

LIBERAL NOTES:

ST. JOHN, N. B., JUNE 7, 1882.

TORY EXTRAVAGANCE.

The Dominion of Canada has to-day, a public debt of \$155,395,078, just about double the amount of indebtedness with which Confederation opened fifteen years ago.

The expenditure of the first year of Confederation was \$13,486,002. The Conservative party held control from that date until 1873.

That was the first period of Tory rule since Confederation. The Liberals then came into power, and when they went out of office in 1878 Sir Richard Cartwright's estimate was \$23,696,873, but Sir Leonard at once increased it to \$24,455,381.

Again the Conservatives came into power, and the amount they have estimated for the current year is \$27,640,000.

Now let us contrast these figures. During the first Tory period, the expenditure increased \$9,830,224—an average of \$1,638,370 per year.

During the Liberal period it advanced \$380,557; or \$76,111 per year.

During the second Tory period it has increased \$3,903,127—an average of \$975,782 per year.

There is a fair contrast. Under Tory rule in the first period an increase of \$1,638,370 per year; in the second period \$975,782 per year. Under Liberal management an advance of \$76,111 per year.

One more contrast. The Hon. D. L. Macpherson, who tries to signalize himself every election by a broad sheet of financial criticism, declares that what is called the "controllable expenditure" of the country is as much under Government control as ordinary household expenses are under the control of individuals.

The total controllable expenditure in Mr. Mackenzie's first year was \$8,324,076; in his last year it was \$6,542,510, a decrease of \$1,781,566.

Under the rule of his Tory successors it ran up from \$6,542,510 to \$7,293,563, an increase of \$751,053.

Are not these evidences sufficient to show which party is best qualified by its past record to administer public affairs prudently? Under Tory rule the general expenditure increases just twenty times as fast as under Liberal management. Under Tory rule the purely controllable expenses increase, while under Liberal management they decrease.

With a public debt doubling itself in fifteen years, what will our future be if we leave our business in the hands of men who increase our expenses on the average of a million and a half a year?

Is it not time for every taxpayer, no matter of what political party, to ask himself, what is the country coming to if it spends money at this rate? Is it not time for every taxpayer who expects Canada to pay her debts some time to vote the management of our affairs into the hands of men whose record speaks of economy, rather than into the hands of those whose record tells of nothing but wilful extravagance?

A Few Comparisons.—The tax on cheap Tweed Coating is 41 1-2 and 50 per cent. On fine Broadcloth and fine French Worsteds 22 1-2 and 24 per cent. respectively. Thus the poor man pays on these articles double the per centage of duties that the rich man pays.

The tax on cheap Cottons is 40 to 43 per cent., on fine cottons 20 to 22 per cent.; on cheap checked and striped Shirtings, 65 per cent.; on fancy shirtings, 20 per cent.; on cheap blanket, 110 per cent.; on a superior quality of blankets 35 per cent.

Who pays the most, the rich or the poor?

Our people are learning that the times may be good for manufacturers and bad for workmen simultaneously. The Government's interferences with the liberty of the workmen to buy and sell are all against the workmen. Take three cases:—

The workman has labor to sell. He goes into the open market with it and finds the Government importing men to under bid him.

The workingman has to buy sugar, cotton and other goods which Canada consumes in excess of home production. He finds the Government passing a law which adds 30 per cent. to the price he has to pay for these necessities of life.

The workingman has to buy potatoes, beef, butter, etc., which Canada produces in excess of home consumption. The price is fixed by the foreign demand, which just now is brisk. The price is high. It could only be lowered by putting on an export duty, that is, fining the farmer 30 or 40 per cent. for sending his produce out of the country.

The Government is welcome to the support of every Canadian who has been benefited by the N. P.; if he gets no other support, the Conservative minority in the next Parliament will be smaller than it was in 1874.

The Tory organs assert that there has been no increase of taxation. But the new and increased duties on five articles amounts to more than two millions and a half! They are as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Article and Amount. Breadstuffs \$175,864; Fuel \$41,177; Pig Iron \$7,263; Cottons \$46,157; Woollens \$15,774. Total \$250,235.

FACTS FOR ELECTORS.

The Discrimination Against the Poor.

Let any impartial man study the facts given below, and then let him declare whether this is a fit state of things to exist in an alleged free country:—

TAXATION ON THE POOR MAN'S COATING AND TROUSERING.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on cheap tweed coating, at wholesale, in England 15 cents a yard, and weighing 10 ounces to the yard is 41 1/2. Tax on a still cheaper cotton coating in England 15 cents a yard, and weighing 10 ounces to the yard is 50.

TAXATION ON RICH MAN'S COATING AND TROUSERING.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on fine broadcloth coating in England \$4 a yard and weighing 22 ounces to the yard is 22 1/2. Tax on fine French worsted coating \$2.85 a yard and weighing 22 ounces is 24.

TAXATION ON POOR MAN'S OVERCOAT.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on cheap overcoatings costing in England 36 cents a yard is 45 1/2.

TAXATION ON RICH MAN'S OVERCOAT.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on fine French overcoating costing \$3.12 per yard is 24.

TAXATION ON POOR MAN'S COTTONS.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on a low quality of cotton costing in England 4 cents a yard is 40. Tax on a still cheaper cotton costing 3 cents a yard is 48. Tax on cheap denims costing 7 cents a yard is 45. Tax on a cheap Canton flannel costing 6 cents is 48 1/2. Tax on a cheap quality of duck costing 6 to 6 1/2 cents is 45 to 48. Tax on cheap checked and striped shirtings worth 4 cents a yard is 65.

TAXATION ON THE RICH MAN'S COTTONS.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on a fine quality of fancy shirting costing 25 cents a yard is 20. Tax on a superior quality of white cotton costing 15 cents a yard is 22. Tax on an extensive denim costing 12 cents a yard is 31 1/2. Tax on an expensive Canton flannel costing 16 cents a yard is 27 1/2. Tax on an expensive duck costing 14 cents is 28 1/2.

TAXATION ON THE POOR MAN'S BLANKET.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on a blanket costing in England 15 cents a pound is 110.

TAXATION ON THE RICH MAN'S BLANKET.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Per cent. Tax on a superior quality of blanket costing 45 cents a pound, if imported, would be about 85. But as Canadian manufacturers have a practical monopoly of the home trade in superior blankets the taxation is, according to their account, Nothing.

In order to bring out more vividly the odious character of the tariff discriminations against the poor, we collect the figures given above, and present them in a different manner:—

RECAPITULATION SHOWING THE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE POOR.

Table with 3 columns: Poor Man's Tax, Rich Man's Tax, and Poor Man's Tax. Materials for Coats: 50 vs 22 1/2 vs 27 1/2. Materials for Trousers: 50 vs 24 vs 26. Materials for Overcoats: 45 1/2 vs 24 vs 21 1/2. Cottons: 48 vs 22 vs 26. Denims: 45 vs 31 1/2 vs 18 1/2. Canton Flannel: 48 1/2 vs 27 1/2 vs 21. Duck: 48 vs 28 1/2 vs 19 1/2. Shirtings: 65 vs 20 vs 45. Blankets: 110 vs 85 vs 35.

Sir Leonard Tilley, his sons-in-law, uncles, nephews and cousins, continue to serve their beloved country to the tune of \$18,496 per annum. Truly the Finance Minister may well say that Confederation is a success.

Sir Leonard Tilley and his Pensioners.

Whatever else may be said of Sir Leonard Tilley "nobody can deny" that "he's a jolly good fellow" to his relatives as shown by the following:—

Sir Leonard Tilley, salary as minister, \$7,000; Sir Leonard Tilley, indemnity as M. P. \$1,000. 2. F. Toller, a brother-in-law, in 1881, paid \$1,075, advanced over the heads of older officers in 1882, and appointed to an office created for the purpose, \$2,600. 3. T. B. Hanington, another brother-in-law, Census Commissioner, \$977. 4. Mr. Hanford, brother-in-law, in the Inland Revenue Department, salary \$1,754. 5. Mr. Street, son-in-law, in the Customs Department, Fredericton, \$1,300. 6. Lewis Burpee, son-in-law, in the office of the Privy Council, \$1,100. 7. Mr. Purdy, brother of son's wife, Shipping Master at St. John, \$800. 8. Mr. Hanington, uncle, superannuated on an annuity of \$615. 9. W. L. C. Hanington, son of the above, appointed in his place, salary \$700. 10. Mr. Carvell's nephew, promoted to Senate in 1881, \$1,000. Total sum drawn by Sir Leonard and family per annum, so far as known, \$18,495.

What a patriot Tilley is to be sure.

The Tory Government taxes the bread of the people of the Maritime Provinces at the rate of more than \$1,000 a day. And they fling two hundred and nine thousand of it to Ouderdonk.

\$209,255.

There is a special interest attaching to the sum of \$209,255 which renders that amount certain of an important place in the records of Canada. Sir Charles Tupper made the acquaintance of a firm of contractors by the name of Ouderdonk & Co. a few years ago. There is to be found in the public accounts and in the debates of Parliament full details of his dealings with that firm in the matter of a contract for the Yale-Kamloops section of the Pacific Railway, in which Sir Charles had all the innocence of the dove, and the contractors all the wisdom of serpents, and between them both the country lost some hundreds of thousands. Evidently there will grow up an attraction between the minister and the contractors, perfectly justifiable on the part of the latter, who know a good man to deal with when they get him. They saw Sir Charles, and they knew him; perhaps Sir Charles did not them; perhaps he did. But they met once more, like the blades of a pair of scissors, with the public treasury between.

Tenders were called for the construction of a railway from Emory Bar to Port Moody. The lowest tender was that of Macdonald & Charlebois, and the next lowest was that of Ouderdonk & Co. Between them was a difference of \$206,255. The cheque accompanying the tender of Macdonald & Charlebois was, by a mistake of the Bank of Montreal, marked "good for two days only." Before the contract was awarded Sir Charles was informed by the authorities of the bank that the limit of time endorsed on the cheque was an error, and that it was good till paid. Nevertheless, Sir Charles took advantage of this technicality, ignored the lowest tender, gave the contract to his old acquaintance, Ouderdonk, and lost the country \$209,255.

This is in brief the story of the \$209,255. It has been explained and defended in Parliament and out of Parliament; but no explanation or defence has ever got over the fact that Sir Charles Tupper took advantage of the technical error of a bank official, which was corrected before the contract was let, and accepted a tender for a public work at a cost to the country of \$209,255 more than the sum for which a responsible firm offered to do the work.

And this is only a specimen transaction—specially noticeable because the latest in the career of a Minister whose reputation is chequered with jobs of an expensive character from the days when he served his apprenticeship in Nova Scotia—railway contracts up to the Capillon Canal contract, Sections A and B of the Pacific Railway contract, the Whitehead-Mackintosh-Tuttle affair, and the Ouderdonk episode.

Every man who votes for a Conservative candidate at the coming elections votes for a Government of which this High Priest of Corruption, as one of his own colleagues has called him, is a leading member, and of which he will be the head. How many Conservatives are there who care so little for an honest and economical administration of public affairs that they will support a Government of this kind, and declare by their votes, that transactions which would be promptly denounced in private affairs are justifiable in connection with the business of the country?

The duty of 50 cents on flour, 40 cents on meal, and 15 cents on wheat was imposed to protect the Canadian millers and farmers. If it does not protect them, and the consumers do not pay the duty, directly or indirectly, why keep it on, or why not place it at double the amount of duty? Say \$2,000 per day.

THE SLANDERER OF OUR PROVINCE.

What is the name of this slanderer? His name is Sir LEONARD TILLEY, C. B., K. C. M. G.

Yet this man is a native of New Brunswick; all that he is owes to her. She took him up when unknown and obscure. She sent him to her Legislature, and from thence raised him to the first place in her Government. Finally, under his advice, she became joined to Canada, and Sir LEONARD appeared to bless the Union.

It was by the people of this Province alone that this man TILLEY became first a member of the Provincial Legislature, then the leader of the Government, then a member of Parliament and a Dominion Minister, then a C. B.; then Governor of the Province; then Finance Minister of Canada and K. C. M. G.

All this New Brunswick has done for TILLEY; what has he done in return? He has slandered this Province by repeating on a dozen platforms that New Brunswick is a pauper, a mendicant among the Provinces, and is receiving \$80,000 more from the Dominion than she is paying to it.

A great many of TILLEY's claqueurs applauded this atrocious lie, for it is a lie, and no man had a better knowledge of that fact than TILLEY the ingrate himself.

Last year instead of New Brunswick receiving \$80,000 more from the Dominion than she paid in, she actually paid into the Dominion treasury \$650,000 more than she received.

What will the people of St. John say to this slanderer; this falsifier of figures, this master of flummery and falsehood?

Why the people of St. John will say to him on the 20th June, "TILLEY stay at home", and he will stay.

HOW THE RICH ARE CODDLED AND THE POOR TAXED.

We here give to our readers a table of the rate of duties on the cotton and woollen goods imported into this country both from the United States and Great Britain. It will be perceived at a glance at our tabulated statement how scandalously unfair and oppressive the manner the duties are levied on the coarser and cheaper material which of very necessity the toiling masses are compelled to purchase.

On cotton goods the following are the prices, with the rate of taxation opposite:—

Table with 3 columns: Manufacture, Cost, Duty. English, 23d. 42 per cent. U. S. Congress shirting, 11 cents. 25. U. S. brown duck, 14 cents. 25. The rate of taxation on woollen goods is as follows:

Table with 3 columns: Manufacture, Cost, Duty. English, 32 1/2 p. c. U. S. Congress shirting, 25.0-10. On blankets we find the duty to be yet more discriminative against the poor than any of the other articles for exceeding all bounds of decency or regard for public opinion or the rights of those the Government rely on for support in towns and cities.

It will be observed by the foregoing that on the article of cotton that which costs 2 1/2 sterling or about 5 cents currency, the duty is 42 per cent., whilst an article of the same class costing 2 1/2 times more per yard, a duty of only a shade over one-half is imposed.

The reader will also observe that in cloth costing \$1.25 per lb. pays a duty of 25 per cent., whilst on heavy cloths used exclusively by the workmen a duty of 50, 60, 70 and in some cases as high as 80 per cent. duty is paid.

In the article of blankets the outrageous nature of the infamous tariff is more apparent than any. From the table given above it will be seen that the highest article on the list, costing more than three times that of the lowest, only pays one-half the duty of the cheaper and poorer article.

Buying worthless coal hoppers in the United States and then shouting "Canada for the Canadians" is a specimen of the kind of men that rule us now.

No Wonder

that it costs more to produce lumber. Look at one of the items entering into its production:—Blanketing, costing \$110 00. National policy duty \$48 70. Duty under Liberal Government 19 25.

Excess under N. P. \$29 45 or 250 per cent. advance on former duties—about 20 cents per yard extra cash paid down for duty alone over and above the duty formerly exacted.

Sir Charles Tupper, at Coburg, last year, said that \$369,000 was collected in duties in breadstuffs, "all of which was paid by the Maritime Provinces." The bread tax is therefore more than a thousand dollars a day!

WHY THE ANCIENT LANDMARKS WERE NOT REMOVED IN RESTIGOUCHE.

A despatch to the Sun, dated from Campbellton, June 1, contains the following:—

Sir Leonard spoke over two hours with great power. He explained that his visit was in compliance with a promise to many of the electors, many of whom he had been acquainted with for a quarter of a century, and said that although he had visited Campbellton and other points in the county when Lieutenant Governor, this was the first occasion on which he had the pleasure of addressing them on political matters. He referred with deep feeling to the offer made to him in the Confederation election when defeated in St. John to return him for Restigouche—an allusion that called forth hearty cheers. The feeling which had been manifested then had been borne in mind by him when the question of the redistribution of the counties came up recently in Parliament and aided him and others in keeping intact the boundaries of Restigouche. (Cheers.)

The people of Restigouche can now attest the truth of the saying, "Cast thy bread upon the waters and it will return after many days." When they invited Mr. TILLEY to represent Restigouche they little knew that they were effecting an insurance on the future integrity of the county. But so it was. The fiat had gone forth to gerrymander New Brunswick, Restigouche included. But as a few righteous men have often averted the doom of a wicked city, so the fact that Restigouche had given a cup of cold water to a MINISTER, in his hour of need, was instrumental in saving Restigouche from an ignominious fate. If the people of Restigouche do not now return a Government supporter, let them at once own that they have no hearts.

But is not this statement a little hard on the authors of the gerrymandering Act? If it is a meritorious act, one worth making known to the world, to stay the hand of the ruthless gerrymanderer in Restigouche, how is it that some reason could not be found for doing the same thing in Ontario? Were there no associations between old M. P.'s and constituencies, a little more tender than even the wonderful sentimentalities which united the FINANCE MINISTER and Restigouche? The unknown juvenile vagrant finds favor with charitable persons because he is "somebody's child." Now were there not constituencies in Ontario to whom a fellow feeling ought to have made Sir LEONARD wondrous kind? The other evening

he spoke in tender terms of his old and long continued relations with Carleton, but if Carleton had been cut and carved in the style of Ontario; if the disjunct members of its wards had been carved into new political connexions, it would only be a small portion of the constituency that would be left to receive the MINISTER's political embraces. The other portions would have to be addressed by as many different political woovers. Remember that fact, how is it that Sir LEONARD was a party to the humiliation of Ontario?

It is strange that if there be any principle in politics, it is not of general application. It is strange that the dead which reveals the good, the grateful, the chivalrous MINISTER in New Brunswick, is one that is obnoxious to the Government in Ontario. That province can now only sigh "it might have been." Had its constituencies only known how, with a power surpassing that of lightning rods, an invitation to a popular MINISTER to represent them, in a time of need to him, would have been the means of warding off future political danger, how gladly would they have made the cheap investment. But it is too late, too late. Ontario had no guardian angel-like Restigouche. It was therefore given up to the Destroyer.

Put a tax on everything that will interfere with the moneyed man's business, but pay a bonus on what will interfere with the mechanics' labor! Protect the capital of the rich men; encourage competition with the labor of the poor men! Is this the sort of a National Policy that the mass of the people want? If it is, they had better vote for the Tory candidates; for that is the kind of protection a Tory Government gives.

The Tory organs are again publishing D. J. McPherson's letters against the Mackenzie Government. The Pherson in his time wrote powerfully against "John A.," but he is now a member of that worthy's Government and sees differently.

When the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was in power, they wrested from the United States \$5,500,000. Now that we are in the hands of the Tilley and Tupper again "Boston" Clark comes over and scoops \$10,000, while San Francisco Ouderdonk goes him twenty times better, and rakes in \$209,000 of the hard earned money of the people of Canada.

Sir John has boasted of his family motto, "By land and sea." It is expressive of the way the treasury has been attacked and plundered since he got back to power, the Syndicate and the monopolists by land, "Boston Clark," from the Atlantic, and "Tankee Ouderdonk," from the Pacific, by sea.

THE TARIFF.

"I never proposed an increase, only a readjustment of the tariff." (Sir John A. to S. L. Tilley, 1875.) Result:—

Table with 3 columns: Item, 1878, 1881. Cranks for mills, stmb'ts, etc. 17 25. Currants dried, etc. 17 20. Cotton, thread, etc. 17 20. Clocks 17 35. Earthenware and crockery 17 35. Dolls, (wax, etc.) 17 20. (Rubber) 17 25. Engines, fire and steam 17 25-30. Earthenware and crockery 17 35. Electroplate 17 20. Fancy goods 17 20. Fans 17 20-30. Felt hats 17 25. Files 17 30. Fire Arms 17 20. Flour 17 50c per bush. Fruits, dried, etc. 17 25. Fur caps 17 25. Furniture, etc 17 35. Forks, (hay, etc.) 17 30. Galvanized iron 17 12 1/2. Glass, and manufactures of 17 25. Glue 17 20. Grain 17 10c per bush. Indian corn 17 10c. Oats 17 10c. Peas 17 10c. Rice 17 10c. Gutta Percha, manufactures of 17 25.

The woollens imported last year were valued at \$9,742,024. The duty paid on that class of goods was \$2,345,627. Under the Mackenzie tariff the duty would have been \$1,529,853. Here in one single article the extortionists have taken from the people \$815,774, more than a fair duty would have yielded them.

WHAT has the National Policy done for New Brunswick? It has taxed the farmer. It has taxed the lumberman. It has taxed the fisherman. It has taxed the mechanic. It has taxed the laborer.

The Tory Government asks the people of Westmoreland to support, collected in the shape of a tax on fuel, \$611,177 in 1881. Not one cent was collected from fuel by the Mackenzie Government.

Sir Charles Tupper found it necessary to "economise" and cut down the pay of intercolonial employes. He saved something in this way to help make up the \$209,000 he gave to Ouderdonk.