

The Carleton Sentinel.

VOL. 62. No. 49

WOODSTOCK, N. B., FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1910

WHOLE No. 3242

The Blue Front Jewelry Store.

Christmas Satisfaction

is the greatest when you buy presents that will give the longest satisfaction.

For months our expert knowledge and deliberate thought have been utilized in investigating the lines of the leading manufacturing Jewelers and Silversmiths.

We have brought to you the cream of the offerings of the greatest makers of dependable Christmas Wares.

NO HOLIDAY SEASON WAS EVER MORE BOUNTIFULLY PROVIDED FOR.

Every artist and every craftsman seems to have achieved his greatest possible success in creating artistic work of the most pleasing patterns in every class of goods suitable for presentation purposes.

WE INVITE AN EARLY CALL FROM YOU.

Marriage Licenses
and
Wedding Rings.

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

KODAKS
and
SUPPLIES.

Vacuum Cleaner to Rent

An excellent way to Clean Carpets in the Fall, thus saving the necessity of taking them off the floors. Apply at the

Woodstock Electric Laundry.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT!

We bought in time to save you money. Woollen Goods have all advanced; but we are pleased to announce to our patrons for

CHRISTMAS TRADE

that we are still able to sell at the old prices.

Suits which sell elsewhere for \$23.00
WE SELL for \$20.00.

A similar difference in price in all our Woollen Goods.

Look at our Goods and our Prices, compare with others, and then you will buy FROM us.

Merchant
Tailoring.

R. B. JONES CO., Ltd
MANCHESTER HOUSE

Our Aim is: SATISFACTION TO ALL.

Buttons
Covered

STIRRING SPEECH BY F. B. CARVELL, M. P.

BELIEVES RECIPROCITY WOULD BE A BENEFIT TO CANADA

Effectually Exposes the Inconsistent Position of the Opposition

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N. B.) Had I time before the hour of adjournment I should like to refer to the question of our trade relations with the United States and also to the question of the naval defence which are in my opinion the two most important references in the speech from the Throne. Time will not permit me to discuss our trade relations at any length, and I, therefore, shall devote myself principally to the naval question which seems to be the paramount purpose of this debate. Let me say, however, that I have not yet understood that it is the policy of the present government to conclude what may be called a reciprocity treaty with the United States; I do not understand that there has been any proposition made by the government of the United States or the government of Canada with the object of securing what might be called a reciprocity treaty; at least in the sense of the reciprocity treaty which we had from 1854 to 1866. The speech from the Throne does not say so, but simply says that there has been a demand for more improved trade relations. Well, I may have an opportunity to discuss this question later on, but I want to ask this House now if it would not be to the benefit of every producer in the Dominion to-day to sell his products at better prices than he now gets. That is all we want. I must confess that in the past the attitude of the government of the United States was not very friendly; and so far as I am concerned, I would not be willing to consent to any negotiations which would jeopardize in the slightest degree the interests of the Canadian people. But if our farmers can obtain freer access to a market in which they can sell their produce to better advantage, if our fishermen can be given the opportunity of selling the results of their toil at more profitable rates, if our lumbermen can be enabled to dispose of their lumber at better rates—if all those in this country who have anything to sell can do so more profitably, without giving away any of the rights we now enjoy, by some mutual arrangement between the two countries, I think it is the duty of the government to conclude an agreement of that kind. And should they fail to bring about any agreement, no harm will be done.

We have had two weeks' discussion over a proposal of the government, enacted into law last year, to make the commencement of a Canadian navy. All sorts of arguments have been advanced by our hon. friends opposite; but there is one thing in this debate which stands out prominently above all others, and that is that our friends opposite are a little ashamed of the position into which they have been driven by the arguments put forward in this matter, and rather ashamed of the position into which they have been driven by a repetition and rehearsal of the facts and occurrences during the last two or three years. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) was evidently put up for a purpose, and that purpose was to draw a herring across the track, and endeavour to escape from the attacks made throughout the country on the party opposite because of—I will not say their alliance since my hon. friend the leader of the opposition says there is none—but on account of the arrangement evidently made between the Conservative party and the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman spent one solid hour this afternoon in trying to show that some members of the Liberal party have in their minds the possibility of an independent Canada in some distant future. In that connection he referred to my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte), and I am convinced that every one who heard

him must have concluded that his intention was to charge that hon. gentleman with having gone into the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska and preached there Canadian independence. It was only when brought to book by my hon. friend himself (Mr. Turcotte) that he was compelled to drop the charge. He also tried to make this House believe that the hon. member for St. James division (Mr. Gendais) had gone into Drummond and Arthabaska and preached there the same doctrine. He likewise charged my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Bland) with having made certain statements at Victoriaville. That charge my hon. friend positively denied and the hon. gentleman had not the fairness to accept that denial, but tried to escape responsibility by saying that he had been quoting only from a newspaper. Then he went on to make a charge still more reprehensible. He said that the Liberal candidate in that country had declared that the object in establishing this navy was to bring about the independence of Canada. In that connection he quoted the Montreal 'Witness,' but he must also be a reader of the Toronto 'Mail and Empire,' for no man who can preach as much lip loyalty as my hon. friend did this afternoon could live in Ontario without being a constant reader of that paper. He must have known, therefore, that the defeated candidate, Mr. Perrault, wrote to the 'Mail and Empire' on the 9th. of November, three or four days after the election, a letter in which he positively denied having ever made any such statement. I do not think I am making an unfair statement when I say that my hon. friend did not do himself justice as a gentleman when he neglected to read that letter which was published in the 'Mail and Empire.' That letter is as follows:

Sir,—In your issue of Saturday, the 5th inst., the following appears in your editorial column: 'Mr. Perrault, the defeated government candidate in Drummond and Arthabaska, appealed to the electors on the separation platform. He said in one of his speeches: "Our fleet is not and never will be, imperialistic; it is a step towards the independence of Canada."'

I wish to give to that statement an unqualified and emphatic denial. I never gave expression to any such opinion or sentiment, and no words of mine ever could, even with the wildest stretch of imagination, be construed as conveying that meaning. On the contrary, at every meeting which I addressed I dwelt on Canada's duty to assume the naval defence of her shores and commerce, and I declared that she would come to the rescue of the motherland should the supremacy of Britain on the seas be ever threatened. I endorsed unequivocally the policy and statements of Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the navy question. I missed no opportunity of asserting that the British flag protects our civil and religious liberties, and that we are proud to live under it. My position was interpreted so differently from that contained in your columns that I was violently assailed for being too ardent an imperialist. My opponents insisted that Canada owed nothing to England, and did their utmost to represent the government as being sold body and soul to Great Britain. These unpatriotic appeals did me sufficient injury without my being saddled with opinions which I never professed and which I repudiate.

I rely on your sense of fair play to insert the present letter.

Believe me, dear Mr. Editor,
Yours truly,
J. E. PERRAULT,
Liberal candidate in Drummond and Arthabaska.
Arthabaska, Nov. 7.

Did my hon. friend from West Elgin possess the spirit of fair play to the extent which evidently the 'Mail and Empire' possesses it, since it publishes that letter, he would not have failed to read it to the House. I do not think it would be possible to review the hon. gentleman's speech from the standpoint of the utter unfairness of the arguments used by him, because that would take much more time than I have at my disposal. He quoted one gentleman from the province of Quebec as having said in that campaign that no country but a nation could have a navy, and in his most melodramatic style he approved of that and said that no country could have a navy unless it was a nation, the inference being that Canada, not being a nation, had no right to have a navy. Mark the inconsistencies, mark the absurdities and contradictions into which the gentleman opposite fell whenever they open their mouths on this question. This compels me to read, what has been read in this House, perhaps half a dozen times during the present debate, the resolution passed on March 23, 1903, as follows:—

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

Mr. Speaker, compare that with the magnificently loyal peroration of my hon. friend from West Elgin, that the only thing to do is to contribute money by millions and declaring for one nation, one flag, one King. And yet that same hon. gentleman voted for this resolution. He swallowed everything that was put up to him. He swallowed a charge when it was proposed last session; and if, before the end of this parliament, the leader of the opposition can think up half a dozen more changes, I am sure no one will be more ready to swallow them than my hon. friend from West Elgin. He swallowed this:

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last imperial conference and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

Two years ago he had no hesitation in voting for the resolution which declared that it was the duty of the people of Canada not only to enter into a policy of self-defence but a speedy policy of self-defence. And as the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) pointed out, the word 'speedy' was introduced by the leader of the opposition to make sure that there should be no delay in getting to work on this navy. But why attempt to follow a gentleman who places himself in such a ludicrous position from the logical standpoint as did my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) this afternoon? He committed another breach of etiquette, which I think is more unpardonable than anything else that I have seen done since I first had the honour of a seat in this House. He deliberately read from 'Hansard' statements which had been quoted by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Bland) statements, in my opinion, of the most damnable nature, made by certain Nationalist orators during that campaign, and I believe his intention was to make the people of this country—if all words could

reach the country—believe that they were the sentiments of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and it was only when called to book by members on this side and asked whose words he was quoting,—and he did not, even then, have the manliness to say whose words they were, but he believed he was quoting the words of some person who had spoken in the campaign. I do not wish to be harsh or to say anything against the hon. gentleman or his mode of conducting an argument, but I do feel that when a member is put up by his party for a specific purpose and places himself in such a position as that in which the hon. gentleman placed himself, it is not right to let his action go unnoticed. I hope the House will pardon me for taking up so much time, not exactly in replying to, but in noticing such statements as those the hon. gentleman made.

The history of this naval question and the history of this Drummond and Arthabaska election have been so thoroughly discussed that I felt it would be only trespassing upon your patience were I to go into the facts again. I have read here a portion of the resolution of March 23, 1903, which was voted for by every member of this House. I think the House will pardon me if I read one or two quotations from the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) on that occasion, because, to my mind, it is the finest illustration of what appears to me to be the true principle governing this question that I have heard or read in these debates on the question of the navy. These words of the leader of the opposition were spoken in support of the motion of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I believe that my hon. friend from North Toronto was sincere when he moved that motion. Possibly he may have had the hope that he was getting the government into a little difficulty, because I have found that when the hon. gentleman assumes the aspect of fairness, you need to watch him a little more closely than you would on ordinary occasions. However, he appeared to be sincere. He introduced this resolution which was read by the Prime Minister last evening, the substance of which was that we should get together and get to work as soon as possible and start the nucleus of a Canadian navy. In that debate, the leader of the opposition said:—

I do not desire to say anything more on this subject. I believe that the defence of our own shores and the protection of our own commerce is due to the self-respect which should fill the heart of every man in this country. You say that we may rest contented to depend for our naval defence on Great Britain. Well if we had assumed the status of a nation in one respect, shall we adhere to the status of a Crown colony in other and still more important respects?

These are noble sentiments. These are the sentiments that actuate the Prime Minister to-day and have actuated the Liberal party for the last two or three years, and they are the sentiments we are trying to carry out, and which we will carry out, and of which, in my opinion, the people of this country will approve when they first have an opportunity to express themselves. The hon. leader of the opposition went on to talk about the Monroe doctrine, showing in what an unenviable position we should be placed if we relied upon the Monroe doctrine for our defence. Then he added:—

We desire that this resolution should go out as the unanimous resolution of the Parliament of Canada to the whole world, and I believe it may go out as a message

(Continued on tenth page.)