.

Market for his Produce

to the south but he would get the extra eight cents a pound right in his own home market. When the Mackenzie government taxed tea and coffee, which was not a sectional tax, a great howel was raised by the conservatives, yet, the first thing the Macdonald government did, on its advent to power was to place a tax of fifty cents a barrel on flour, which was a sectional tax. If there was anything under heaven that the people ought to have untaxed it was bread. From 1878 to 1889 the people of the maritime provinces, according to the admission of Sir Charles Tupper himself, paid into the treasury for the flour they used the round sum of $450.000. (Applause). In 1889 tho Ontario millers again took a hand in and forced Sir John to raise the tax twenty-five cents more. It was claimed by government orators that that duty actually cheapened the price of flour. Then, in heaven's name, why didn't they make it a dollar and we would have it cheaper still? (Laughter and Applause). Does the tax placed upon corn-meal make it cheaper? If so, we ought to petition the dominion government to make it a little higher. The fact was the very next day after the last addition was made to the flour tax the great flour concerns in Montreal had made hundreds of thousands of dollars in the twinkling of an eye. The price went up instantly. If the people of the maritime provinces can buy flour cheaper in the United States than in Ontario they ought to have the privilege of doing so. Mr. Allen spoke of the almost unanimous endorsement by St. John, Fredericton and Woodstock manufacturers of unrestricted reciprocity as the best answer to the claim that free trade would ruin our manufactures. Mr. Hoegg of Fredericton had stated that there was nothing he so much desired as reciprocity. It would enable him to greatly extend his business; to buy all the peas and corn the farmers could raise and to undersell the American manufacturers in their own market. (Great Applause).

HON. A. G. BLAIR

on coming forward was greeted with hearty cheers—He said:

I can assure you, Mr. chairman, that I myself had very little expectation three or four months ago when I last had the pleasure of addressing you, that I would be again so soon upon this platform and taking part in a political contest. We had not at that time any expectation that there would be an early dissolution of the dominion parliament, and when it did come, though foretold by some political prophets, it was somewhat of a surprise to us all. I think I can fairly claim that I myself have enjoyed a fair share of political discussion during the last 12 or 14 months and have only just emerged, safely I am happy to say, from rather an active and vigorous contest in the county of Westmorland, (Applause) when I find myself again in the harness and taking part in the present contest.

At the time of the nomination of the candidate who is now running in the interest of unrestricted reciprocity, I was not present in Fredericton, and was not therefore active in connection with the convention, but that convention having made a nomination and this platform of unrestricted reciprocity being a question in which for many years I have taken a very lively and very keen interest and I hope an intelligent interest, I did not think that it would be improper in me to offer wherever the opportunity might be afforded me such explanations on the question as I thought might conduce to a better understanding of it.

There are no doubt many phases of the question of unrestricted reciprocity and of the probable effect and bearing of that policy upon our manufactures and upon our

Agricultural and Lumber Interests,

with which business people, and with which you yourselves are probably very much more familiar than I am. I am not going to assume to myself such entire knowledge upon that question as to inform you what is to be the particular effect upon each branch of the farming business of the country, I leave you to judge of that for yourselves and your judgment will, no doubt, be very much sounder and more accurate than mine. There are, I venture to think, some phases of this question, however. upon which I may be better informed than many of you, to which I have given more direct attention and upon which you would be glad to hear an expression of my views.

I have no interest in this controversy further than the interest which any citizen of our country has. I do not feel for one that it approaches so much a party question as some imagine. I think it is a question of such magnitude that it

Rises Higher than any Mere Party Issue

or a man's allegiance to his party. It enters into the direct personal concerns of every one of us and we ought to examine it calmly and carefully and from every standpoint our judgment affords, and reach a conclusion upon that judgment entirely irrespective of whether the conclusion will lead us adverse to our former party affiliations or in the line of those connections. (Applause). I think there is such a thing as a party being the curse of the state and disastrous to the best interests of the country. I like to see men faithful to their party, but when a great issue plainly and clearly arises involving the public benefit and interest, it does seem to me that it is the highest duty of men to act independently of what they may have thought hitherto were the claims of their party. (Applause). I think that is the position to-day. At no period in the history of Canada has there arisen an issue so vital to us all. We are now determining a question at the polls which strikes us for weal or woe, and which transcends in dignity the ties of party.

Now, it is very important for us to ascertain

Just What the Issue is;

what is the position each party takes, where they differ and where your interests lie. An attempt has been made to involve the question in doubt. One of the candidates announces himself in favor of reciprocity, and the other says he is in favor of reciprocity. There must be an error on the part of one of these gentlemen. Mr. Temple tells you that he is in favor of reciprocity, and will direct his energies to bringing about the object. Now, it is only fair to the people of the country that they should know that Mr. Temple is in no position to promote the cause of reciprocity in the slightest particular, because we have the platform of his leader put so plainly before us that he who runs may read. What is the declaration which Sir John Macdonald makes to the people? I venture to affirm that no man can find in that declaration a syllable pointing in the direction of the negotiation of reciprocal trade relations with the United States. (Applause).

It is Not in His Manifesto

from beginning to end, but there is an avowed and clear announcement that he stands upon the N. P. as inaugurated by him in 1878. (Applause.)

Now, I take exception most distinctly to Mr. Temple's card, because if Mr. Temple is not in sympathy with Sir John he is certainly sailing under false colors. If he goes there as a supporter of the dominion government he has no right to utter a syllable of reciprocity in his card, or go before the poople in that capacity. If there is anyone authorized to speak for the government of Canada it is the leader of the government. No member of the cabinet or candidate is entitled to put any other platform before the people when Sir John has defined the lines upon which his policy is to proceed, and on which he appeals to the country. Now, the manifesto of Sir John contains these words: "As in 1878, in 1882 and again in 1887, so in 1891 questions relating to the trade and commerce of the country occupy the foremost place in the public mind. Our policy in respect thereto is to-day what it has been for the past thirteen years." That is very clear and explicit. In 1878 he inaugurated the N. P. and he adheres to it to-day, a policy that is utterly and entirely antagonistic to the idea of reciprocal trade with the United States. In 1878 Sir John Macdonald excused the adoption of the N. P.—that it was merely intended to be a temporary measure—that his object was to adopt such a system as would coerce the people of the United States into the adoption of reciprocity with Canada, and he said then that he would be willing whenever the government of the United States on their part were willing to make a reciprocal treaty. But, now, we find that

He Stands Upon the National Policy

as it has been in operation for the last thirteen years, and he further adds that he is opposed to the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. Not one syllable is there from the beginning to the end of this lengthy paper in favor of reciprocal trade relations with that country, and I will tell you why. Because in my judgment reciprocity with the United States is antagonistic to the idea of protection. It is entirely opposed to the national policy; the two things will not work; they will not harmonize. Canada for the Canadians will not rhyme with free trade with the United States. The N. P. is designed to keep out the manufactures or produce of other countries that can by any forced process be produced in our land. Therefore, if Sir John were frank with the people of Canada, he could not very well profess to be in favor of the N. P. and at the same time of reciprocal trade relations with the United States. It is important that we should understand whether we are being fairly and frankly dealt with by the government. Now on the 13th of December there was a

Despatch of very great Importance

sent from Ottawa to the colonial secretary of the home government. That despatch starts out by intimating that it is the desire of the government at Ottawa that the home government should approach the government at Washington with a view of having a commission appointed for the purpose of agreeing upon a treaty to cover various matters now in dispute, and also a renewal of the reciprocal treaty of 1854 with such modifications as are required by the altered circumstances of both countries. Now, what does that mean? To my mind it is clear that on the 13th of December the government of Canada were

Impressed with the Strength of the Sentiment

throughout Canada in favor of a wider extension of trade relations with the United States and the necessity of something being done to provide a market for our people. Otherwise the government would not have proposed (not merely a renewal of the treaty of 1854) but a treaty with certain additions and extensions, meaning manufactures, as well.

Now, it does not appear, after that despatch was sent to the colonial office, that it was communicated very promptly at Washington, but it was published throughout Canada. On the top of that comes the statement in the Empire, the official organ of the government, that in view or certain proposals submitted to the president of the United States the Canadian government is "of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty which may be ratified by the parliament of Canada, it is expedient that the government should deal with a parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund house." Now, mark you, the object of the dissolution, thus stated by the official organ on the 5th of February, was that a

Fresh Parliament Might be Convened

which would sustain Sir John Macdonald in his proposed negotiations with the American government on the basis of the renewal of reciprocity. Not for a reciprocity treaty covering natural products only but one that "should extend and enlarge the commerce of the country." Now, after that announcement what takes place. Something important, which I cannot pretend to divulge, takes place between the 5th of February and the 11th day of February when the manifesto of Sir John is issued. For in that manifesto from beginning to end there is not a syllable with regard to the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with or without extensions. (Applause) Not one word.

It must be very clear that between the date of the dissolution and the date of the manifesto,

Great Pressure was Brought Upon the Government

by the manufacturers to induce them to alter the stand they had intended to take in appealing to the people of Canada, for there is not a word in the manifesto about reciprocity at all. It is clear that Sir John abandoned, if he ever entertained the idea of, a reciprocity treaty and took up the other attitude—the continuation of the N. P. Now, what has the N. P. done for Canada which would make it desirable that the people of this country should express by their votes a desire for its continuance? Sir John tells you in this same manifesto what it has done. If you agree with his statement you could not do better than continue that policy for all time to come. He speaks of the glorious era of prosperty which followed, and states that "almost as if by magic the whole face of the country underwent a change," and "that all Canada rejoiced under the quickening impulse of a new-found life." (Laughter).

Now, I appeal to anyone of you. Does that statement correspond with your knowledge of the actual facts? Has the N. P. quickened and enlarged the tide of business, increased the value of your labor? If so, I have not a word to say. But if your experience corresponds with my own then it would be that the N. P. has not met the expectations of the country, but has proved to be an entire failure. I will say as a mattter of justice that I believe he thought it was going to be a benefit to the country. I believe he thought it was going to have all these magical results that his fancy now portrays. But his judgment in reference to that subject must have been entirely at fault. I maintain, as we in New Brunswick at least know, (I do not know how it is in Ontario nor am I so interested in Ontario as I am in New Brunswick) that the

National Policy Has Not Done That For Us

which it was represented to us it would do. I take it as a matter of fact that the friends of the N. P. in the maritime provinces recognize that it has proved to be a failure. It has built up some industries, but in the other provinces of Canada, it has led to a system of combines, and of the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few. It has led to the destruction of some sections probably to the advantage of others, but that it has had any beneficial effect in New Brunswick remains yet to be proved and I think cannot be maintained. (Applause.) If you look over our own province you will hardly be able to put your finger upon the successful manufactory that it has inaugurated. It has started cotton factories, but they have not been as successfully carried on as were those which were started before it. Mr. Parks before the N. P. carried on a most successful business in St. John but whether it was owing to over-production or undue competition, he has since met with financial disaster. I certainly know of

No Industries in the County of York

which depends in the slightest degree upon the N.P. for their successful prosecution. If that is true the N. P. of building up a wall around Canada for the purpose of fostering the establishment of manufactures within our own borders has not conferred upon the country the benefits which it was represented it would confer. That being the case, the people of this country are obliged to turn their attention in some other direction, and Sir John himself I believe was convinced of the importance of branching out on some other line, but the influence of the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec was too great and overcame his judgement and inclinations. I do not think it is possible to resist the conclusion that Sir John A. Macdonald believed in his own mind that the liberal policy

Was the Policy to go to the Country upon

at this time, and it was not until he felt the pressure of these great influences in Quebec and Ontario upon him, and that the Ontario millers and manufacturers threatened to withdraw their support from him, that he retraced his steps. I think you will agree with me that when any candidate friendly to Sir John Macdonald, professes at the same time to be in favor of reciprocity, he is riding two horses that are carrying him in diametrically opposite directions, a feat which I do not think any politician, however astute, can successfully accomplish in this country. There is no reciprocity of any kind in the platform of Sir John, and I will give you conclusive evidence that you cannot find it there. First, I will give you

The Evidence of Mr. Blaine,

secretary of state for the United States Some five or six weeks ago senator Baker of the state of New York saw published in the Ontario press that Sir John was proposing a renewal of the treaty of 1854 with some modifications, and asked Mr. Blaine whether that proposal had been made and whether it would be entertained? Mr. Blaine replied to that, under date of 29th of January 1891:

DEAR MR. BAKER:

I authorize you to contradict the rumors you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be sure that no reciprocity confined to natural products will be entertained by this government. J. G. BLAINE.

Now, what other evidence have we? Well, we have the

Evidence of Sir John Macdonald Himself,

in the speech which he delivered in the House of Commons, where, referring to the question of the renewal of the reciprocity treaty, he said:

I believe that the feeling which then existed still exists and that you will never get a treaty between the United States and Canada for reciprocal trade in the natural products of the two countries.

That is the most explicit possible declaration, that unless we are willing to include manufactures as well, we will never have a treaty. (Applause). Now, is it not practising a fraud upon the people of the country for a candidate to come out and say that he is in favor of a reciprocity treaty in natural products when his leader has said in parliament that no such treaty is practicable, and when the other party to the treaty has made a similar declaration? Does not that settle the question? Might not a man be as well opposed to all reciprocity as to be in favor of a

Reciprocity which he knows is Impracticable

and cannot be obtained? (Applause). That is the position in which Mr. Temple stands in this contest. Let us be fair with one another. Let them be fair to the people and state frankly and squarely where they are and not seek support on any side issue or deceiving representation. (Applause). This question is too great, and the issue is of too great a magnitude that the people should be led to vote for one man or another upon any misrepresentation of the attitude he stands in or perversion of the real issue. There can be no reciprocity unless it extends beyond natural products. Conservatives profess that they are in favor of restricted reciprocity although they cannot get it. Although it is wholly impracticable and although it is not in Sir John Macdonald's card yet they are willing to take it. Well, that is restricted, I should think. (Laughter). Now, the liberal party say that they are in favor of a reciprocity which is not restricted, and they know that unless we get such a treaty we will get none at all.

Now, gentlemen, which do you prefer?

Do you want Reciprocity at all

or do you prefer that the N. P., with all its imperfections, with its total failure to realize the needs and expectations of this province and give you proper returns for your labor and enterprise, shall be continued as the tariff system of Canada for all time to come? (Hear, hear). Do you want a policy which will open to you the splendid market of a vast country right at your doors, for all your labor and the output of your industrial energies in all directions? (Applause). That is the question for you to decide. If you want the N. P. hold to it, but if not there is nothing for it but to take the policy which the liberal party propose because it is the only practicable policy or treaty which will be agreed to by the people of that country.

Now, you can see how reasonable the attitude of the United States government is. The treaty, which was in operation from 1854 to 1866, was confined to the products of the farm, the forest, the sea and the mine, practically, and the same provisions that applied to products going from Canada to the United States applied to products coming from the United States to Canada. That is to say, we could not send them any manufactures and they could not send us any. But

It was a Jug-handled Agreement.

We had natural products to send them, but they had no natural products of any consequence to send us. The arrangement between us was nothing like a fair one. So, it was not at all unreasonable under the circumstances that the government of that country should annul that treaty as they did in 1886, and is it to be supposed for one moment, that having abrogated that one-sided treaty in 1866 they are going to renew it now under the same conditions? I think you may lay aside completely any hope or prospect that that will be done. Do you want reciprocity at all. Do you feel that your best interests call for the adoption of a treaty between this country and that, or do you not? If you do, then let us get it. It is

A Matter of Adjustment

between the two countries. You cannot trust the duty to Sir John Macdonold's government, because he is committed to the N. P. by his own manifesto and you can get nothing from him. It is your duty to say which policy shall obtain. The liberal party say that they are prepared to make the best arrangement, on the most reasonable scale for Canada, that can be made. They say they are not going to restrict the treaty to natural products for they know they cannot get it. That treaty will be framed upon lines which the judgment of the liberal party may dictate. After all you have got to leave the details of such questions as these to the government of the day. All that any party can do is to define in a broad way what their policy is and the working of it out must be left to them afterwards. The liberal party has no ambition to make an arrangement with the United States that would be suicidal to that party and to you. If in a general way

The Liberal Party Promises to Meet the Hopes

and expectations of the people of Canada then it is your duty to entrust to them the working out of the details of that treaty, and you may with reasonable confidence rely upon their making such a treaty as they believe would be in the best interests of the people. (Applause).

Now, I am not going to-night to elaborate all the advantages which reciprocity will confer upon you, however great they may be. I have always been a strong free-trade man and I say that the best possible measure of free trade that you can arrive at not only with that country but with every country in the world, consistent with the revenue and the claims upon it, will be in the best interests of the people. The

More Restrictions you Place Upon Trade

the more you injure the prosperity of the country. Two men cannot trade with one another without being mutually benefited. Otherwise the trade will not take place at all. That is one of the essential principles of the laws of trade. The laws of trade are laws that operate if you allow them to operate as nature intended they should, to the advantage of both parties in the transaction. These laws are so suited to the needs and conditions of men that if you but let them operate unrestrained they will confer prosperity upon the people who are trading with each other. I am a

Free Trader of the Broadest Possible Kind,

and I am prepared to be satisfied with any treaty that may be made between the governments of Canada and the United States, even though they should take down all the barriers and allow all the products of both countries to be interchangeably passed between them. (Loud applause). But there would no doubt be considerations of revenue and our debt obligations to be dealt with when these governments came to meet and arrange the new treaty. It is quite supposable that we will be obliged to make a selection of some classes of manufactured goods upon which a tariff will have to be placed in order to make up the deficiency that will no doubt exist for some time to come because of the lowering of the tariff wall. The government

Will be Responsible to the People of Canada

and will most assuredly take a course which will enable them to fulfil all their duties as a government. They are not going into this thing without carefully marking their steps. Let the people of Canada give them the power and cast upon them the responsibility and I will venture to say there are men in the liberal party, as there are men in the conservative party, who would be able to so regulate the negotiations between the two countries as to ensure a workable treaty and ensure a proper safe-guarding of the rights and interests of the people. (Applause).

But there are objections which every reasonable man takes to the proposals of the liberal party and it would be unreasonable to suppose that so broad, liberal and expansive a policy should not meet with a good deal of opposition from timid people and very strong party people and people opposed to change, and I am going to take occasion to-night to

Analyze Some of the Objections

urged against the adoption of this policy. I have not the slightest hope of being able to impress my views upon the minds of those who are determined to support their party to the uttermost ditch and who are not open to argument, but I do hope to reach the judgment and the reason of neutral people and people who are not very strong in party feelings, so that they may see their way clear to give their support to the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. What I wish to do is to reach the judgment and intelligence of the people. I think

It Is a Melancholy Spectacle

when a question entering as this does so deeply into the material welfare of the people, is submitted to their sentiments, and passions and prejudices, as a deliberate attempt is now being made to do throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Cannot a people possessing self government discuss a question of this kind upon an intelligent basis? Must we have reflections cast upon our moral rectitude as citizens when we simply seek to advance what we believe to be in supremest interest of the people of this country? I hope, gentlemen, to reach your intelligence. I am going to pass hastily in review all the objections, so far as I have heard them, to this question of unrestricted reciprocity.

In the first place they say if you adopt this policy of unrestricted reciprocity you are going to

Destroy The Manufacturing Industries

of the country. It occurs at once to us to inquire: What are the manufacturing industries now that are going to be affected? What are they and where are they? Well, chiefly they will tell you they are in Ontario. Well, I am just so much wrapped up in the welfare of my own province and my own county that I feel more concerned as to what will benefit her and it than I do as to what is going to benefit the province of Ontario. (Tremendous applause). It does not galvanize the slightest particle of enthusiasm in my breast to tell me that a dozen manufacturers in the town of Brantford, or London, or Toronto, are amassing wealth there, at our expense. (Applause). There are forms of joy more exhilarating than that which thrills me when I read that the combines and monopolists of Quebec are satisfied with the N. P. (Loud cheering). It

Does not Afford me the Slightest Hope

for our future or the slightest promise for the time to come for the people of my own native province in the stern struggle of life. (Renewed cheering). I want to know where are these industries in New Brunswick that are going to be benefited. Well, they say, your cotton mills. Well, I at once join issue with them. I have tried to get the judgment of the people in the cotton business and they say the N. P. does not benefit them. I have been somewhat closely connected professionally with the owners of

The Saint Croix Cotton Mill.

They have had to transfer a large portion of their property. I saw Mr. Owens, who owns some $800,000 of that property, and asked him what he thought would be the effect of the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity, supposing the effect of that was to let him into the United States and let the United States cotton products into New Brunswick? Why, he said, it is the very thing I want, and he said most emphatically that he should consider that his mill at St. Croix (not one yard of the product of which can now enter the United States) would be worth $2 for every dollar that he valued it at to-day if he could get his cotton free into the markets of the United States. (Applause). Said I: Do you think you could compete? Why, he said, there are six or seven mills in the State of Maine making money, why could not I, with the magnificent water privileges and facilities and the intelligent labor I have, do the same? And why should not he? Are the people of Maine possessed of superior climate or superior energy as compared with our own? Surely, surely not. It is a gross reflection upon our people to say that people breathing the same air on the other side of the line can succeed while there is nothing but failure for us. Surely, Mr. Owens ought to know as much at least as we do about it.

It is only a few months ago that Mr. Gibson told me he was

In favor of Unrestricted Reciprocity.

He said the market of Canada is too small. We have got a very large number of mills and our climate being cold we want wools more than cottons, and I am satisfied if we got into the United States we could make something. We have not made anything yet. If Mr. Gibson is opposed to Mr. Thompson in this election, it is probably because there are some unsettled matters which, reasonably enough, would have some influence upon his mind as they would upon any one in the same position. Take

The Woodstock Manufactures,

situated as they are right at the boundary line, furniture, sash and door factories, foundries, agricultural implements etc., every single man of them in the town of Woodstock has signed a declaration over his own hand that they are ready and anxious to see a policy that will let them into the United States though it should allow like concerns over the border to enter our own. There are, no doubt, some manufacturers in St. John, who are timid men or strong party men, who say it would ruin their industries, but there are a number who say the very opposite. Take

The Case of Mr. Burpee,

who employs 80 or 90 men in polishing granite for the U. S. market. He says the tariff prevents him sending his products to the U. S. market and he can only polish his granite in certain forms because the cost incidental to the high American tariff restricts his market, but he says this and says it most positively, that if he had free access to the U. S. market, instead of employing 80 or 90 men he would have 1000 men in his employ inside of six months engaged in polishing granite in all its forms. The St. George people say the same thing, and who can measure the extent to which our business would be expanded in legitimate directions if the tariff wall was thrown down? When I allow my imagination to dwell upon it, it seems to me we can hardly estimate the extent to which this province would bloom and grow if we had access to the markets of that country. Some manufacturers would be destroyed no doubt. But did we stop the building of railways because stage coaches would have to be taken off and the people in that business would have to leave it? No, the march of progress must be permitted to go on though a few people should fall by the way. Some would be injuriously affected but they would be a mere bagatelle to the advantages which would be derived by the overwhelming mass of our people. Look at

The Expansion of our Lumber Business

which would follow from free access to the United States market. Look at the mills that would go up for the manufacture of small lumber and shingles and clapboards. Look at the millions of acres of hardwood we have that could be manufactured, and the employment that would result therefrom, and the enhanced prices that would follow. Why, if you take the lumber business alone and look at the difference in the prices paid on the other side of the line and those which are paid on this side it represents a magnificent profit for the people engaged in that business. And look at the wages. In the state of Maine you can get $5 a month more than you can get here for working in the woods. It is not because their products are any better than ours, but because they have that magnificent stretch of country calling for the products of their forests, and if the barriers were taken down our people would secure the like remuneration and profit.

Supposing, there were a few manufacturing industries that had to lose, I want to know where is the reason and the fairness of calling upon people to settle this question in the interests of others? Every man has to settle this question in his own interests, as he thinks it will pecuniarily affect his own individual case. If you are going to vote for other people

You will not be Voting for Yourselves.

Suppose, for example, New Brunswick votes in the interest of Ontario, and Ontario, as she most assuredly will, votes to help herself, who is going to help New Brunswick? (Applause). Let them determine it for themselves and let us determine it for ourselves. All they care about us is for what they sell to us; they are making no sacrifices for us. Don't understand me to be taking a sectional view—I am simply taking the true representative view. But you know that they can send their products down here from Ontario cheaper than we can send the same articles from one point in New Brunswick to another. We are buying everything from them. Do they buy anything from us?

Who have we got to sell to?

The people on the other side of the line. (Applause). There is where you have to look for a market to support your family and provide the necessaries of life. Let that McKinley bill come into full operation, as it will in another summer, and you will find that market entirely shut against you, and where are you going to sell your sheep, your horses, your potatoes, your hay and eggs? If they go there they will go at a direct personal loss to every man of you. A colt worth $100 you will get $70 for. The buyer will tell you he has to take that off the price, and that he would give it to you but for the McKinley tariff. By that one operation you would be paying more than you could possibly be called upon to pay under any system of taxation. We have got to take just such a course as is dictated by our self-interest. That is the only way in which the wishes of the whole country can find expression. No matter what inducements are held out it is every man's privilege to go to the ballot box and vote it as his own interests dictate, and I do not question but that the great body of the agriculturists of this country and of those in the lumber business also will record their votes in favor of the adoption of a policy which means a hope and a future for them that will otherwise be denied them. They tell us about the markets of Ontario and Quebec.

What is There We Can Sell

to them? We know they are a long distance off. We know that an expensive railway has to be traversed before we can get there, and when we get there we find they have the same products to sell to us that we have to sell to them, but the moment you go south you go where God and nature intended you should go and where you will find a profitable market for everything you have to sell. (Loud applause). The two countries are the complement of each other and the extent to which their trade relations might be developed seem to me illimitable.

Take the Egg Business Alone.

Previous to 1871 the egg trade of Canada with the U. S. amounted to $5042 a year. Then the duty of 10 per cent was taken off and the egg export of Canada to the United States in 1886 amounted to $2,140,000. (App.). Well, under free trade similar development would be attained in other lines of business. Production would be increased many fold and no man could point out its limits. They tell you that you are going to interfere with manufactures. Ask yourselves what manufactures in the county of York are particularly involved, and put alongside of that enquiry the advantages which your judgment tells you would flow to our farming and lumber industry. Why, you take all the men in these manufactories in Saint John, that they say would be injuriously affected (though I do not believe it) by the operation of the treaty, and what comparison do they bear to the thousands and tens of thousands of farmers and lumbermen of the country who would be benefited? (Applause). Is it reasonable that you should forego these advantages because a few hundred people might possibly be obliged to seek other employments.

Well, they say, but what are you going to do about the tariff? Are you not going to lose a large amount of revenue? I will tell you what seems to me to be a complete answer to

This Bugbear of Direct Taxation.

They say we will lose $7,000,000 or $,8000,000 of revenue the moment we allow the products of the United States to come into Canada. Well, I think one important consideration is that if you get these goods in free of tax you keep that $7,000,000 in your pockets. (Applause). I have not the least doubt that when the liberal party come to arrange that treaty they will make such arrangements as will guarantee and protect the country against the loss of any large amount of revenue. The duty derived from other goods may increase until the amount is made up. There will no doubt be a substantial saving made in the government of the country, for the government which adopts a policy of this kind is under bonds to carry on their administration in the most economical way, so as to make up in a large measure for the deficiency in the revenue. You have the assurance of the leaders of the liberal party that they have no thought of resorting to direct taxation. Recognizing the strong objection which many of the people have to direct taxation, they have given a pledge that they will not adopt that system, nor make any arrangement that will necessitate it. Again, when the people of this country commence to realize the rejuvenating, and vivifying influences resulting from unfettered trade with the neighboring republic, would not they be likely to buy more goods from other countries than they now buy? At the present time a very much larger proportion of the revenue is obtained from European than from American goods, and perhaps that tariff would have to be still further increased, which would render it wholly improbable that direct taxation would have to be resorted to. So that I think

You may Dismiss from your Minds

altogether this idea of direct taxation. In my own judgment it seems to make very little difference whether you collect the tax directly or indirectly. I do not believe the mass of the consumers of the country would have to pay as much under direct taxation as by the indirect system. You don't realize how much you pay when you pay it indirectly. If you paid it directly you would keep a more scrutinizing watch upon the way in which it was expended. But I think we may very well lay aside that argument as one of the bugbears of those who desire to continue the system of monopoly and combines now prevailing in Canada.

Then, there is the cry that we would be

Discriminating Against England,

which would be disloyal and tending towards annexation. Now, assuming that it would discriminate against England, are we to be guided in a matter that affects us so vitally, by what will benefit us or by sentimental considerations as to the mother country? No, gentlemen, no. Trade knows no nationality, nor bounds, nor peoples, nor religions. Trade if you let it run is cosmopolitan; it would circle the globe and know no distinction of race or people. Whatever would be to the advantage of our people would not be hostile to England. To say that instead of keeping up a wall all around our country, if we take down a part of it, and thus put more money in our pockets and earn more bread for our wives and children, we are disloyal seems to me a deliberate attempt to mislead the country and appeal to the sentiment rather than the sense of the people. The people of England in their trade system do not determine what they shall do, as to whether it discriminates for or against any other country in the whole world. They adopt a trade system

That is in Their own Interest

as individuals and as a nation and not otherwise. England is not impelled in her trade arrangements by sentiment for her colonies but by her own individual and national interests, and may she legislate in her interests and we not legislate in ours? Shall we allow ourselves to be cribbed, cabined and confined out of deference to a sentiment that has no lodgment in the English mind? Surely not, surely it is absurd. Surely we should be guided by what our trade interests demand, and if we are I can assure you the people of England will find no fault. Why should we be concerned about it when England is not? There is no use in Canadians being more loyal than people who live within a stone's throw of the throne itself. A few days ago a leading member of the imperial government was asked in parliament if the government intended to take any course to interfere with Canada with reference to the proposed reciprocity arrangement with the United States, and what did Mr. Goshen say? He said the imperial government

Would not Interfere in the Slightest Particular

but leave to the people of Canada their free will and action to take just such course as they pleased in their own interests. (Applause). People who talk to you about loyalty, are seeking to draw your minds from the real issue you have got to decide. When a man is truly loyal, he will be loyal to his own country first. No man has a monopoly of loyalty. No man in any political party can claim to monopolize to himself or to his party, loyalty to his country. Other men cherish the traditions and the history of the old mother land, and take an interest in her welfare, and glory in her greatness, her success and her achievements, but to say that loyalty to England calls upon us to deprive our homes and our families, our wives and our children of the material comforts and advantages which are at their command, appears to me to be

Making A Burlesque of Loyalty

and to reveal a sham pretense to cover some other design and compass some other purpose. (Applause). I say that loyalty consists in our so dealing with our own interests and acting in our own interests as to safeguard and protect them. I take more pride in being a patriot than a loyalist. (Applause). I think that patriotism is a nobler, diviner quality, and that when the demands of home and country call upon a man to take a particular course that is patriotic, those are the demands and that is the course that he should follow. (Applause).

I saw a reference in one of

The Leading London Newspapers

(the Spectator) and I wish to make a brief extract from it. It is a high-toned, philosophical, calm, judicious paper and supports the imperial government and no man would think of questioning the loyalty of the Spectator. You have an article in this very last number touching this very question of loyalty and of the effect of the policy the liberals of Canada propose upon the relations between Canada and England, and as bearing upon the problem of annexation.

Is it, however, necessary to assume that reciprocity means absorption into the United States? We see no reason to suppose it is. Indeed, all the examples point the other way. England does not enjoy reciprocity with the world, it is true, but does enjoy free trade, yet who can say that our people are less anxious to maintain their independence than in the days of Cobden?

On the contrary, the Spectator thinks it might induce Canada to give up all idea of going into the United States. That instead of freedom of trade promoting annexation, it would rather have the opposite effect. It appears to me that that is the true view for any thoughtful man to take of this question. If we are made more prosperous,

Why Should we Desire to Leave

that condition of contentment and prosperity? Is it not rather otherwise? Is it not rather otherwise: that if the hopes and expectations of the people of this country should continue to be doomed to disappointment; if it should continue to feel the pressure of the hard and cruel jaws of monopoly, and continue to be excluded from the only markets really open to us, may it not well be that discontent will follow upon the poverty and distress we will then find ourselves in, and that from that discontent may spring up and grow an impulse so irresistible that it will sweep us into the neighboring republic in order to obtain relief? If I was anxious to see the day when we should exchange the Union Jack for stars and stripes, I would say shut down upon any expansion of your trade with them; continue to maintain your high tariff wall for a longer term, and then with almost deadly certainty you will anticipate the advent of the day when annexation would surely come. (Loud applause). That is the view I think reasonable men would and ought to take.

Political Upheavals do not Arise

from a people contented and happy. No one can point to an instance where close trade relations merged the identity of one people into another. Men do not change their nationality as they take off their coats, but when their own country fails to give them what it should give them, then they change. (Applause). I look as we must all look with the most poignant regret at the state of things which has been existing in Canada. We see it everyone of us in our own neighborhood, often in our own families; we find that under the unfortunate fiscal system that has prevailed there has been

A great Exodus from our Country.

In what direction have the best and brightest sons of Canada wended their way when they have bid all they hold most dear farewell and left their mothers and their fathers and their homes behind them? They have annexed themselves to the United States and they have carried with them the wealth of energy and the wealth of intellect which the young men of Canada possess all over its broad domain. When, therefore, a man talks to you about the danger of annexation, I think you may say to him that we are being annexed from day to day. There is hardly a family in New Brunswick which is not having its thoughts diverted, nor a mother who has not her sympathy directed because some one or more of her sons or daughters, dear as the apple of her eye, have been compelled to cross the threshold and go to a distant land to earn the livelihood which has been denied to them at home. (The audience greeted the speaker with a storm of applause). Is it not idle for men to talk about the effect of annexation under such circumstances? It looks to me as though it was flying in the face of Providence. It looks to me as though men were blind as the stones to every consideration except the consideration of party triumph. This matter of annexation, I think, we can lay aside, and lay it aside the more safely because we have precedents to support us.

Space compels us to condense the conclusion of Mr. Blair's magnificent address. He pointed out that under the old reciprocity treaty Canada was never so prosperous and contented. Previous to that there was talk of annexation and even Sir John himself expressed a yearning to be clasped to the bosom of uncle Sam. Was it not absurd to contend that reciprocity in natural products was loyal, and the moment manufactures were included our allegiance was gone? He spoke of one of the government orators in York at the last election who fiercely denounced annexation, and three months after that annexed himself body and bones to the western states. The cry of disloyalty was an old one. It cropped up when the currency was changed; when responsible government was being advocated and at every other important reform that had been secured. He closed with an eloquent appeal to the electors, regardless of the powerful influences that might be used upon them, to record an independent vote upon this question.