

The Carleton Sentinel.

VOL. 61.—No. 21

WOODSTOCK, N. B., FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1909.

WHOLE No. 3231

Board of Works Jan 07

A

purchase of one dollar or more will entitle the purchaser to their choice of a Fob Pin or other piece of Jewelry

FREE

This offer is absolutely free to each and every purchaser that comes into the store.

GIFT

These gifts will not last very long, so come early and get your choice.

Marriage Licenses and
Wedding Rings.

JEWELER
H. V. Balling
30 MAIN ST.
WOODSTOCK, N.B.
— OPTICIAN

KODAKS
and
SUPPLIES.

**LET US SHOULDER
THE DRUDGERY OF WASH DAY**

AT

Woodstock Electric Laundry.

Telephone No. 8-11

A Few Interesting Facts!

THE SCOTISH UNION & NATIONAL Fire Insurance Co of Edinburgh, Scotland, has Assets of \$46,230,784.42
The North British & Mercantile Insurance Co of Edinburgh and London has a capital of \$80,343,315.46
The Sun Insurance Co of London, England, is the oldest fire insurance office in the world. The London & Lancashire, The Hartford and the New York Underwriters are leaders. It would be impossible to find 6 more Reliable Fire Insurance Companies in the world to day than the above mentioned—no Technicalities, no Law Suits, but Honorable, Prompt and Satisfactory Settlement of all Claims
This is the established reputation of the above named companies of which

J. W. ASTLE is the Agent.

OUR

STUNNING SPRING and SUMMER

READY-TO-WEAR

**SUITS ARE SHAPELY
STYLISH
NUG**

and can be altered to fit any form or figure on our premises. All this year's goods are guaranteed.

R. B. JONES Co., Ltd.

Manchester House,

Main Street, Woodstock, N. B.

MR. CARVELL on the Transcontinental Railroad.

(From Hansard.)

As a maritime member of this House I do not feel like giving a silent vote on this question, which is considered of so much importance. I am bound to say that I think I am justified in concluding that the object of this proposed amendment is not to benefit the Grand Trunk Pacific, is not to benefit the transportation interests of Canada, but it is a catch vote with the object of making some political capital in the maritime provinces. We listened this morning to the hon member for North Toronto (Mr Foster) in an impassioned speech of nearly two hours duration, when he came out flat footed against the scheme in its entirety, that is, against the construction of the eastern section of the Transcontinental. He pointed out how easily it would have been for this government to accomplish all they require by making the grant of a small subsidy of a few million dollars to the Grand Trunk Railway to get across the prairies to the Pacific ocean. He pointed out how they would have money left to construct the Georgian Bay canal. Why, the hon gentleman was willing to go into anything except to build the Transcontinental from Winnipeg to the east. But my hon friend the leader of the opposition, now that he represents a maritime constituency, is not so bold as the member for North Toronto. The leader of the opposition says the Conservative party takes issue with the Prime Minister when he says they are opposed to the construction of a Transcontinental Railway. What a reformation, what a conversion there has been in the mind of my hon friend the leader of the opposition in the last three or four years, yes, I may say in the last one year? The member for North Toronto pointed out the barrenness of the country through which this road would run from Moncton to Quebec, and he asked in his own peculiar tones: 'What local products are there from Moncton to Quebec to feed a great railway?' Then he asked the same question: 'What local products from Quebec to Winnipeg will feed a great railway system?' Forgetting apparently that the object of this great work was not local at all, although it will do local business to some extent. Its chief object is to carry the products of the prairie provinces to the east, to make us independent of our neighbours to the south, to place us in the position which the dignity and importance of Canada demand.

Well, there has been a great deal of discussion in this House during the past few weeks over the cost of this road, and to-day it has been pointed out by some hon gentlemen that this road is going to cost \$130,000,000 or \$135,000,000. But my hon friends have not stated that when we spend this \$130,000,000 we are not giving it away to some corporation in the form of a subsidy; we are not doing as the Conservative government did when they assisted the Canadian Pacific Railway; we are not giving this road hundreds of millions of dollars of assets in land and money to put into their own pockets, and then give them the privilege of taxing the people whatever they choose in the way of freight rates. No, we are building a road which, if it is true, may possibly cost \$135,000,000, but we own the road, we own every foot of it, every rail in it, and after the first seven years we are going to get three per cent interest on the total cost of construction, and at the end of fifty years the road comes back to us, and is our own absolutely without a dollar against it.

But some one will say: 'What is the good of that portion which runs from Quebec to Winnipeg?' Does he mean to say that 50 years hence a road running through this great country, through 1,000 miles of virgin forest, tapping the great prairies, will not be worth the \$135,000,000 we are putting into it? Sir, if I had no more faith in the future of this country than to believe this road would not be worth what we are putting into it at the end of 50 years, I would get out of the country on the very first train. We have heard about the great difficulties we are going to labor under on account of the bond guarantee. It has also been stated here to night by the hon member for North Toronto that this road passes through a portion of the great northwest country, probably 1,000 miles from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, which is the most fertile 1,000 miles in one continuous stretch on the whole American con-

inent; and does anybody mean to say that a road going through a country like that will not pay interest on the cost of construction? They forget that the road from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean possesses grades which no other transcontinental has ever dreamed of possessing. We are getting grades of less than one per cent over the Rocky mountains, a road over which you can haul heavy freight per ton per mile at a less cost than you can over the Intercolonial. And yet they say this road won't pay the interest on the investment. I think the best evidence any one can offer of the wisdom of the government in going into this scheme, is the fact that even hon gentlemen opposite are bound to admit that the road goes through this magnificent country; that fact I say is a sufficient guarantee that it will pay all expenses.

Now, my hon friend the leader of the opposition, while he has been converted, to the idea of building a transcontinental, finds fault with the construction of that portion of the road between Quebec and Moncton, and I wish to devote a few minutes to that portion of this great work. The leader of the opposition states that we are spending \$35,000,000 in order to get a road which is only 29 miles shorter than the Intercolonial. But my hon friend fails to conceive the idea that while possibly, in actual mileage, this road is only 29 miles shorter than the Intercolonial, it is not 29 miles, but it is 100 miles, yes, 200 miles shorter from a transportation standpoint. And when you are talking transportation it is simply a question of dollars and cents, it is simply a question of what it will cost to transport a ton of freight from one given point to another given point. If my hon friend wants to discuss what it will cost to transport a ton of freight from Quebec to Moncton by the Intercolonial or by the new road, then I submit it is two or three hundred miles shorter by the new road than by the Intercolonial. We are told by competent engineers that the same engine and the same train crew that will haul 35 or 40 loaded cars, as engines are built to-day, from Quebec to Moncton by the Intercolonial, will haul 60 or 70 loaded cars by the Transcontinental, practically double the weight. In addition to that, you have an average increase in speed of about ten miles per hour. I think I am safe in saying that for all practical transportation purposes, the Transcontinental between Quebec and Moncton will be almost one-half the distance, or not much more than one-half the distance of what it is by the Intercolonial. My hon friend forgets another thing, that after you strike what is called Grand Falls in New Brunswick, there are immense possibilities in store for transportation. They can go down the St John river to St John or they can go to the Canada Eastern Crossing and from there to St John, and in either of these cases it is 70 or 80 miles shorter to tidewater than by going by way of Moncton. View this question from any engineering standpoint and you are forced to the conclusion that the government, in building this road, have not only shortened the distance but they have made it possible to keep the business on Canadian territory, and to direct it through Canadian ports.

Now, I want to say briefly that the amendment moved by the hon leader of the opposition (Mr R L Borden) to the third reading of this Bill this afternoon is not one which should commend itself to the judgment of this House. I stated earlier in my remarks that, in my opinion, it was open to the suspicion that it had been moved for political purposes and not for the benefit of maritime ports. If my hon friend had been as sincere as he would like us to believe he is, there are several propositions which he could have made with which we would not have quarrelled and which we would have been only too happy to have consulted with him about. For instance, suppose he had told us that in case the division from Lewis to Moncton is constructed before the line from Winnipeg to Quebec an arrangement should be made by which the Grand Trunk Pacific would be compelled to route freight, not specifically routed by the shipper, by way of the Transcontinental Railway from Lewis to Moncton and on to the sea coast, we would have been willing to have discussed that with him. Or, if he had proposed that when the line is constructed from Winnipeg to Quebec

and from Lewis to Moncton a grant should be made by the government, or some means should be taken in order to provide a ferry across the river so as to put the Grand Trunk Pacific in the same position that it would be in if the Quebec bridge were completed, then again we would have been happy to have discussed it with him, because these would have been practical measures which in the end would have insured to the benefit of the maritime ports. But, what did he propose? He proposed that in some way we shall compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to route their freight through Canadian sea-ports. Now, let us see what that means. It means that when you get the freight down to Montreal it has to diverge in one of two directions, that it has either to go by the Canadian Pacific Railway, or perhaps by the Grand Trunk to Sherbrooke and then by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sherbrooke to St John, or it has to go from Montreal to St John or Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway. Take either of these propositions and see the absolute ridiculousness of them when you analyse them from the railway standpoint. When a car load of freight from the Rocky mountains or Edmonton, shipped to the sea coast, arrives at Montreal it is handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to the Intercolonial Railway, and then the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Intercolonial Railway only get their proportionate charge according to the mileage of the whole route. If the Grand Trunk Pacific brought a car load of freight from Edmonton to Montreal and then asked the Canadian Pacific Railway to transport it from there to St John on the proportionate mileage, which would figure out according to railway arrangements, why, the Canadian Pacific Railway would laugh at them. To make it worse, if you asked the Intercolonial Railway to carry that to the sea-board at that rate, and if that went on for five years, which time might elapse before the Quebec bridge would be available, instead of having an annual deficit of \$300,000 or \$400,000, you would have a deficit of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 every year. Yet, that is the proposition which, for political purposes, the hon gentleman wants this House to adopt. As far as I am concerned, and I speak with a full sense of the responsibility of the position which I occupy in this House as a maritime member, I have no hesitation in saying that I purpose voting against this amendment. I have no hesitation in saying that, according to my judgment, it does not appear to be a proposition that we should accept, either from the standpoint of common sense or from the railway or any other standpoint. It is only advanced with a political object. It is only put up as a scheme by which my hon friend thinks he can obtain some political support in the maritime provinces, but I want to tell him that the people of the maritime provinces have listened to this bogey of the Grand Trunk Pacific too long to be caught by such a shadow as he puts before us today. In 1904 the campaign in the maritime provinces was fought upon the question of the Grand Trunk Pacific and nothing else. Then the Conservative party did not take the ground which my hon friend from North Toronto (Mr Foster) takes now that the road should not be built, but they said that the trouble was that the eastern section from Quebec to Moncton would not be built. They said that it would stop at Quebec, that the government never intended to build the road from Quebec or that they were building the road to Quebec in order to build up the port of Portland. Cartoons were published in the papers and circulated all over Canada showing how Portland was to benefit at the expense of Canada. The scheme, according to their contents, never intended to go beyond Quebec. An hon friend of mine here says that they declared it was not intended to go beyond Gravenhurst. They asked the people to vote for them because the government did not intend to carry out their promise when they said they were going to build the road to Moncton. Now, they have built the road to Moncton. They have built a road the like of which does not exist in Canada today. If some of my hon friends would go over that work, as I have gone over a large portion of it, and look at the character of the work and the grades which they have adopted, they would come to the conclusion that the government at least meant business when they told the people of the maritime provinces that they intended to build the road. The people of the maritime provinces know that it has been built to the ports of St John and Halifax. They know who have been their friends and who are trying to assist them.

The people of the maritime provinces know that the majority of the members of this House who have forced this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme through, notwithstanding the violent opposition of hon gentlemen opposite, will continue to force it through and will take whatever means are necessary and wise in order to see that this railway scheme is carried out as it was intended to be carried out, and that Canadian freight is transported over Canadian routes and through Canadian sea-ports and no others. Having this faith in the Prime Minister—and I am satisfied that the people of the maritime provinces have faith in him and his government—I have no hesitation in voting against this proposition, and I am satisfied that I will be justified by the great majority of the voters of the maritime provinces in voting against an amendment which is put up simply as a political scheme and not with any honest desire to promote the interests of the people of the maritime provinces.

New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Conference Programme.

The 26th session of the N B and P E I Conference will be held in the Methodist Church, Woodstock, N B, on Wednesday, June 16th, 1909.

The Ministerial session will open on Tuesday, June 15th, at 9 a.m. The Stationing and Statistical Committees will meet on Tuesday, June 15th at 7 p.m. The Nominating, Epworth League, Sunday School, and State of the Work Committees will meet for organization on Wednesday, June 16th, at 1.30 p.m.

Wednesday, June 16th—9 a.m., opening of the General session with Conference Prayer meeting and Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. 8 p.m., open session of the Conference, Sunday School and Epworth League Anniversary; addresses by Rev Neil McLaughlan B A and R D Smith, Esq.

Thursday, 17th—2 p.m., Laymen's Association; 3 p.m., Conference session; 8 p.m., open session of Conference; Educational Anniversary; addresses by David Allison, Esq., LL.D., President of Mt Allison University, Prof W G Watson, B D and J M Palmer, Esq MA, Principal of Mt Allison Academy.

Friday 18th—3 p.m., Conferences on Missions. 8 p.m., Missionary Anniversary; addresses by Rev James Allen, M A General Secretary, and J N Harvey, Esq President of the Laymen's Association. B B, 10-16, 16 p.m., Wesleyan.

Saturday 19th—9 p.m., Evangelistic Service conducted by Rev Wm Lawson.

Sunday, June 20th—Conference Church; 9.30 a.m. Conference Love Feast, conducted by Rev T J Deinstad. 11 a.m. Ordination Service conducted by the President of the Conference; Sermon by the Rev H S Magee, Temperance Field Secretary, 3 p.m. Open session of the Sunday School with addresses by the Rev E Styles and W C Turner Esq, 7 p.m. Sermon by the Rev T Albert Moore, Secretary of the General Conference, to be followed by an Evangelistic Service conducted by the Rev James Strothard.

Monday 21st.—8 p.m. Temperance and Moral Reform Anniversary. Addresses by the Rev H S Magee, Field Secretary, and the Rev O R Flanders, D D.

Prayer meetings will be held at 7 a.m. during Conference to be led by the following; Wednesday (16th) Rev G F Dawson, M A; Thursday (17th) Rev W J Kirby; Friday 18th, Rev Hammond Johnson; Saturday 19th, Rev Richard Opie; Monday 21st, Rev H C Rice B A.

Sunday Services in other Churches. Presbyterian Church, a.m. Dr Flanders; p.m., G A Ross.

United Baptist, a.m., Dr Rogers; p.m., H D Marr, B A.

Reformed Baptist, a.m., W Lawson; p.m., Neil McLaughlan.

Advent Church, Hammond Johnson.

Upper Woodstock, 3 p.m., James Crisp.

Jacksonville, 7 p.m. H C Rice, B A.

Northampton, 10.30 a.m., J F Esty.

Waterville, 3 p.m., J K King.

Rosedale, 3 p.m., C Comben.

Lindsay, 3 p.m., John A Ives.

Hartland, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m., C Flemmington.

PURE SPRING WATER is what E W Mair is using solely at his Soda Fountain in the manufacture of his Fruit Syrups, Soda water and his celebrated ROOT BEER. Bear in mind it is not TOWN WATER nor even BOILED WATER, but clear sparkling "SPRING WATER" hauled fresh every morning from the Spring.