MR. LOGGIE'S SPEECH.

Member for Northumberland Makes Important Contribution to Budget Debate.

Following is the Hansard report of the admirable speech of Mr. W. S. Loggie, M.P. for Northumberland, delivered in the budget debate at Ottawa a few days ago:

Mr. Speaker, you have not heard from the province of New Brunswick during this debate and therefore I wish to make a few remarks. The hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Wallace) who had just taken his seat, has asked that the government should restrict immigration, and he refers to the Japanese as a people who should not be allowed to enter Canada to any great extent. The hon. gentleman should know that this is exactly what the government have done, that restrictions are now being enforced and that during the last year a very limited number of Japanese have come into this country. The hon. gentleman ought to know as well that the government are using every endeavor to have a proper class of immigrants come into this country, and that every precaution is taken that when undesirable immigrants are landed in this country they are returned to the place whence they came at the expense of the transportation company bringing them to Canada. Another plea made by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat is that the government should increase the protection to the agricultural interest, and he cites the protection on hogs, which he says ought to be increased. Forsooth there is a duty now of two cents per pound or four dollars per barrel, and yet the hon. gentleman wants to have the farming interests of Canada protected to a greater extent than four dollars per barrel on pork. The hogs that come into this country are very largely of a class which are not raised in Canada. The imported hog products are consumed in the Maritime Provinces and in the lumbering operations of Ontario and Quebec, and the eastern provinces. My hon. friend would ask that those who are consumers should pay an increased tax to the farming interest of this country. In my judgment it would be unfair to the consumer to increase the taxation on that product when we realize that the producers are already protected to what I consider a sufficient extent. If there is one item in the tariff list which, it seems to me, is on a protective tariff basis, it is the item of hog products. That is one of the items which the Liberal party have continued in force which was in force under the Conservative party in 1896. As to the request of the market gardeners that they be protected, I think we will admit that the products that are imported int this country are imported at a tim at which they cannot and are not supplied by our Canadian market gardeners. If that be true is it reasonable that the consumers should be unduly taxed? They are reasonably taxed now? They paid what is a fair tax for revenue purposes. I think that the government have acted wisely in not every year tinkering with the tariff and making changes. We have framed a new tariff about each decade, and during the interim changes of no great consequence have been made. I do not think that I need refer any more to the remarks by the hon. gentleman. But, I want once again to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the showing that he has brought down to this House. A year ago he told the House and the country that it was a time for caution and that yet we should take courage. It seems to me, from the report laid on the table by the Minister of Finance, and that this is exactly what the Finance Minister has done.

The hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Wallace) tells us that the expenditure was $83,000,000, that the revenue was $45,000,000 and that we have a surplus of $1,500,000. It is certainly an encouraging fact that it is so, because of the stress, if I may so term it, it might have been fair to expect that the Finance Minister would come down to the House showing a deficit on the year's transactions. I think, therefore, that we might repeat what was said a year ago that perhaps no Finance Minister has ever done more to sustain the high credit of the country than has the present Minister of Finance. From his statement we find that the estimated net debt of the country on the 31st March, 1909, was upwards of $323,000,000, and that during the twelve and three-quarter years, since 1896, we have added to the net debt, in round numbers $65,000,000. But, Mr. Speaker, I want you to mark that the $65,000,000 is accounted for by $52,000,000 expended on the Transcontinental railway.

THE TORY RECORD.

That leaves a balance of only $12,000,000 expended on the great public works of this country which would represent about $1,000,000 each year for the twelve years. Will you just recall to mind what has happened during the last five years of the Conservative regime? During that five years they expended $16,000,000 on capital account. During the very same term they borrowed $21,000,000, that is to say they had not sufficient money in the treasury to pay the ordinary running expenses of the country. They had to borrow $5,000,000 for that purpose. But the Liberal party have expended nearly $100,000,000 on ordinary consolidated account and the other great public works that they have undertaken dur-inging the past twelve years, have added to the public debt only $1,000,000 per annum over and above the expenditure on the National Transcontinental railway. It seems that the situation is one from which we might well take courage and which should warrant us in going on and completing this great undertaken. We find that in the year 1896, when the Conservative party gave up the reins of power the per capita debt was $50.82, while in 1109, after we had expended $52,500,000 on the Transcontinental railway, and after the expenditure on other great public works, we have reduced the per capita to $45.72, equal to a decrease in the debt of the country after all these great expenditures of about 10 per cent. I meant the per capita debt, of course. I have explained already that the net debt has been increased, but we have assets for it as I shall tell you later on. Now, I want to say a word about how we got this money. Perhaps I should remind the House here that the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in speaking of that the other day, used the following language:

—which surplus were got absolutely and solely because of extraordinary taxing powers that the government availed themselves of. If the government had kept the volume and burden of taxation down to what it was, in Liberal Conservative times, they could not have amassed such immense sums of money, and they could not have had such large surpluses. If a government will tax sufficiently, it will have large revenue and may have large surpluses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the last five years of the Conservative reign, they taxed at the rate of about 14 per cent. more than the present administration is taxing. Let me put it in this way. In 1908 we collected 16.48 per cent on $351,879,099 worth of imports. In 1896 there were imports valued at $105,361,000 and the rate collected in that year was 19.12 per cent. Our rate is $2.74 on the $100 less on the value of the invoice, or, or equal to a difference of about 12½ per cent on the duty collected. Apply this and it would demonstrate that if in 1896, under the Conservative government, the people of Canada had imported as many goods as they did last year under the Liberal regime, the Conservative government would have taken out of the pockets of the people over $9,000,000 in extra taxation. If, on the other hand, last year the Liberal government had exacted the same rate of duty as did the Conservative government before 1896, there would have been $9,000,000 more collected in duties, and half million dollars instead of one then our surplus would be ten and a half million dollars instead of one and a half millions. But, the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and the hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) says the vital point is that the present government collects $10 per head, whereas in 1896 the Conservative government collected only $5.46 per head. My contention is that the vital point is the rate at which $10 per head was collected. If I pay taxes on $10,000 this year at two per cent. and I am fortunate enough next year to have $20,000 on which to pay taxes at 1½ per cent, I pay a less rate but I pay more money on the whole and I ought to be glad I am able to pay it because I have something to represent the extra payment. And why is it that at a less rate of duty then formerly, there is more revenue produced? The answer is perfectly simple. A merchant will keep in his store just the goods his customers require, and if there is a demand for two suits of clothes now where there was only a demand for one suit before, the merchant will have the two suits and the customer will buy them instead of one.

Mr. Blain—Why not manufacture them here and pay no duty?

Mr. Loggie—Oh my dear man, don't you know we do manufacture them here? Let me tell my hon. friend that there is a very small proportion of clothing imported into this country.

Mr. Blain.—The house doing the largest business in the province of Ontario imports all their ready-made clothing under this tariff.

Mr. Loggie.—I will accept the hon. gentleman's word but I can tell him that I know of not one but of dozens of mercantile establishments that do not import one dollar's worth of ready-made clothing. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) advanced an argument the other day which it would have been fairer for him to have carried out to its logical conclusions. He told us that in 1886 we would find $10,000,000 charged to capital account but that was for seven and a half million acres of land, which, as an asset, converted into money was worth $22,500,000, and he asked us to take that into consideration. Well, I will admit the hon. gentleman's argument, but had he been fair he would have carried it further and he would have explained that the fifty-two and a half million dollars spent on the National Transcontinental railway was a national asset. Will the hon. gentleman have the audacity to tell me that in the National Transcontinental railway we have not an asset representing that fifty-two and a half millions. Does he not know very well that in a short time that money will be bearing interest and that it is just as if we got the fifty-two and a half millions back, put it in the bank, and drew our interest on it, as in the case of the twenty-two and a half million dollars we received lor the public lands. Is not that a fair comparison to make? Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spoke about borrowing during the interim, but that argument was answered by the Minister of Finance, who told us that it was a temporary loan which had been paid off. If the manager of an ordinary mercantile establishment borrows during the year and pays off his debt, he has no explanation to make to his directors. What he has to explain to the directors is what he owes and what he has to represent it. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) also insinuated that if the Minister of Finance had taken care of the surpluses it would not have been necessary for him to go to the London markets to borrow money. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that no one can deny that the moneys received by the government have been wisely expended, for, although there may have been some small items here and there that might not be expended as we all would like, yet on the whole there is not a man on the opposite side of the House who would undertake to charge that there has been any improper expenditure of public money. It is all very well to make insinuations and inuendo, but when it comes to making a charge hon. gentlemen opposite will not assume that responsibility. Has this government not promoted the prosperity of our great country; has it not deepened the St. Lawrence, protected our fisheries, aided agriculture, assisted in the building of great railways. It is true that if we had tied the surpluses up in a napkin as it were, we could have reduced the debt, but in growing times such as these and in a growing country like Canada, it was wise that we should have applied our expenditures in the days of prosperity to developing the resources of the country. But nevertheless we have reduced the per capita debt, and yet we have an increase in 13 years in the net debt of only $65,000,000, $52,500,000 of which I call liquid assets that will bring us a return in good time. Just one word more and I have done—the hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) gave us a long list of duties levied by Canada and compared them with the duties levied by the United States. I quote his words:

I submit that it is manifestly unfair and unjust to Canadian farmers, and when we take into account the fact that the United States sent into Canada last year 6,428 horses valued at $1,254,704 we must see that a portion of that was deliberately taken out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers.

If that hon. gentleman were here I would ask him who pays the import duties on goods that come into Canada. Would the hon. gentleman have the audacity to tell me that the Canadian farmer pays the duty on the horses that we send into the United States? And yet that is the logical conclusion of his whole argument; and he turns round and tells us that on the horses we sent into the States that the Canadian farme pays the duty, and that argument is manifestly unfair. I do not understand the tariff if that is the basis of the hon. gentleman's reasoning. Perhaps in the case of a few articles there may be an exception to the rule. If you have no market but the United States, and are forced to sell your goods there on commission, it may be possible in some cases that the Canadian producer pays the duty on the goods imported into this country, just as the United States farmer pays the duty which his government levies on goods imported into that country; and it is unfair for the hon. gentleman to argue that it is unfair to the Canadian farmer to allow horses to come into this country at a lower rate of duty than they have to pay on going into the United States.

Mr. Geo. Taylor.—The Minister of Customs tells us that the Canadian farmer has to pay the duty on Canadian barley going to Germany.

Mr. Loggie.—I have no doubt that the Minister of Customs will answer for himself. Now, I want to say just one word in regard to the hon. member for Frontenanc (Mr. Edwards). Why is it, he asks, that there is a reduction of $35,000 in the estimates of the department of Agriculture for 1909-10? And then he makes some inuendoes or insinuations—is it because of this or that or the other thing? If the hon. gentleman will read the budget debate of a year ago, or if he studies the budget debate of this year, he will probably get the answer, but I want to tell him this: In 1896 how much do you think the Conservative government expended on the agricultural interests of this country? No less a sum then $210,000. And how much did this government expend on agricultural interests in 1908? $1,218,000, or more than $1,000,000 in excess of what was expended in 1896; and yet the hon. gentleman has the audicity yo ask why the estimates for 1909-10 for the Department of Agriculture are cut down $35,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, my five minutes are up, and I thank the House for the attention it has given to me.

She—Sir, I understand you said had hard features.

He (suavely)---I plead guilty to saying you had a marble brow, arched yebrows, eyes like diamonds and lips ke rubies.

THAT AWFUL PAIN IN THE BACK

Is a Sure Sign of Congestion of the Kidneys. Take "Fruit-a-tives."

Lots of men, and women too, are limping about the house—groaning in easy chairs—or tossing about the bed—because of that nagging pain in the back. The old standbys—hot vinegar, porous plasters, liniments, etc.,—don't do any good any more. You see, you are a bit older now. The kidneys are not as strong as they used to be. And even those "blistering" liniments and plasters won't stimulate the kidneys.

Your trouble is kidney trouble. The kidneys are not diseased, they are overworked and strained. The bowels and skin—which help the kidneys to rid the system of waste matter—have not been doing their share of the work. The kidneys have had to do too much.

What you need is a medicine to cure the bowels, liver and skin. This medicine must cure the Constipation by acting on the liver and thus make the bowels move regularly and naturally. This medicine must heal and strengthen the kidneys, and thus relieve the congestion. "Fruit-a-tives" is this medicine. It is the most effective Kidney Remedy known, and keeps these vital organs in a vigorous, healthy condition. For aged people, for those who work hard, for tired-out women, "Fruit-a-tives" never fail to stop that severe pain in the back and build up the whole system. 50c a box, 6 for $2.50, or trial box, 25c. At dealers or from Fruit-a-tives Limited, Ottawa.

Was Troubled With Weak Back For Years.

Could Not Perform Household Duties. Doctors Attended Without Avail.

Mrs. Arch. Schnare, Black Point, N.B., writes: "For years I was troubled with weak back. Oftentimes I have lain in bed for days, being scarcely able to turn myself, and I have also been a great sufferer while trying to perform my household duties. I had doctors attending me without avail and tried liniments and plasters, but nothing seemed to do me any good. I was about to give up in despair when my husband induced me to try Doan's Kidney Pills, and after using two boxes I am now well and able to do my work. I am positive Doan's Kidney Pills are all that you claim for them, and I would advise all kidney sufferers to give them a fair trial."

Doan's Kidney Pills are a purely vegetable medicine, realizing quick, permanent relief, without any after ill effects. A medicine that will absolutely cure Backache and all forms of Kidney and Bladder Disease.

A medicine that strengthens the kidneys so that they are enabled to extract the poisonous uric acid from the blood and prevent the chief cause of Rheumatism.

Price 50 cents per box, or 3 for $1.25, at all dealers or The T. Milburn Co., Limited, Toronto, Ont.

In ordering specify "Doan's."

FORCIBLE FACTS.

One-sixth of the deaths from disease are due to consumption. Ninety-eight per cent. of all those who have used Dr. Pierce's Golden Discovery or "Weak lungs," have been perfectly and permanently cured. Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery is not advertised to cure consumption in its advanced stages. No medicine will do that. The "Discovery" does cure obstinate, lingering or "hang-on-coughs," and all those catarrhal conditions of throat and bronchial passages which if not properly treated end in consumption. Take the "Discovery" in time and if given a fair and faithful trial it will seldom disappoint.

Free. Dr. Pierce's great work, The People's Common Sense Medical Adviser is sent free on receipt of stamps to pay cost of mailing and send 31 one-cent stamps for paper covered to pay cost of mailing and customs-Send 31 one-cent stamps for paper covered book, or 50 stamps for a copy in cloth binding. Address Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.

MAIL CONTRACT

Sealed Tenders addressed to the Postmaster General, will be received at Ottawa until noon on Friday, the 8th of May, 1909, for the conveyance of His Majesty's Mails on a proposed contract for four years, three times per week each way, between Fredericton and Meductic from the first of July next.

Printed notices containing further information as to conditions of proposed contract mey be seen and blank forms of Tender may be obtained at the Post office of Fredericton, Meductic and route offices and at the office of the post office inspector, at St. John.

G. C. ANDREWS,
Superintendent.

Post Office Department,
Mail Service Branch,
Ottawa, 10th April, 1909.
Apr. 14d3i.

HOTELS CUT OFF.

Upwards of 150 Have Licenses Cancelled Throughout Ontario.

Toronto, May 1.—Ontario is just getting over a very unseasonable cold spell, and now she is right up against a drought.

Twenty-one municipalities will for three years from to-day go a long way for drink.

As a result of the voting on local option last January, twenty-one localities went dry at midnight, and 52 licenses were cut off. Throughout the whole province upwards of 150 licenses have been cancelled this year.

The action of license commissioners in various corporations have greatly reduced the drinking resorts. In Toronto 41 were given three months in which to sell out. While Cornwall lost five, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Niagara Falls and New Ontario four each, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Stratford, and South Elgin each lost one.

Following are the districts affected by local option yesterday, showing the number of licenses affected in each. Seven of these indicated by asterisks are incorporated towns and villages:

Ashfield, 4; *Athens, 2; *Bowmanville, 3; Brougham, 2; Caradoc, 3; Escott Front, 2; *Hazelock, 2; Hillier, 1; Iroquois, 2; Kennebec, 1; Limerick, 1; Malahide, 4; Seneca, 4; Thurlow, 4; Tudor and Cashel, 2; *Tweed, 4; *Wellington, 2; Wollaston, 1; *Wyoming, 3; Yonge and Escott R., 2; Sidney, 4. Total, 52

Police Steal Boy.

Santa Barbara, Cal., May 1.—Detectives employed by J. Shaw, president of the Interborough Railroad Co. of Boston, and a member of the Massachusetts Senate, yesterday entered the house occupied by Mrs. Shaw and H. Keno Marble, formerly the Shaw chauffeur, and seized possession of the 10-year-old son of the Shaws. The boy was taken to the police station and is being held there. The raid was directed early in the morning by Lewis Field, the Shaw family's butler.

According to the story as learned here, Mrs. Shaw deserted her husband in Brooklyn in June, 1907, and came to California, in the company of Marble, bring her 10-year-old son with her.

Finishes In Time.

Cornwall, May 1.—Thomas Nicholson, contractor, in spite of a great run of hard luck and numerous unexpected difficulties, will finish his contract sharp on time, his concrete wall being now practically erected, and will be ready for navigation from the O. & N.Y. bridge to lock 18 today. This wall is 27 feet in height and 437 feet long. The stone, which held down the crib of the coffer dam, built around the break last summer, has been thrown up on the north bank of the canal, and the crib work has been sawn into sections, which will be floated down the canal to the foot, where the cribs will be torn apart and the timber piled up at the [illegible] sheds.

Why You Should Buy
— AT —
S. KERNER'S
THIS WEEK'S BARGAINS

Bargains for Ladies

$1.25 White Lawn Waist for 69c
1.50 " " " " 79c
2.25 Noby " " " 1.10
1.75 White Underskirts " 99c
50c Pretty Corset Covers 29c
85c Extra Pretty Covers " 55c
1.75 Good Blk. Sateen Underskirts for 99c
1.50 Underskirts " 64c
1.50 All kinds of Kid Gloves " 99c
1.00 Children's Cotton Dresses " 50c
12.00 Latest Style Ladies Rain Coats for $5.99

See that you get one.

Bargains for Gentlemen

$2.25 Good Strong Pants for $1.19
3.25 Extra Strong Pants for 1.79
3.50 Extra Good Pants " 1.99
5.50 Pretty Dress Pants " 3.15
9.00 Men's Waterproof Coats " 5.75
10.00 Pretty Pattern Coats " 6.75
10.00 Men's Rubber Coats " 7.49
Every Sport should have one of these Coats
$2.50 Latest Green Hats for 1.39
1.50 Self Opener Umbrella for 1.00
2.00 Men's Dogskin Gloves for 1.10
50c Men's Caps " 25c

S. KERNER 450 Queen St
The Peoples Bargain Store

A NEW SPRING SUIT

Is Just What You Want at This Season

Come in and let me show you some of the Newest in Fancy Worsted Tweeds and Serges at prices the lowest in the City.

W. E. SEERY

Merchant Tailor 550 Queen St.

Zon-O-Phone Records
ARE THE BEST

New lot just received

Double Records 80c Single Records 60c

Have your wheel repaired now

W. C. BURTT SUNDRIES

Queen St., Fredericton., N. B.

G T WHELPLEY

Manitoba Oats
Middlings
Bran
Durham
Eagle and
Banner Feeds
Corn Meal
Cracked Corn

G. T. Whelpley
Queen St. Fredericton

Semi ready

We wish to announce to our numerous customers and the public that we re sole agents for the Semi-ready lothing and we have a complete line f these goods in stock.

We also wish to announce that our pring stock has just arrived and we nvite you to call and see our New pring Goods. Fit and workmanship be best.

Walker Bros.
IMPORTING TAILORS