

THE HERALD

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1910

SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 A YEAR.
TO THE UNITED STATES \$1.50
PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY
AT 81 QUEEN STREET,
CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND.
JAMES MCISAAC,
Editor & Proprietor

Please send in your subscriptions. The year is nearing its close and we need the money to meet our obligations. Please don't delay.

Government Still Angry.

The temper of the Ottawa House of Commons especially on the government side, did not improve during the lengthy debate on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. On the defensive from the start, the government ranks had to face a determined opposition, which man for man possesses greater fighting ability than those who sit to the right of Mr. Speaker. It happened therefore that the debate on the address was filled with stirring incidents, and the hammering which the government received soured the temper of its supporters. The word "liar" was banded about the floor of the Chamber, and often the House during a few days was in a state of turmoil and disorder. When a government loses its head and substitutes abuse for argument, it is a sign that it is not only weakening but its grip on the reins of power is at an end. The Laurier administration consists of one man only. During a week he was referred to as an autocrat, a despot, and the uncrowned King of Canada. His refusal to trust the people, and to govern "for the people and by the people" while posing all the time as a unifier of races and creeds, and a democrat, has stamped Sir Wilfrid Laurier with a hall-mark of duplicity and opportunism.

The naval question, thrust again into the arena of political discussion by the result of the by-election in Drummond and Arthabaska, was the sole topic of the debate on the Address. Mr. R. L. Borden put the attitude of the opposition clearly and forcibly when he declared, in the most brilliant speech of his career that the Conservatives were not in alliance with either the Liberals or the Nationalists on this question. The taunt had been freely made by government speakers that there was an understanding between the opposition and the Nationalists, led by Messrs Monk and Bourassa, but Mr. Borden quickly disposed of that Liberal canard by showing that all through the Drummond and Arthabaska campaign the opposition policy was attacked as bitterly by the Nationalists as was that of the government. Mr. Borden reaffirmed the stand taken by him last session when the naval bill was before the House, declaring that the proposals of the government were dangerous, useless and expensive. "We may" said Mr. Borden "be of different minds as to whether Canada should contribute to the defence of the Empire outside of her own territory, but if we once make up our minds that Canada is to so contribute, then it seems to me the naval supremacy of the empire can be upheld only by one great naval force under one great central control. While I respect the opinions of able and intelligent men who disagree with me, I cannot see that it is the proper position to maintain the naval supremacy of this Empire by a series of disunited navies not under one central control."

There is Mr. Borden's position, clearly put, and with no beating about the bush. Com-

pare it with the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier who has committed Canada to an "order in council" navy, which cannot be and is not intended to be of any assistance to Great Britain in time of trouble, as it stands out clearly as being Canada's duty as one of the younger nations making up the British Empire. Before any permanent policy is undertaken, Mr. Borden wants the people to pronounce on it. The Government's aspiration in building this disjointed navy is independence. One of their prominent supporters from the province of Quebec, Mr. Turcotte de Nicolet, declared from his seat in parliament that he would support its proposals because it would be a step towards independence, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier sat by and hearing these loyal expressions uttered not one word of reproof. The premiers attempt to gain sympathy in the English provinces for his alleged attachment to British principles should not go very far in light of the facts.

The most interesting thing about the navy's development was something which did not happen. It was the applause which Mr. Gilbert, the victor in Drummond and Arthabaska did not obtain. He was introduced on Nov. 28, a prosperous-looking youngish man with a black curled moustache and a mop of black hair. Mr. Monk and Dr. Paquette brought him past the bar of the House, and Mr. Monk recited the customary formula. He spoke in French. The Speaker, also in French, bade the new member take his seat. The customary shake of the Speaker's hand followed and Mr. Gilbert repaired to the seat appointed for him, in the back row, on the Speaker's left at the point where the Liberal overflow just infringes on the Conservative block. All this in perfect silence, Mr. Nantel, Mr. Lortie and Mr. Blondin being absent. Not a sound was heard until Mr. Gilbert had reached his seat when a ripple of suppressed jeers ran over the Liberal side of the House. It probably was in part their animosity to the man whose triumph has scared them so. It probably was in addition an expression of vexation that the Conservatives had shown such coldness to him.

There was no vote on the Borden and Monk amendments on Tuesday night Nov. 29th, and the debate went over. The reason was an extraordinary turmoil, in which the House became involved through Conservative resentment of the attitude towards a member of that party by Speaker Marcell (Bonaventure \$126 per head). The Conservatives gained their point and forced him to deal equal measure; but when the fifteen minutes fight which was necessary had ended the temper of the House was so ruffled that Mr. Crothers, who was about to speak, adjourned the debate. The affair arose over a piece of bad parliamentary manners to which the Liberals are particularly prone. They flock into the chamber when Sir Wilfrid Laurier is up; and they have a trick of rising the moment he finishes and ostentatiously and noisily trooping out. Tuesday night Sir Wilfrid Laurier finished his speech at 10.30 o'clock. Mr. Crothers rose to reply. The Liberal exodus was no noisy as to drown his opening sentences, though the Conservatives raised cries of order. The Liberals paid no attention, and Mr. Crothers paused. There were Conservative expressions of dissatisfaction and Dr. Schaffner cried "cowards." Instantly Speaker Marcell was on his feet rebuking Dr. Schaffner. Dr. Schaffner promptly withdrew the

word. Thereupon the Speaker rose again and insisted that Dr. Schaffner apologize. The House listened in amazement at this, Dr. Schaffner rose and said that as he had to obey the Speaker's ruling, he would also apologize.

Now, the other day Mr. Gauvreau called Mr. Monk a liar. Speaker Marcell did not notice him, but next day, on seeing the word reported in Hansard, called on Mr. Gauvreau to withdraw. This Mr. Gauvreau did, in so grudging and defiant a manner, as to cause Mr. Monk to utter his defiance to come outside and settle. The Speaker did not call on Mr. Gauvreau to apologize. When the House recovered its breath after Dr. Schaffner had been treated in this manner, Mr. Foster said, "What about liar?" Mr. Borden rose and suggested to Mr. Speaker that "coward" was not more offensive a word than "liar." (Lour cheers from the Conservatives.) Then Mr. Foster's voice was heard: "Make the other man apologize." Mr. Speaker pleaded that on the former occasion he had not heard the word "liar." He had heard Dr. Schaffner's remark.

Mr. Borden retorted—"It was reported in Hansard and no apology was exacted."

"Make him apologize," this from Mr. Foster. Deafening shouts of "Apologize! Apologize!" from the Conservatives. They were very angry. The Liberals were not disposed to see Mr. Gauvreau treated as Dr. Schaffner had been and they shouted their defiance. Sir Wilfrid Laurier rose and objected that the demand that the Speaker should force an apology from Mr. Gauvreau should have been raised when the "liar" incident occurred. Mr. Borden replied that if an apology was exacted in one case it should be in the other. "An apology will be given before the House does business," said Mr. Foster. Again Sir Wilfrid Laurier intervened. All men were fallible, he pleaded, if a mistake had been made attention could be called to it at another time. "We may as well fight it out now," said Mr. Borden, "in the Gauvreau case no one called attention to the offensive epithet, though cries of order were raised. No one asked for a ruling in Dr. Schaffner's case. He himself (Mr. Borden) had never heard anything exacted beyond a withdrawal. 'Liar' was a more offensive word than 'coward.' If an apology was demanded in one case it should be in the other. 'Equal rights,' called one Oppositionist. 'No race, or creed,' called another, in scornful reference to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's peroration not ten minutes old, in which he had reiterated his familiar boast. Once more Sir Wilfrid Laurier urged that the Speaker was not infallible. "We know that," cried Glen Campbell. This was not the time to correct the Speaker's mistake, Sir Wilfrid Laurier urged. Let the House have a separate debate on it.

"We can't get on," said Mr. Foster, "if one side is to use the word 'liar' and have its man escape reprimand while if the other side says 'coward' the Speaker makes it his business to go further than exacting a withdrawal." He had not in his 23 years of parliamentary life seen an apology exacted in addition to withdrawal. "We can't live that way and we won't." "The Speaker must be fair," Mr. Foster said in conclusion. Sir Wilfrid Laurier urged that the Gauvreau incident should not be recalled after this lapse of time. Mr. Crothers at this point moved the adjournment of the debate. Speaker Marcell now spoke, urging that he had on his own initiative called on Mr. Gauvreau to withdraw this epithet.

Mr. Foster—"Why did you not call on him to apologize as well?" "I did not hear it," was the Speaker's reply. Finally the Speaker submitted and asked Mr. Crothers to apologize. Mr. Gauvreau, who had been sitting looking very ill at ease, replied in French, that it was against the rules, he had nothing to say, Mr. Speaker expostulated with Mr. Gauvreau in French and after showing further reluctance, Mr. Gauvreau said in English, I utterly withdraw the word and apologize to Mr. Monk and will not ask him to go into the corridors with me: Mr. Crothers pressed his motion to adjourn the debate, and after the Liberals had shown some reluctance Sir Wilfrid nodded and the debate was suspended. Thus the Conservatives carried their point.

The division on the debate on the address took place in the House of Commons about 2 o'clock Friday morning last. Borden's amendment was defeated by 126 to 70. Mr. Monk, and Messrs. Paquet, Lortie, Nantel, Blondin and Gilbert voted with the government. The Monk amendment was defeated by 120 to 67. Mr. Verille voted for the amendment, Col. Sam Hughes voted with the government. The address was not passed, as Mr. Aylesworth wished to make a statement on the Hague award.

In this connection it is to be noted in the movement to the navy bill moved by R. L. Borden last session it was set forth: "That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character, until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval." In the course of his remarks on that occasion Mr. Borden said: "Proceed slowly, cautiously and surely. Lay your proposals before the people and give them if necessary, opportunity to be heard. The will of this country today is that these different proposals ought to be submitted to the people and the people ought to be permitted to pass upon them before any permanent policy of this kind is engaged in. 'I am as strong as any man in this country in the belief that it is the duty of Canada to participate upon a permanent basis in the defence of this Empire and to do our reasonable share in that regard. I say that to attempt to force a policy of this kind upon the people of this country without giving them an opportunity to say yea or nay, with regard to it, would be one of the worst mistakes that could be made by any man.'"

In all the discussions this was one of the chief points on which all Conservatives were agreed, as it was felt that the people certainly ought to be consulted before any permanent change was made. This fact has not been thoroughly understood throughout the country as there seems to have been a systematic attempt in many quarters to make the people think that the Conservatives approved of the government's naval scheme. But Mr. Borden in both his speeches this session went into this more carefully again in order that it might be thoroughly understood that the position taken by the party in this regard was that they considered a question of this kind could only be properly settled after it had been submitted to the people. The unexpected amendment moved by Mr. Monk this session raised again the question of an appeal to the people. Mr. Borden's subsequent amendment expressed more satisfactorily the attitude of the Conservative members, but as Mr. Monk's amendment is in line with the position taken on this question by the party at the last session, it was decided to support both amendments. In other words the Conservatives believe now as they did a year ago, that the people have the right to be consulted on the whole question of permanent policy.

There was just one event in the House on Friday. The address passed, after Mr. Aylesworth had made a statement upon The Hague arbitration and award. This was an important pronouncement, somewhat marred perhaps by the minister's invertebrate verbosity, but grave, moderate and marked by a spirit of sobriety and a sense of responsibility, and the hearty reception given to it by the Opposition, exhibited the Canadian House of Commons at its best, just as two or three incidents of the previous ten days had shown the House at its worst. By far the most important feature of the speech, which must rank as th-

official pronouncement of His Majesty's Canadian government on the subject, was the following notable passage: "I would wish only to say this further, not with reference to that particular treaty alone, but with general reference to all the various international arrangements and agreements which during the last 130 years have been entered into between the statesmen of Great Britain and those of the United States, that while it seems to be rather the fashion, or to have been the fashion in this country to take the view that in the greater number, if not all of these international arrangements, the United States has succeeded in getting the better of it, and that there has been in perhaps most instances on the part of British statesmen some sacrifice or some failure to recognize sufficiently the rights and interests of the British colonies in North America, I for my part, speaking certainly after considerable study of the matter and with some knowledge of it, do not in the least degree share these views. I think it is no more than simple justice that I should say with respect to the arrangements which from time to time have been entered into with regard to the various matters of difficulty which have arisen between the United States and Great Britain, that the general interests of the Empire at large have been well conserved by the representatives of the British Crown in those negotiations."

What a change the last few years has wrought. Seven years ago Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Aylesworth himself and many others were cursing the British government on the ground that it had sold Canada over the Alaska affair; whereas the fact was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, realizing in advance that the result would not be to his liking, had insisted upon having Lord Alverstone, a member of the tribunal, for the premeditated purpose of throwing the blame upon him. Perhaps the new desire to wave the British flag over English Canada has something to do with the change. Much of Mr. Aylesworth's explanation has appeared before, he having delivered several addresses upon the subject but there were some fresh and interesting points. Mr. Aylesworth stated that the Canadian authorities had deliberated and of set purpose excluded the ownership of Hudson Bay from the questions submitted, the Americans having expressly admitted the rights of the Hudson Bay Company. There was no question whatever as to Canadian ownership of the bay.

Mr. Aylesworth specially praised Sir William Robson's masterly argument on the question of bays. In Europe bays were regarded as international waters, but Sir William Robson proved that from the earliest treaties of the 17th century onwards the European nations which colonized North American coast lines, from the first and uninterrupted, had treated them as territorial waters. The United States had no sooner set up a nation than they asserted the same doctrine—as witness the case of Delaware Bay, thus international law is different as regards bays in Europe and bays in America. The one exception to this is the Bay of Fundy; this became international in 1845 through the action of Lord Aberdeen, who offered to recognize American rights to it if they would abandon their claims elsewhere on the Canadian coast. The Americans accepted the concession and abated no jot of their claims. Sir William Robson absolutely made good this thesis.

Mr. Aylesworth described the American doctrine of "servitude." To make their position good the United States representatives were driven to argue that the United States had a better right than had British legislators to legislate with regard to the British territorial waters and possessions in question, and that the United States had a right to place armed forces in British territorial waters to compel British subjects to observe, in British waters, laws passed by the United States congress. This grotesque theory was utterly rejected. In this connection the Minister of Justice said that the award on this subject was couched, verbatim, in the words in which Mr. Boyce, British ambassador at Washington, had framed the Canadian view of this claim.

Minard's Liniment cures distemper.

LOCAL AND OTHER ITEMS.

There was a pretty good outside market yesterday, and prices were rather stiffer than at last previous quotations. The cold turn in the weather had its effect on the pork supply, and an immense quantity was on sale. The price ranged from 7 1/2 to 7 3/4 with a possible shade higher here and there. Hays sold for 48 to 50 cts. and potatoes at these same figures. Other outside commodities were practically unchanged. In the inside market there was not much change except in eggs which sold at 35 cents a dozen.

On the evening of Wednesday last St. Andrew's Day, the usual St. Andrew's festival was admirably carried out under the auspices of the Caledonian Club of P. E. I. in the Club Rooms, in Charlottetown. The President, James Paton, Esq., presided and a very large assemblage sat down to the supper. The Haggis was brought in with regulation honors. Good speeches were made by the President, Rev. Mr. Fullerton, Mr. J. A. Mathieson, M. P. P. Dr. Warburton; M. P. P., Councillor McDonald and others. After the supper dancing was kept up for some time.

The annual meeting of the Fruit Growers Association and the fruit show, in the Kindergarten Hall, on Thursday and Friday of last week, attracted much attention and elicited lively interest. The exhibition of apples was splendid. There were exhibits from Ontario and British Columbia, as well as from Prince Edward Island, and it is a pleasure to state that in size and color our own apples compared more than favorably with those from the other Provinces. On Thursday evening interesting addresses were delivered by President Dewar, Lieut. Governor Rogers, A. McNeill chief of the fruit division Ottawa, Hon. John Richards, Dr. Gordon Hewitt, Ottawa, Rev. Dr. Gauthier D. A. McKinnon and others.

MARRIED.

CARTER—CASEY—In all Saints Church, Charlottetown, Rev. Bernard McDonald, D. D., officiating, Peter Carter to Elizabeth Alice Casey.

CUMMINGS—MITCHELL—In Charlottetown on Nov. 30th, by Rev. T. E. Fullerton, Miss Nettie Pearl Mitchell, of North Wiltshire, to Daniel Murdoch Cummings, of Milton.

IRVING—SENCAUBAUGH—At the home of the officiating clergyman, Rev. J. F. Floyd, Charlottetown, on Saturday, Nov. 26, 1910, James Irving to Miss Ruth Sencaubough of Beach Point, P. E. I.

DONOVAN—BROWN—At the home of the officiating clergyman, Rev. J. F. Floyd, Charlottetown, on Saturday, Nov. 26th, Wm. Joseph Donovan to Miss Gertrude Brown, both of Charlottetown.

NICHOLSON—STEWART—In this city on the 30th ult., William Nicholson, B. A. to Isabel May Stewart.

OMEARA—GALLANT—In St. Cecilia's Church, Boston on Sept. 25, Pius O'Meara, to Miss Margaret Gallant, both formerly of this Province, Rev. Father Ryan, officiating.

MURPHY—DOYLE—In the Mission Church, Boston on Nov. 14, Richard Murphy to Mary Florence Doyle, Rev. Father Kaul, C. S. S. R., officiating.

HAYES—REEVES—At the residence of the bride's father, Col. W. Reeves, Freetown, on Nov. 30th, 1910, by Rev. W. E. Johnston, Joy B. Hayes of Sealton, to Miss Emmeline M. Reeves.

DIED.

WEEKS—At Granville, Nov. 15, 1910, Robert Weeks, aged 82 years.

PINEAU—At New Glasgow, on Dec. 2nd, Josephine Pineau, aged 19, the youngest daughter of the late Louis Pineau.

SNOW—At Victoria, Nov. 27th, 1909, Katie Jane Snow, infant daughter of Fred W. and Mrs. Snow, aged four months.

LIVINGSTONE—At Charlottetown on the 28th ult. Boyd Livingstone aged, 28 years.

TROWSDALE—In Winnipeg on Nov. 30th, of Chasley T. Trowsdale, formerly of Grand. Death was due to typhoid fever and he has been ill for over a month.

MacNEILL—At Halifax, at the residence of her son-in-law, Hector McInnis, K. C., on Saturday, December 3rd, 1910, Mary Sutherland, relict of the late Rev. Donald MacNeill, of Charlottetown in the eighty-fourth year.

Get your printing done at the Herald Office.

FIRE INSURANCE.

Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool, G. B.

Sun Fire offices of London.

Fidelity Phenix Fire Insurance Co. of New York.

Combined Assets \$100,000,000

Lowest rates and prompt settlement of Losses.

JOHN MACBACHERN AGENT.

Telephone No. 362. Mar. 22nd, 1906

ALLOW US TO SHOW YOU OUR NEW Watches, Rings, Pearl Brooches, And other novelties in Jewellery. We never had so large an assortment before.

W. W. WELLNER, JEWELLER.



PATON'S

The House of Quality

Where THE Best Clothes COME FROM.

Trunks

Suit Cases

Flat Top Japanned and Marbelized, Sheet Iron, Birch Slats, Heavy Brass Yale Lock, 3-ply Leather Handles.

28 inches long \$2.85
32 inches long 2.60

Same as above except has round top,
28 inches \$2.75
32 inches 3.00

Plain Waterproof Canvas Edges of ends sheet iron bound, 3-8 inch Hardwood Slats, 3-ply Leather Handles,
30 inches \$3.25
32 inches 3.75
34 inches 4.15

Stanley Bros.