

The Carleton Observer

VOL. XV., NO. 51.

\$2.00 a Year

HARTLAND, N. B., JUNE 4, 1924.

Single Copies 5c

WHOLE NO. 730.

IF YOU PATRONIZE The Everyday Bargain Store YOU LEARN TO SAVE MONEY!

Wash Goods at Attractive Prices

38 IN. IMPORTED SCOTCH GINGHAM at 45c YD.
In plain and fancy stripes

FRENCH IMPORTED RATINEES, AT 65c YD. UP
Fancy, checked and plain

PLAIN CREPES, 38 inches wide, at 40c YD.
They come in all the new colors

Also Vestings, Nainsook, Dimity, Voiles

NEW ARRIVALS:

Floor Oil Cloth, 2 yds. wide at \$1.10 yd. Very pleasing design and attractive values.

Curtain Scrims, fine quality, 36 in. wide, at 20c yard. Colors, white, cream, ecru.

THE HOUSE WITH THE STOCK

A. W. PHILLIPS & CO.

BRISTOL N B

ELECTRIC MOTORS

We can supply Electric Motors in size from a tenth h.p. to many horse power, and instal them in proper manner. You cannot get better service for less money. Will instal at any point served by Carleton Electric. If you doubt the efficiency and cheapness of Hydro Power ask any present user.

HARTLAND ELECTRIC CO., Ltd
Electricians



SIMMONS BEDS 'Built for Sleep'

No matter how simple or how elaborately furnished the bedrooms of your home may be—there is a Simmons Bed of a design and finish that will harmonize exactly. Artistic beauty, refinement, design and elegance of finish characterize every number. Simmons steel beds, in either "twin" or "double" widths, are masterpieces of beauty, and unlike beds of wood, they cannot warp, become loose jointed or noisy. They are strong, correctly proportioned, serviceable, thoroughly sanitary and 100% comfortable. Let us show you these new designs.

With the above beds you need an OSTERMOORE MATTRESS and comfortable refreshing sleep is assured. They last a life time.

JOHN T. G. CARR
Agent for Simmons, Limited



Simmons
Bed and
Bedding
Made for
Sleep

SPEECH OF T. W. CALDWELL, M. P.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): If I felt that an apology was necessary on my part for contributing to the debate at this late hour it would be the fact that I have occupied, not only during this session but in the last session as well, as little time as any hon. member has done. I have been particularly impressed with the speeches that have been delivered in this debate, although the whole discussion has been somewhat like one of the serial stories that one reads in the magazines; it is difficult to keep in mind just what transpired in the first chapter. However, I do not wish to review the whole story, but I shall content myself with dealing with a few things that have been said in the debate. I do not propose spending very much time in any discussion of the budget, which has been very well considered by hon. gentlemen in this group, the attitude of the Progressive group party having been clearly defined not only by its leader (Mr. Forke but also by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crozier) and other hon. gentlemen on this side who have spoken. I was very impressed with some of the sentences that fell from the lips of the Prime Minister this afternoon as well as from the hon. member for Marquette, both having largely stated the same views in certain respects. I refer particularly to the plea for unity in this country, if we expect to attain to that full stature of nationhood which is ours by right, by the gifts of Nature, and by providence. I heartily agree with the Prime Minister's statement that the aim of the government should be to unify or harmonize the different elements in this country. With that feeling I desire to associate myself, although there are some very prominent men in Canada who seem to devote their whole energy to making this ideal an impossibility by trying to set one interest and one section of the country against the other. In this respect I wish to quote from a speech made in the House last year, which by the way I had not the pleasure of hearing. As a matter of fact, I was unaware of it having been made until after publication when I discovered that it had been printed in pamphlet form and distributed where the hon. member who delivered it, evidently thought it would do the most good, or from my point of view, the most harm. Now I quote from a speech made in this House on February 8 last year by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter). I will not quote the whole speech because a great deal of it is not worth repeating.

An hon. MEMBER: Which member for St. John?

Mr. CALDWELL: The member who spoke to-night, I could define him so you would know beyond question if I thought it necessary. That part of his speech which I am now about to quote relates to the restoration of the Crownsnest pass agreement and its effect on eastern farmers. This quotation will be found on page 137 of last year's Hansard:

In his parliamentary speech last year potatoes were not mentioned. Now, can you tell me anything that distinguishes the man who grows grain from the man who grows potatoes? Is there any reason why a burden should be even partially lifted from the one and yet allowed to remain upon the other? I know my hon. friends will not say there is any reason. Well, then, what happened? The government's action paralyzed the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the potato growers of New Brunswick could not seek relief in that quarter. Railway rates were so much reduced that the railway companies, which have to pay their bills like every company, had to get money from some source and the only source of course, of their revenue is the passengers and freight they handle. Therefore the Railway Commission could afford no relief by lowering the freight rates on potatoes or lumber, except upon one commodity only coming under the classification of building materials, namely, bricks, and in this instance the reduction was very small.

It is just possible that the hon. member was ignorant of the actual conditions when he made that statement; I hope so. Two months after the Crownsnest pass agreement was restored by legislation, and about five months before the hon. member made this speech, the potatoes of New Brunswick—what he refers to almost with tears in his eyes—got a greater reduction in freight rates than the farmers of the West secured on their grain. We obtained a reduction of over 25 per cent on our export rate, and all the potatoes we moved that year were for export. I shall refer

to the Crownsnest pass agreement a little later because even to-night the hon. member stated:

"The government makes the Crownsnest pass sacrifice for the benefit of the West."

It has been said that that agreement was only of benefit to the western grain grower. I therefore propose to show the benefit this agreement was to the eastern manufacturer and fruit grower in comparison with its benefit to the wheat grower. As we all know, the reduction of the rate on wheat was 3 cents per hundred pounds on a short haul on a rate that was only twenty three and one half cents a hundred pounds originally. This made our reduction over 25 per cent of the original rate. To show the absurdity of the statement made by



the hon. member—and I hope he was ignorant of the facts when he made it, because I would hate to think that any hon. member would make such a statement otherwise—to show the absurdity of the statement I have worked out the reductions per acre. I have taken twenty bushels of wheat per acre as the average yield, but I think it is above the average. That would be equivalent to twelve hundred pounds, or a reduction of 36 cents per acre to the western grain grower. Taking the average yield of potatoes at 100 barrels to the acre—which would be small, the yield last year running in some cases as high as 150 barrels to the acre—this would mean 15,000 pounds or a reduction of \$9.90 per acre. In other words a gain to the potato farmer of \$9.90 per acre, as against a gain to the wheat grower of 36 cents per acre.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago I moved a resolution in this House asking the government to establish frost-proof facilities at St. John in order that we might get our potatoes to market during the winter season at a rate that would return the farmer something for his product. I had some difficulty in convincing the government of the necessity for establishing these facilities. I made several trips to Ottawa and as to St. John, and at last almost despairing of being able to convince the government single-handed, I asked the secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of St. John to call a meeting of his board, which he kindly did. It was well attended, but the hon. member for St. John, although he professes to have the interests of the potato-growers of New Brunswick so much at heart, did not put in an appearance at the meeting of the Board of Trade realizing that these facilities at St. John would very much increase traffic through the port—a traffic which was at that time going through the port of Boston owing to our lack of facilities—got behind the project. As I say, the hon. member for St. John did not attend, although this meeting was for the purpose of urging the government to furnish facilities in his own port and to bring traffic to it, a subject upon which he is so insistent, and in which I heartily concur with him. I have estimated that the benefit to the potato-growers of New Brunswick would amount to 75 cents per barrel. As confirmation of this estimate, I shall quote an exact figure from a letter from one of our shippers who was very anxious to have these facilities established, giving his view of what it would mean to the potato-growers of New Brunswick. By the way, this saving of 75 cents per barrel would mean a saving of \$75 an acre, because it would get the short rate haul to St. John. When we shipped through Boston we not only had to pay the freight in American funds from point of shipment clear to Cuba, which in 1921 meant a discount of 15 per cent on our money. The discount is less now. This shipper has been shipping to Cuba for twelve or fourteen years, from Boston in cold weather and from St. John when there was no danger of frost. In writing

DAVID IRVINE DEAD A FORMER MEMBER

Carleton County Loses One of Oldest Residents

Centreville, May 28. Carleton county lost one of its oldest and most highly esteemed men in the person of David Irvine, former M. P., who died at his home here early this morning from heart trouble.

Mr. Irvine was born in the north of Ireland, but spent the greater part of his life in Knoxford, Carleton county, where he carried on successful farming operations. The late Mr. Irvine was a member of the Dominion Parliament and will be remembered as the only representative who ever returned his extra indemnity cheque for \$500, which had been voted by the members to themselves, after a prolonged session. He was a life-long Liberal in politics and a Methodist in religion. He had reached the advanced age of 92 years. His wife died several years ago. He is survived by two daughters, Miss Addie Irvine and Mrs. Hume, in British Columbia, and two sons, Horace and David, of Centreville.

The funeral services were conducted by Rev. Hugh Miller, pastor of the Methodist church.

me to urge upon the government to establish those frost-proof facilities, he said:

"Now, all we need is the government to do what they should do for this province, furnish us frost-proof facilities at the port of St. John and a line of twelve deck steamers out of St. John. They will not only be helping out the revenue of the Canadian Merchant Marine, but a boon to the farmers and shippers."

This is the interesting part: "If we had a rate of \$1 per barrel from St. John to Havana we could be paying the farmer in New Brunswick today \$2 for potatoes instead of 75 cents. Not only this but we would have a market which is a regular market for our products."

He estimated that the saving at that time would be \$1.25 per barrel. As I pointed out the discount on our money then was greater than it is today. However, I think, Mr. Speaker, you will admit that I am making a very conservative estimate in placing the saving to the shipper at 75 cents per barrel by the establishment of frost-proof facilities at St. John. Therefore I say that any hon. member who will stand up in this House and make a statement of this kind, if he knows the facts, is certainly not trying to promote national harmony.

With regard to the restoration of the Crownsnest pass agreement, the statement has been made repeatedly that it is a benefit only to the western grain-growers. I shall quote from the agreement itself and then give some figures as to the freight saving to other people besides the western grain grower. This is the agreement: "The Crownsnest pass agreement was an undertaking entered into in 1897 between the government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, whereby in consideration of a subsidy to be earned by the construction of the Crownsnest pass railway, which subsidy amounted to \$8,404,720, a reduction should be made in the rates upon the classes of merchandise below set out from and including Port William and all points east of Port William on the company's railway—"

I want the House to pay particular attention to this:

"to all points west of Port William on the company's main line or on any line of railway throughout Canada, owned or leased by, or operated on account of the company. The commodities, the classes of merchandise to be affected, are as follows:—"

"Upon all green and fresh fruits, 33 1/2 per cent;

"Coal oil, 20 per cent;

"Cordage and binder twine, 10 per cent;

"Agricultural implements of all kinds, set up in part, 10 per cent;

"Iron, including bar, band, Canada plates, galvanized, sheets, pipe, pipe-fittings, nails, spikes and horse shoes, 10 per cent;

"All kinds of wire, 10 per cent;

"Wire-rope glass, 10 per cent;

"Paper for building and roofing purposes, 10 per cent;

"Roofing felt, box and packing, 10 per cent;

"Paints of all kinds and oils, 10 per cent;

"Live stock, 10 per cent;

"Woodenware, 10 per cent;

"Household furniture, 10 per cent;

"The agreement also provided for a reduction in the rates on grain and flour from all points on the main line, branches or connections of the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Port William and Port Arthur. The decrease was fixed at 3 cents per hundred pounds to be reached in two annual reductions of a cent and a half each."

Another contention has been made that the Crownsnest pass agreement provided for a rate on grain away below the cost of hauling. I think I can prove conclusively that this is not the case, and I wish to quote briefly from the report of the Transportation committee of this House in 1922:

"The Crownsnest rate on grain and grain products remained in entirety from September 1, 1899, until October 7, 1903, when it was modified by a lower rate resulting from an agreement made between the province of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway. Lower rates continued until March 15, 1918, when an increase of (Continued on next page)

Town Topics

Tid-bits on the Tip of Everybodys Tongue

Vol. 1, No. 40.

Wednesday, June 4, 1924.

Free

FIRST AT WEMBLEY

A letter just received from Moir's London representative contains this passage:

"Yesterday I visited Wembley and met Mrs. C. M. Williams where I wrote the first order at your stand No. 4 and possibly the first order taken at the British

Empire Exhibition.

King George visited the exhibition the same day, a newspaper dispatch relating that he got weighed and found himself to be 154 lbs. He then ate some chocolates, displayed nearby.

If they were Moir's, he had a royal time!