

## THE BOARD OF TRADE

## Executive Receive Reports From Two Sub-Committees

## ON THE WINTER PORT.

## A Delegation Who Interviewed Mr. Shaughnessy Give That Gentleman's Opinion Very Fully--He is Running the Canadian Pacific on Business Principles.

abuse. When Sir John A. Macdonald died, on the 6th June, 1891, an effort was made by some of Sir Charles Tupper's friends to have him made premier. This was stoutly resisted by Mr. George E. Foster and other members of the cabinet and Sir John Abbott was chosen instead. One of the reasons then urged against Sir Charles was that he was a dishonest politician and would introduce evil political methods into Canadian public life. One of Tupper's strongest opponents at that time was the Toronto Mail, then a Conservative paper and now the chief organ of the Conservative party. In an editorial published on the 9th June, 1891, the Toronto Mail said:

"There can be no doubt that the wiles are being actively pulled for Sir Charles Tupper at Ottawa by his son, with his other special abilities in the cabinet, as well as by members from the eastern provinces, to which, as a reward for loyalty to him in the late election, he has promised 'even more than justice' in the division of the spoils. His professional withdrawal from Canadian politics has deceived nobody; at all events, since his proceedings in the late elections."

"Of the system which Mr. Blake places Sir Charles Tupper has notoriously been the chief agent; he represents that is worst in it, and that has tended most to debauch the national character. So familiarly connected has been the system with his name that it may be said to be a household word of corruption. His name is at this moment unpleasantly connected with the name of the man who is charged with the duty of a man whose veracity is much impugned, and who does not seem to be a man of letters. It is too evident what sort of a scene would be opened by his accession to power. He is the prince of political cranks, and no doubt, but we cannot allow to purchase ability, even of so rare a kind at such a price as that of continued and increased demoralization. The appointment of such a man as the head of the state would be not merely the inauguration of violence and corruption, unredeemed by any true wisdom, but it would be the signal for a disruption of the community and for a moral civil war."

## THE ANGLO-GERMAN TREATY.

The treaty which has just been made between Great Britain and Germany for the purpose of preserving the integrity of the Chinese Empire and keeping the "open door," is a matter of the very highest importance because it touches the future of that great empire and will probably determine whether it shall continue to be what it has been, the trading ground for all the nations, or a preserve for one or two countries. Although Great Britain has acquired one or two pieces of territory in China, it is well known that these are mere trading posts, and not intended in any sense to be used for the purpose of dominating that empire. Hong Kong, which was acquired half a century ago, has always been one of the greatest public markets of the world, and although it is a British possession it is quite as available for commercial purposes to foreign nations as it is to Great Britain. It is a free port at which the goods of the whole world may be entered, and other nations take advantage of it to the fullest extent. Russia, on the contrary, has been seeking to acquire large areas of territory in China for the purpose of permanent occupation. Already one great province, Manchuria, is practically in the hands of Russia and there is no doubt that unless this spirit of conquest is checked, all Northern China would in time pass into the hands of Russia. This measure would not only be destructive to the commercial interests of other nations which trade with China, but it would enormously increase the power and importance of Russia, and in fact, the possession of China by Russia might in future years be made the basis of the conquest of the whole of Asia. This is a danger which it is necessary for modern statesmen to guard against, and a very important step in that direction has been taken by this Anglo-German treaty.

This treaty, moreover, shows that Great Britain and Germany are likely to be friends in the future. Indeed there never was any good reason for the enmity between the two nations, except in the way of commercial rivalry there are no causes of friction between Germany and Great Britain. On the other hand, Germany and Russia are naturally enemies because their territorial ambitions cannot be reconciled. Germany would like to acquire a portion of the Austrian dominions, and also to reconquer those German provinces which are now held by Russia; while Russia desires to extend her boundaries westward and acquire more territory in Europe either at the expense of Germany or of some other power. It was a part of the policy of Bismarck to develop friendly relations with Russia, but it is clear that this policy can only have a temporary force, because the time will come when the ambitions of the two powers will be irreconcilable. This compact with Great Britain is one of the triumphs of Lord Salisbury's diplomacy, and it will have a distinctly peaceful effect, showing as it does that Great Britain is by no means isolated, and that her alliance is regarded as more important than that of any other western nation.

Tory journalists who talk of the sympathy of the French-Canadians being France in the event of a war between that country and Great Britain appear to be not aware that Great Britain and France were at war for twenty years at the close of the last century and the beginning of the present one, yet not a line was struck from France by any French-Canadian. On the contrary when the United States, acting as the ally of France, went to war with Great Britain in 1812, and invaded Canada, the French-Canadians were as active and as brave in the defence of their country as the British Canadians.

## THE BOARD OF TRADE REPORT.

We publish elsewhere the report of the committee of the Board of Trade that waited on Mr. Blair in regard to the winter port business, and also of the committee that waited on Mr. Shaughnessy on the same subject. It must be admitted that the latter committee has made a very full presentation of Mr. Shaughnessy's side of the case. We would be disposed to give them great credit for their ability as reporters were it not for the fact that we understand that their report is largely made up of type written documents handed to them

by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Any one who takes the trouble to read the report will probably not be much impressed with Mr. Shaughnessy's ability as a reasoner. He makes no case whatever on behalf of his demand for the freight of the Intercolonial; he simply says that he must have it and that if the government will not give it to him he will not haul freight to St. John. That is the style of argument that prevailed in Hunkard House in the brave days of Dick Turpin and Claude Duval, but we have never before seen them applied to railway business. Perhaps, however, the P. R. which has been so highly favored by former governments has begun to think that it is a law unto itself, and that the ordinary rules of business do not apply to it.

The same gives a fuller explanation of Mr. Foster's movements, as connected with the acceptance of the nomination of the Conservatives to the city of St. John. It says that he was extremely anxious to meet Mr. Blair and for that reason he had himself nominated for Sunbury-Queens. We have never observed that Mr. Foster accepted this nomination, and it was well known that Mr. Blair would not probably run for his former constituency. The fact is that Mr. Foster held out until Mr. Hetherington's name was put forward, and then he came to the conclusion that he could not be elected for Sunbury-Queens. His running in St. John has simply been due to the fact that he waited too long for a constituency and had no other place to run except in St. John. No doubt he came to the conclusion that it would be less disagreeable to be beaten in St. John by the minister of railways than in any other part of New Brunswick, for beaten he was bound to be no matter where he ran.

On the evening of February 22, 1887, although the Tory government had been sustained, the Liberals of St. John had won a great victory and they met in the hall of the Mechanics' Institute to rejoice over it. Among them were Dr. Silas Alvord and Dr. A. A. Stockton, both good Liberals, and both made speeches. Among other things the latter said that on the night before he had the pleasure of addressing the electors of the west side, and he ventured the prediction that the knell of boodism was about to be rung. It had been. He had made many charges of corruption against the government during the campaign. The government, on the Sun, had not attempted to answer these except by abuse. He was happy that the Liberal party had carried three seats which they had not carried for years. This was a rebuke to the people who were now living on the spoils of the government.

Now Dr. Stockton is marching arm in arm with the men he then denounced as "boodlers," and is in full accord with the abusive Sun. The Sun has been attacking Mr. Tarte because Dr. Tarte said that Mr. Cahen's friends in Cambridge were making appeals to race and religious prejudice. The following paragraph, which appeared in the Parishore Leader, would seem to justify, to the fullest extent, Dr. Tarte's statement:

"At no time is it advisable for a man to exercise the right of voting rashly. Before voting ponder over the matter. Consider that at the present moment the slightest spark would ignite a bloody conflict between Britain and her old and sworn enemy France and should a war occur where would the sympathy of Canada be? We know where the sympathy of noble old Cumberland would be but here would the sympathy be of the men who now lead the present administration? Think over it carefully and placing love of country loyalty to our race first, vote as your best judgment dictates irrespective of party affiliations or monetary considerations."

The meaning of the above, if it has any meaning, is that in the event of a war between Great Britain and France the sympathy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government would be on the side of France. If this is not appealing to race and religious prejudice what appeal would bear that character. Dr. Gilchrist, who spoke at the North End meeting on Friday evening, said something in regard to alleged disloyalty of a branch of the Liberal party, and warned his audience against placing their votes in favor of such. It would be interesting to know just to whom he refers, is the Hon. Mr. Blair a disloyal man, or is there anything to be said against the loyalty of Lieut. Colonel Tucker? It would be difficult to find anything worse in the form of disloyalty than the declaration made by Sir Charles Tupper in August last that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was too British for him. What does Dr. Gilchrist think of the Conservative candidate for Acadouche, Mr. Gellay, who told his hearers at a meeting just one week ago that the English went to South Africa simply for robbery, plunder and rapine, and who delivered a most eloquent eulogy on the Boers? This is very treasonable language, but it is not much worse than some of the speeches that Sir Charles Tupper himself made in the province of Quebec.

Tory journalists who talk of the sympathy of the French-Canadians being France in the event of a war between that country and Great Britain appear to be not aware that Great Britain and France were at war for twenty years at the close of the last century and the beginning of the present one, yet not a line was struck from France by any French-Canadian. On the contrary when the United States, acting as the ally of France, went to war with Great Britain in 1812, and invaded Canada, the French-Canadians were as active and as brave in the defence of their country as the British Canadians.

Tory journalists who talk of the sympathy of the French-Canadians being France in the event of a war between that country and Great Britain appear to be not aware that Great Britain and France were at war for twenty years at the close of the last century and the beginning of the present one, yet not a line was struck from France by any French-Canadian. On the contrary when the United States, acting as the ally of France, went to war with Great Britain in 1812, and invaded Canada, the French-Canadians were as active and as brave in the defence of their country as the British Canadians.

do all in his power to build up the trade of the port.

All which is respectfully submitted.  
(Sgd.) D. J. McLAUGHLIN,  
G. WETMORE MERRITT,  
T. H. ESTABROOKS,  
JOHN SEALE,  
THOS. GORMAN.

To the Council of the Saint John Board of Trade.

The committee appointed to confer with Mr. T. G. Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with regard to winter port traffic, beg to submit the following report:

On communicating with Montreal, it was found that Mr. Shaughnessy was on his return from a tour of inspection in the west, and that, in order to confer promptly with him, it would be necessary to proceed to Montreal.

Feeling that the matter was one of vital importance to St. John, the committee urged Mr. McLaughlin, the president of the board, to accompany them, but owing to the fact that he was unable to do so.

Mr. Shaughnessy, who had only returned to Montreal on the morning of the day of the interview took place, at once arranged to meet the committee, and received them with every courtesy.

The result of their interview, which took place on the 15th inst., was as follows:

1. The committee explained the object of their visit, pointing out the large expenditure of money and the loss of time and freight in the winter port business, and asked Mr. Shaughnessy to state the reasons for his demand for the freight of the Intercolonial.

2. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

3. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

4. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

5. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

6. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

7. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

8. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

9. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

10. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

11. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

12. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

13. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

14. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

15. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

16. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

17. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

18. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

19. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

20. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that the freight of the Intercolonial was a matter of great importance to him, and that he was unable to do otherwise than demand it.

at all times ready and willing to meet the minister of railways and discuss the question of permanent arrangements for traffic via St. John; that a short time after the memorandum had been made and practically revoked he had seen the minister for a short time in his office at Ottawa, and that since that time the minister of railways and canals had never intimated a desire that Mr. Shaughnessy should call upon him to discuss the arrangements, so that some agreement might be made early in the present year, covering a definite term of years and thus placing the whole winter port traffic on a permanent basis. Mr. Shaughnessy stated that he would have at any time called upon the minister had he felt that it was the duty of the P. R. to do so.

2. Mr. Shaughnessy was then asked why it was that difficulties between the government and the P. R. as to traffic arrangements between the I. C. R. and the C. P. R. at St. John prevented the C. P. R. from entering into the contract for the conveyance of freight to Montreal and the west for shipment during the winter months at St. John. The committee pointed out that the C. P. R. would receive for some seven years more a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had contributed liberally through the Carleton Place railway and the Grand Trunk, and the deep-water wharves and other improvements; and they asked if it was fair to St. John that the \$180,000 tons of freight should be sent to Montreal, and that St. John should not receive a subsidy of \$180,000 per annum in connection with the line from Montreal to St. John; that St. John had