

The Carleton Sentinel.

VOL. 63. No. 47

WOODSTOCK, N. B., FRIDAY NOVEMBER 24 1911

WHOLE No 3255

Black Front Jewelry Store

Only Four More Weeks Until Christmas

Select

Your



Gifts

Early

Call and Look Over Our Extensive and Beautiful Stock

There is something for every member of your family and friends. We are always ready and prepared to pay

Special Attention to Watch Repairing

Mail Orders Promptly Attended to

Marriage Licenses
and
Wedding Rings.

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

KODAKS
SUPPLIES.

OUR NEXT SPECIAL

Commencing Monday, December 4th and lasting until December 9th.

- 1 pound Black Pepper, 25 cents
- 1 pound Ground Cloves, regular price 40 cents, for 30 cents
- 1 pound Ground Ginger, " 40 " 30 "

We Guarantee every one of these articles, or money refunded.

BURDEN & KING, - Grocers.

Our Motto---Quality. Also ask us for a sample of our Carleton Blend Coffee and Noble's Tea

Special Tailoring Announcement

We have just received some English Worsted Trousers, purchased at a greatly reduced price, and we are offering these excellent Trousers, made-to-you-measure, for \$5.00.

Trousers---made-to-measure---a large variety of stripes to choose from, worth \$6.00 and \$6.50---Our special for \$5.00.

Custom
Tailoring

R. B. JONES CO., Ltd

Buttons
Covered.

F. B. CARVELL, M. P. SHOWS UP INCONSISTENCY OF BORDEN AND HIS COLLEAGUES; THE TORY-NATIONALIST ALLIANCE

House of Commons, Tuesday, November 21, 1911.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett: For an Address to His Royal Highness, the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the Opening of the Session, and the proposed Amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N. B.). Mr. Speaker, we had the pleasure last evening of listening to a very racy, if not very lucid, address by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster.) That address dealt practically altogether with the trade question, and, therefore, I shall briefly deal with that subject. Coming back fresh from the country with a majority which he estimates at from 45 to 50, it is all Brunswick were concerned, practically well for my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) to claim that the question of reciprocity has been threshed out and settled by the Canadian people, once and for all, and to repeat the statement which he has so often made in this House that the prosperity enjoyed by this country during the last 15 years has not been due to any wise legislation or administration by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his colleagues, but has been due entirely to the policy or foundation laid by my hon. friends when they were in power from the Minister of Trade and Commerce during nearly every budget debate in which he has participated since 1896 when he had the honour of a seat in this House and I have no doubt that to some extent he believes in the truth of it. I shall not quarrel with him or any hon. member opposite as to the cause of the enormous development which has taken place in Canada in the last 15 years, but it is certain the development has been enormous, and if my hon. friends opposite during the term of office, whether it be lengthy or otherwise, can continue the ratio of progress which existed from 1896 down to the present time, they certainly will not have lived and governed in vain.

My hon. friend says that the whole discussion during the late elections was upon the economical side of the trade question submitted to the people by the Government. Mr. FOSTER. Not quite as broad as that. Mr. CARVELL. I want to be correct, and I will say it was nearly all along those lines. Mr. FOSTER. As far as I was concerned. Mr. CARVELL. I have no doubt that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is too astute a politician to go through the country occupying the high position that he does, and talking nothing but the economical phase of the reciprocity proposition. But, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce does not represent the whole, Conservative party in all the back townships. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce may not have been present in some of the back townships and have listened to the impassioned appeals which his supporters and friends made on every question almost in the world except the question of reciprocity with the United States in natural products. I know I am voicing the experience of all the members on this side of the House who represent English speaking constituencies when I say that practically the last thing that was used to influence votes in our constituencies was reciprocity or what the result of reciprocity would be. I state here that practically the only thing which was used for the purpose of affecting votes was the race and religion of the hon. gentleman who led the government of this country down to September 21. I realize that there are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who will deny that; I realize that newspapers will take up the statement I make and deny it, but nevertheless I repeat it and declare that in the English-speaking portions of the maritime provinces and in the province of Ontario, practically the only thing which we had to fight was the money which reciprocity furnished. Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh. Mr. CARVELL. The money which reciprocity furnished and the contemptible cry of race, creed and religion which was waged against a right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition. So far as New Brunswick is concerned, I have personal knowledge of this because I met it on the platform, I met it in public and I met it one hundred times in private to every once I met it in public, and I say that so far as the English-speaking portions of New Brunswick were concerned, practically the whole campaign was waged on this contemptible cry. We see from the newspaper reports, we hear from our friends in Ontario, we hear from almost every source—not only that, we have this proud boast of "The Orange Sentinel" three days after the election that it was their work which won the election for the Conservative party and placed them in power. I have here a clipping just placed in my hands by a friend containing a statement made by a Methodist clergyman at a meeting held in Leeds, during the campaign of the present Minister of Finance (Mr. White). On November 6, a prior to 1896. We have heard that from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, minister at Phillipsville stated: He recognized the truth of Dr. Dunn's charge against the Conservative campaigners in Leeds, "I yield to no man in my Protestantism," he declared, "but I blush for the appeals made in this riding on grounds of religious prejudice against a great Canadian who has spent his life in public service, seeking to unite in true and patriotic Canadianism all creeds and classes."

This is only one evidence of the cry and the campaign urged all over this country by my friends opposite. Now they say: we have won because the people do not want reciprocity with the United States. I am not in a position to speak for any other portion of the Dominion of Canada excepting the maritime provinces, but I am here to state that reciprocity and subjects closely allied to it are not dead so far as the maritime provinces are concerned. I do not care whether you say reciprocity with the United States in natural products or not, but my opinion, and I know I am voicing the sentiment of every gentleman here from the maritime provinces, on either side of the House, is that the admission of the natural products of the maritime provinces into the United States would have been the greatest boon which has been offered to our people in a lifetime or which can be offered to them within the next generation. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says that what Canada needs is home markets, trade with ourselves; we do not want foreign markets.

Mr. FOSTER. I never said that. Mr. CARVELL. Does he not go that far? Then I stand corrected, and I will say that he wants foreign markets when he can get them, in the British West India Islands, in the British Guiana, and in a few other countries where Nature supplies bananas and dates for the food of the people, but we do not want to sell our products to the great country of ninety million people which is growing faster than any other country in the world and which is able to pay a good price for them. We do not want trade with them, but we do want trade with a few people in the West India Islands. Well, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is welcome to his opinions, and there is no member of this House in a better position to judge of the opinions and wishes of the Conservative party. But, Sir, he is not judging truly the aims and desires of the people of the maritime provinces. I regret to say that the people of the

maritime provinces are not prospering in a commercial sense as much as they should. I do not know why it is. The census returns on this point must I think be unpleasant reading even to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. They are unpleasant reading to any man who wishes well of any portion of Canada or of Canada as a whole. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says we should sell to the home markets. We can sell from the maritime provinces to the home markets nothing that I know of which our people can produce except a few potatoes which we are able to sell to Montreal and Toronto. We cannot sell a thousand feet of our lumber outside of the maritime provinces unless we go to foreign markets. We cannot sell our horses, our sheep, our cheese, our butter, our fish, or anything else that we produce unless we go to some foreign market.

Mr. CURRIE. What has the hon. gentleman been doing with St. John harbour? Mr. CARVELL. I want to tell my hon. friend that we have been developing the St. John harbour in a manner which his friends never dreamed of doing, and I only hope, now that his friends are in power, that they will have the true patriotism to carry out the schemes that our friends started for the development of that harbour, and make it the great national seaport which it ought to be.

Mr. CURRIE. What for? Mr. CARVELL. I commend St. John harbour to my hon. friend. I hope he will go to his friends on the treasury benches and urge them to do justice to St. John harbour. I cannot tell why it is, but it is a cold fact that at least three-fourths of all the exports of the maritime provinces during the last few years have gone to the American market, even in the face of enormous duties. It may be possible for our hon. friends opposite to devise some scheme for finding other markets for these exports; but no man can tell me that under these conditions the people of the maritime provinces do not want freer access to the American markets. I think I can go so far as to say that we have another intimation from the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he says that we must trade at home. That means, of course, higher protection. Perhaps I am drawing an improper inference from the statement he made, but if I am, my hon. friend can deny it. I think that is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from his statement—that it means greater protection. Let me tell you that from the standpoint of the maritime provinces we shall hear of this later on.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend intends to pin his argument on that, perhaps I should make a little denial. It is not necessary in my mind to place a larger protection on imports to make home markets grow, when you are contrasting that with a policy which proposed to throw down protection, as in the reciprocity agreement. Mr. CARVELL. I am glad my hon. friend has given us this intimation that we will not have greater protection in Canada than we have had in the past. Mr. FOSTER. Neither did I say that. I think I had better not make any explanation to my hon. friend. Mr. CARVELL. I think my hon. friend is wise in not being drawn too far on that line. We shall know better when we see the personnel of the Tariff Commission which my hon. friend proposes to create, whether we are to have higher protection or the same or less protection than we have at the present time.

Something has been said by other speakers as to the personnel of the present government. I have no quarrel with my hon. friend the Prime Minister in regard to the personnel of his government. That is his affair, and not ours. No doubt

my hon. friend has had his own troubles, and is getting the punishments and rewards that must come to every government. If there are heart-burnings in his ranks, that affects him, not us. But I do have a quarrel with my hon. friend as to the position of his government in so far as it affects the well-being and the advantage of Canada. I am going to discuss for a short time the proposed amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I submit that the inclusion in the government of the three gentlemen who represent the Nationalist party in Quebec will be a distinct disadvantage to the well-being of Canada as a whole. This leads me to a resume of the naval affairs of this country during the last two or three years. I have taken a great deal of pleasure during the last two or three days in reading the speeches made by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and my hon. friend the Prime Minister on the 29th of March, 1909, when the famous Resolution was introduced into this House and carried, in favour of Canada starting on some sort of naval policy. I commend particularly the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the careful perusal of every member in the House, no matter whether he be a Liberal, a Conservative, or a Nationalist, and I wish it were placed before every elector of Canada and that they might read it in their calmer moments. If they did so, I think they would come to the conclusion that no finer sentiments and no more logical conclusions have ever been uttered or reached than those of the hon. member on that memorable occasion. It is wonderful, however, to consider the results that have followed from the statements he made and the pictures he painted at that time.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) discussion in the first place the proposition I am making of a monetary contribution in support of a navy and in his own inimitable, logical manner pointed out first the advantages, and I think he marshalled every fact which could come to the support of that proposal, or the proposal to send a money contribution to the mother country. Having done so, he then took the other side of the picture, and he pointed out in the most masterly manner possible the disadvantages which he thought would flow from it, and concluded that the proper thing for Canada to do in the first place was that we must have some method or means of naval defence, and in the next place concluded that it must be by constructing our own navy, by becoming our own contractors and defenders, and in that way contribute not only to our own self support, but also to the support of the empire when necessity should demand. At the risk of being a little tedious I want to recall to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McKim) and the members of this House the noble sentiments, and the logical sentiments, to my mind, put forth by him as contained in "Hansard" at page 3496 on the 29th March, 1909. After discussing our isolated condition, after discussing the unpatriotic course of relying upon the Monroe doctrine for our defence after showing what we could do, he sums up in these words: "Whatever may be necessary has to be collected and assembled and de-veloped with such expedition and in such abundance, as circumstances will allow. Under that system our first vessels would be British built, British equipped, British manned, British officered from stoker to captain. There is no other way in which we could proceed."

And I may say here, Sir, that under the policy carried out by the Liberal government we went to England and purchased two vessels, brought them here with certain British officers and certain British sailors. (Continued on page five.)