

THE HERALD

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12th, 1905. SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 A YEAR, PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY JAMES MCISAAC Editor & Proprietor.

Our Provincial Debt.

The report of the Provincial Auditor on the Public Accounts of this Province for the year ending 31st Dec., 1904, was tabled in the Legislature yesterday. Three months and a half after the close of the financial year is surely a very long time to wait for this statement. But this is the way the Government conduct the business of the Province, not in accordance with the wishes of the people, but just as suits their own pleasure, regardless of the welfare and convenience of the electorate. But when the financial statements which these accounts reveal is published, no one will be surprised that the Government should keep the knowledge from the people as long as possible. The report shows that the expenditures for the year amounted to \$375,880.13, while the receipts were \$307,730.50, leaving a deficit on the year's transactions of \$68,149.63. The debt of the Province on the 31st Dec. 1904 was, according to the Government's own admission, \$730,222.73. Of course the debt was considerably more than that; but taking their own statements it was in all conscience, quite enough. What do the people now think of the party and the Government that promised to make revenue and expenditure meet, and now have to meet the House, after fourteen years, with an acknowledged debt of over \$730,000, and a deficit on last year's transactions of over \$68,000?

In addition to the regular statement of revenue and expenditure, the report has what is called a "Temporary Account," showing the amount paid for hay to have been \$13,513.15, while the receipts for hay, as shown in the same account, amounted to \$3,553.56. This left an adverse balance on the hay account of \$9,959.59. This added to the figures already given, brings the deficit up to \$78,092.22, and the debt up to \$740,082.32.

The amount paid for interest during the year, as shown in the report, was \$26,334.76.

Sessional Notes.

After routine on Wednesday of last week, Mr. J. M. Clarke of Summerside, moved the address in reply to the speech of the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session. He made a very good speech, fairly moderate and well delivered. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bowlen, who spoke very briefly.

Mr. Mathieson, Leader of the opposition followed and made an excellent speech. It was logical and vigorous. After congratulating the mover and seconder of the address, he proceeded, in a masterly manner, to analyze the speech under review. He showed up in splendid style the tortuous and misleading course pursued by the Government in their conduct of the affairs of our Province. Mr. Mathieson held up to public ridicule the duplicity of the Government regarding the question of the fishery award. In 1901 the Government sought to make the people believe the question was so far advanced towards settlement that all that was necessary was to vote the money. Later the matter seemed to have retrograded and a case was to be prepared for the Supreme Court. Subsequently it was discovered the Province had no legal claim on the Federal Government in the matter, and the whole case was to be submitted to arbitration. Later on the question was to be submitted to the Imperial Privy Council to determine whether or not we had an equitable claim. Now it seems to have been pushed back beyond where it was, according to the Government's contention, in 1901. After placing the matter in all these different attitudes, the Government now tell us they hope a case may be prepared for the Supreme Court. This is surely sufficiently contradictory to suit almost anyone. At the same time the Minister of Marine has said in Parliament that no action is to be taken in the matter. The Leader of the opposition took Mr. Peters severely

to task for his mismanagement of the representation case. Had the Leader of the Government kept our case clear of that of New Brunswick as evidently could have been done, we might have got a different verdict from the Privy Council. Mr. Mathieson severely criticised the Government's conduct in the matter of importing hay. This matter should have been conducted by the Commissioner of Agriculture and should have been attended to earlier in the season. As to funding the Provincial debt, Mr. Mathieson was in favor of it provided it was done in a way as advantageous as possible to the Province. The Government, he thought, should have shown themselves alive to the inconvenience and loss sustained by the Island in the matter of our winter communication. The Government should have co-operated with the delegation that had gone to Ottawa. Mr. Mathieson thought the Government should exert itself in the matter of securing suitable emigrants from the old country to settle in this Province. This could be done by co-operating with the Federal emigration officials. He knew from experience in Manitoba and the West that many from the British Isles, who had been comparative failures in the West would very likely succeed here as the conditions were more akin to those in the old country than were those of the West.

The Leader of the Government followed and tried in the same old way to buoy up the conduct of the Government on the different questions under consideration. He was speaking at 6 o'clock and resumed when the House met on Thursday.

Mr. Fraser followed and made a very good speech. The speech from the throne foreshadowed little or no legislation. There were many matters of the greatest importance to this Province that might very well occupy the attention of the members of the House. The matter in which our winter roads were allowed to remain was sorely in need of improvement. Our education laws needed considerable attention and were susceptible of great improvement. He had nothing to say against our present Superintendent of Education; but he considered the system should be changed. He thought the Superintendent of Education should occupy a seat in the House and be responsible to the people. The frequent changes of our school text books was not only a hardship; but an imposition. Why were so many and such changes allowed? Regarding the representation question, he considered our case was badly managed in being permitted to be tacked onto that of New Brunswick when presented to the Privy Council. He hoped this question would not be allowed to drop. It seems that Quebec is to have her boundaries enlarged, and in that case it would be very unfair for our representation to hinge upon the population of a new Quebec instead of the Quebec of Confederation. Taking up the question of the fishery award he said he had noticed that the Premier had refused to be bound by the different versions of the progress of the case as published in the Patriot newspaper. Were we to assume that these phases of the question as presented by the Government organ were just like any other fish story? Mr. Fraser quoted from the revised edition of Hansard the answers of the Minister of Marine to Mr. Martin, which plainly showed the Federal Government did not intend to distribute this award among the Provinces interested. The Government's attitude in the matter was quite contradictory. Mr. Peters had acknowledged he had no legal claim, but when he spoke to the Minister of Justice about an equitable claim, the Minister, according to Mr. Peters, stared at him and asked what he meant by equity. Now Mr. Peters says the case is to be presented to the Supreme Court; but the court can only try a legal claim. There is no legal claim, consequently we have no case for the Court.

Mr. Agnew followed Mr. Fraser and spoke briefly. He was followed from the opposition by Mr. A. J. McDonald. Mr. McDonald was glad to observe that several of the Government speakers were in favor of county Exhibitions. He agreed with them in this particular. He scored the Government for the unfair manner in which they had distributed the hay. Discussing the Fishery Award, he said he never expected

it would be distributed among the Provinces and consequently he was not disappointed. He went on to show how the bounty to the fishermen originated from the interest of the award. As the award was in consequence of the fish taken from our waters by the Americans, it was proper that the fishermen should benefit, to some extent, from the earnings of the award. At the same time this Province must have a large claim on account of the reduction in the amount of the bounty now paid us as compared to what we received when it originated. We then received something like \$15,000 a year; now we receive less than \$10,000. There was a wrong there that should be remedied.

The debate was conducted on the Government side by Messrs. McMillan, Hassard and Warburton. Mr. McKinnon took up the debate on the opposition side and made an excellent speech. Referring to the question of winter communication and the procuring of a new steamer, he said the matter had had not been made to do what they could in the matter, nor anything like it. Members on the Government side spoke loudly of the victory gained by the Government at the polls. These victories gained as they had been were very little to boast about. They were won under false pretences and by following in the wake of the Dominion elections. The fishery award had done duty for the last seven years; but we were evidently as far from any benefit therefrom as we were when the question was brought up by the Government. Claiming to be economists the Government had rolled up the debt by huge deficits, especially on election years, till we were now face to face with a debt of over \$700,000. The Government's tortuous and unfair conduct in the distribution of the imported hay was well shown up. Hon. Mr. Hughes continued for the Government. He was speaking at 6 o'clock and continued in the evening.

Mr. Prowse took up the argument for the opposition and spoke well, concisely and to the point. Referring to the speech with which the session was opened, he said it was made up of a series of regrets. The Government's hay policy certainly has not helped us in the eyes of the world, he said; but no doubt it helped the Government supporters to secure their seats in the House. It was his opinion, however, it would be quite sick of the hay business before all was over. He challenged the Leader of the Government or any of his colleagues to grant the opposition a commission of inquiry into the hay business. It was not the wants of the people so much as a desire for votes by which the Government were actuated in the matter. Why had not the Government steamers been employed in bringing the hay when they had little else to do last fall? He considered the representation case had been badly bungled. It should not have been bracketed with that of New Brunswick. The case should have been withdrawn rather than presented in that way. Mr. Prowse scored the Premier on the duplicity and disingenuousness exhibited in connection with the question of the fishery award. Why had the public accounts not yet been tabled? We had been obliged to wait two months while the headless Government were waiting to get the old head on again. The Government, when in opposition, had raised against a debt of \$128,000; but while in power they had increased it to upwards of \$700,000. The Leader of the Government had said the delegates to Ottawa represented nobody. Well, the delegates were appointed in consequence of a meeting convened principally by the activities of Capt. Joseph Reid, one of the Premier's supporters. Did he condemn his supporter and former colleague in the Government?

This closed the debate with the Speaker in the chair. House went into committee and passed the address clause by clause, after Mr. Mathieson had called attention to a very serious error in construction. The chairman of the committee thanked the Leader of the Opposition and gladly amended the paragraph. The Leader of the Government carpentered at Mr. Mathieson for his criticism, but got such a combing down from the Leader of the Opposition that he became as meek as a lamb.

On Friday after routine several bills were introduced and read a first time, the House then adjourned till Monday afternoon.

Several of Acute Bronchitis by MINARD'S LINIMENT. Bay of Islands J. M. CAMPBELL I was cured of Facial Neuralgia by MINARD'S LINIMENT. Springfield, N. S. WM. DANIELS I was cured of Chronic Rheumatism by MINARD'S LINIMENT. Albert Co. N. B. GEO. TINGLEY

Without his knowledge If that has taken place it has been wholly without my knowledge and without my participation, and I never heard of it in any way whatever until last Saturday, when the matter was brought to my notice by a telegram from the Toronto Globe. On Monday last I brought down to the house a return to an address moved for some time ago by Roche (Marquette), asking for copies of all correspondence that had taken place between the government of Manitoba and this government on the subject of the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. The last paper upon this return was the acknowledgment of the receipt of our reply to the prayer of the Manitoba government. We have received since that time a further rejoinder by Manitoba to our reply; We did not bring it down on Monday with the return because we had not then received it. It arrived at the privy council office only yesterday, and I at once gave orders to the clerk of the privy council to have it prepared for presentation to the house, and I have to day laid it on the table of the house. In all this there was no evidence of an intention to conceal anything. There was nothing to conceal. This was a public document. Then

Dominion Parliament.

The greatest possible interest attached to the Parliamentary proceedings last week, and no inconsiderable excitement prevailed in consequence of a new turn given to the discussions on Manitoba affairs. On Tuesday the 4th, Hon. Mr. Rogers of the Manitoba Government, gave out a lengthy official document at Winnipeg, embracing the following statement:

"On Feb. 13 we received a formal invitation by telegram from Sir Wilfrid to come to Ottawa as soon as convenient. We left on Feb. 14 and arrived on the afternoon of the 16th, when we received a letter from Sir Wilfrid at the Russell House saying he would meet us at his office at noon on Friday, 17th. During that interview we presented the claims of our province as urgently and as strongly as possible. In reply, Sir Wilfrid said that if we would remain in Ottawa for three or four days he would again send for us and would then be in a position to give us an answer. Three days later, on Feb. 20, a letter was received from his excellency Mgr. Sbarretti asking for a conference. This invitation was accepted, and his Excellency the ablegate then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on the statute book of our province it would greatly facilitate the early settlement of our mission, the fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to the shores of Hudson Bay. His excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward.

HIS EXCELLENCY'S PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

"Following is a copy of his excellency's memorandum containing his proposed amendments to the Manitoba School Act. Add to Sec. 125 (B). And when in any city or town there shall be thirty or more Roman Catholic children, and also thirty or more non-Roman Catholic children, or in any village more than fifteen of each of such classes, the trustees shall, if requested by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of either such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes. Add to Sec. 48 (B). And when in any district there shall be fifteen or more Roman Catholic children and fifteen or more non-Roman Catholic children, the trustees shall, if required by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of either of such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes and employ for them respectively Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic teachers."

RECEIVED NO REPLY.

"Notwithstanding Sir Wilfrid's invitation and our interview, followed by this promise, of which he was reminded by our letter, strange to say that up to this very hour we have had no reply to ours of February 23. What more natural conclusion can be arrived at than that Sir Wilfrid is simply killing time and making protest in order that the polite instructions of his excellency Monsignor Sbarretti could be acted upon by Manitoba.

Immediately after routine in the House of Commons, on Wednesday the 8th, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, evidently anticipating cross-examination from the Opposition started in to explain the Manitoba affair. He read Rogers' statement in full and commented as he proceeded. He said: "In so far as there is a charge that there was an understanding between Mgr. Sbarretti and myself to have the school question considered in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, there is no," said Sir Wilfrid, "a shadow of truth in it. I assert that if Mr. Rogers states that Mgr. Sbarretti did press him to make the suggestion of terms and conditions, which he says he did with my knowledge and consent, he states something which is not in accordance with truth.

WITHOUT HIS KNOWLEDGE

"When the orders of the day were reached on Thursday afternoon, the discussion on the Manitoba matter was resumed by Mr. Borden, Leader of the opposition, and continued by Mr. Foster and several other speakers. Mr. Borden said: "Since the discussion of yesterday a statement has been made by his excellency, Monsignor Sbarretti. I do not know anything of the circumstances under which the delegate was in the first place brought to this country beyond what has been stated by gentlemen on the other side of house, who have personal knowledge of that which they state. As I gather from them, the delegate apostolic came to this country in 1897, not at the instance of the bishops in Canada but at the instance of some forty liberal members of parliament, members of the Roman Catholic church. I understand that there was no demand for the appointment of a delegate so far as the bishops are concerned. I rely entirely on what has been said by honorable gentlemen on the other side, by the prime minister, by Mr. Bourassa and others, who have very frankly stated the position of affairs in that regard. The delegate came as stated, because there was a certain misunderstanding between the laity and the clergy. I understood him to say that a difference arose in connection with the Manitoba school question. However, the delegate came in the first place on account of a political question

I see by the correspondence that the order of the Manitoba government was passed on March 31. It was sent to us on the following day (Saturday). It could not, therefore, get here until yesterday morning, and as soon as it was received by us, as I said a moment ago, I gave instructions to have it prepared and I laid it on the table of the house so as to form a part of the correspondence which the people of this country have the right to have before them."

THAT CORRESPONDENCE

Sir Wilfrid then read again from Mr. Rogers' statement regarding the invitation from Mgr. Sbarretti for the Manitoba delegates to a conference with him. "According to this statement," Sir Wilfrid continued, "it appears that Mr. Rogers and Colin Campbell, who were the delegates of the Manitoba government, had a conference with Mgr. Sbarretti, the papal delegate. There has been a rumor in the press—not in the press, but at all events about the corridors of this house—that this conference had been brought about by means of one of my colleagues. I have to say to the house, and I have the authority of my colleagues for this, that there never was any conference brought about by them between the delegates and Mgr. Sbarretti, and I have to make the further statement, neither myself nor any of my colleagues were the intermediaries between Mgr. Sbarretti and the delegates of Manitoba. If there has been such a conference, how it came about I cannot say. Perhaps Mgr. Sbarretti may have had previous communications with these gentlemen. I do not know. Perhaps he knew them and perhaps that is the reason why he called upon them to have a conference. At all events, it is no concern of mine. I know nothing, and I never knew anything of it until this day, nor did the government. What conversation took place between the papal delegate, Mr. Rogers and Colin Campbell, I do not know. This is a question perhaps as to which there may be something later on. I do not know."

On Thursday morning, Mr. Sbarretti handed out for publication the following statement:

"I think it my duty to declare that the Press report of a conference with the Manitoba delegates is not altogether exact, and that it is given in such a way as to make a false impression on the minds of the people. These are the facts: Taking occasion of the presence in Ottawa of the Hon. Mr. Campbell, the attorney general of Manitoba, whom I had met in a friendly way more than a year ago, I invited him to come to see me. I never met Hon. Mr. Rogers, nor did I have any communication with him. On the evening before his departure for the west, Feb. 23rd, Mr. Campbell came. I asked him if something could not be done to improve the conditions of the Catholics of this province with respect to education. I pointed out that in the cities of Winnipeg and Brandon, for instance, the Catholics were paying double taxes. I urged my request on the ground of fairness and justice, and referring to his mission to Ottawa, I remarked that from the point of view of the Manitoba government some action on these lines would be politically expedient to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba. Mr. Campbell then asked me what would be my desire in this respect. I then gave him the memorandum, which has already appeared in the press. This is the sum and substance of my interview with Mr. Campbell. The federal government had absolutely no knowledge of it. It was a private conversation, and simply intended to express a suggestion and a desire that the condition of the Catholics in the respect I have mentioned would be improved. Any other assumption or interpretation is altogether unfounded. I think my right of speaking to Mr. Campbell in a private way and on my own responsibility cannot be disputed.

When the orders of the day were reached on Thursday afternoon, the discussion on the Manitoba matter was resumed by Mr. Borden, Leader of the opposition, and continued by Mr. Foster and several other speakers. Mr. Borden said: "Since the discussion of yesterday a statement has been made by his excellency, Monsignor Sbarretti. I do not know anything of the circumstances under which the delegate was in the first place brought to this country beyond what has been stated by gentlemen on the other side of house, who have personal knowledge of that which they state. As I gather from them, the delegate apostolic came to this country in 1897, not at the instance of the bishops in Canada but at the instance of some forty liberal members of parliament, members of the Roman Catholic church. I understand that there was no demand for the appointment of a delegate so far as the bishops are concerned. I rely entirely on what has been said by honorable gentlemen on the other side, by the prime minister, by Mr. Bourassa and others, who have very frankly stated the position of affairs in that regard. The delegate came as stated, because there was a certain misunderstanding between the laity and the clergy. I understood him to say that a difference arose in connection with the Manitoba school question. However, the delegate came in the first place on account of a political question

which arose in this country. His functions have been to some extent at least political, and perhaps more political than ecclesiastical. NOW THE RIGHT HON. GENTLEMAN. has laid a great deal of stress upon the fact that no communication from the executive of Manitoba in regard to the boundary question had come to this government before the month of January last. But my hon. friend was aware that the question had been brought up in the Manitoba legislature; that resolutions, unanimously concurred in by his own political friends in Manitoba have been passed by the legislature and that when he sent his letter into the Northwest in the month of September, last announcing that new provinces would be created, he knew well that the question would be for the fore as soon as the bill was introduced for the purpose of creating these provinces. Therefore the boundary question was very much to the fore during the present year.

was amazed. In conclusion, the opposition leader said: "I notice that my hon. friends opposite charged very much the statement that 'Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools, and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba. That is what they cheer, as I understand. I am amazed at these hon. gentlemen. (Hear, hear.) The other day we had the ex-minister of the interior rise in his place and publicly thank the prime minister, without whose aid, he said, the Catholics of Manitoba could not have been deprived of those rights—publicly thank the right hon. gentleman for having come to the aid of the majority in Manitoba, and for having prevented the conservative government from restoring to the minority those rights of which they had been deprived. (Loud conservative cheers. The right hon. gentleman has declared this to be a happy solution of a difficult situation. But hon. gentlemen who oppose the utterance which I have just quoted. Their attitude is a little incomprehensible to myself, and I think it must be incomprehensible to any reasonable man throughout the country. (conservative cheers.)

HIS EXCELLENCY. Now, let me observe a little what his excellency does say. He is an able and accomplished man, brought up in one of the best schools of diplomacy in the world, a diplomat, a man who would make no suggestion. I am sure to Mr. Campbell or to Mr. Rogers, which he did not feel himself able to carry out. And let us see if my hon. friends opposite will cheer a little analysis of what his excellency does say: "I remarked that from the point of view of the Manitoba government some action on these lines would be politically expedient." Politically expedient, mark you, "and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools, and to be subjected to the educational conditions which exist in Manitoba."

Conditions which the right honorable gentleman himself stated in 1897 were absolutely satisfactory not only to himself, but to the people of the province of Quebec. "Politically expedient," what does that mean? He has said, and the prime minister has said, that that interview was not arranged on behalf of the government, but at the instance of the gentleman, but I do not observe in the statement of his excellency that he did not consider himself to have authority to make the suggestion which he did make to the Hon. Mr. Campbell on that occasion. If there was a supposed authority, or if beyond that there was real authority given on behalf of the government, or given by any member of the government, how does the action of the members of this administration contrast with their attitude in 1896? Then their cry, at least in most of the provinces of Canada, was: "No coercion, hands off Manitoba." That was in answer to a remedial order and remedial legislation proposed by a conservative administration within the strict terms of the constitution. But any such action as has been suggested might readily be regarded, I think, as a remedial order of another type—as a remedial order of an unconstitutional and unwarrantable character, and I for one am a little surprised that even upon the statement of his excellency, which I have do doubt is absolutely accurate in every respect; there should have been this suggestion to the members of the government of the province of Manitoba. I am not concerned with the question as to whether or not his excellency should be recalled. As I said yesterday, he is not responsible to us in any sense. He is responsible only to his own superior.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE.

But the government of this country are responsible to us, and if there has been any suggestion of this kind by or on behalf of the government of this country, or by or on behalf of any member of it, then I say the country will demand, and I think the people will demand the dismissal or retirement of any member of this government who ventured to confer upon his excellency any authority of that kind. He is not responsible to us, but the members of the administration are. This was not an ecclesiastical matter. It concerns ecclesiastical matters, it seems to me, in no way whatever. It was to all intents and purposes a purely political matter, the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. I venture to think that in addition to the explanations which were given by the prime minister yesterday in this regard there should be some further explanations made to the house and to the country to-day, in view of the very frank statement which has been made by his excellency, and which I have brought to the attention of the house. I move the adjournment of the house.

She—To think that he should treat me so? And told me he loved me his whole heart.

He—that was all right; but you see since then he has been suffering with heart failure.

Stanley Bros.

GREAT SALE OF DRY GOODS! NOW ON.

Our Whole Stock OF HIGH CLASS MERCHANDISE

AT FOR 25 to 50 per cent. Off Regular Prices. STANLEY BROS.

More Bargains IN WINTER GOODS

Blankets. We have 4 grades in the pure wool blankets. Each grade marked at a special price, \$4.05, \$5.50, \$6.25, \$7.00. Here are three special values in low price blankets. For real good value they cannot be equalled, \$2.50, \$2.90, \$3.90.

Flannelette Waists. We have a small lot of about 2 dozen Flannelette Waists in very pretty patterns and shades all new this fall. They are marked \$1.15 each. We want to clear them out at once, so to-day you take your choice at 70 cents each.

Ladies' Coats. To-day we place on sale six cloth coats at a special price of \$8.90 each. You can see them in our eastern show window. They are one of the best values we have ever offered in ladies' coats. If you need a new coat see them at once.

Ladies' Underwear. Ribbed cotton fleece undervests long sleeve special 25 cents. White ribbed cotton fleece vests, long sleeve, special price 35 cents. Ribbed union vests with long sleeves, special price 50 cents.

Hosiery. Imit. ribbed cashmere hose, regular value 20 cts., special price 16 cents. Ribbed and plain all wool cashmere hose, special price 25 cents. Special line of heavy ribbed all wool stockings, special price 30 cents.

Men's Underwear. Men's heavy fleece lined underwear, a splendid line marked 60 cents per garment, special to-day per garment 50 cents. Men's all wool unshrinkable underwear per garment 75 cents. Men's black cashmere half hose, spliced heels and toes, seamless feet, special price 25 cents.

Sale of Dress Skirts. These skirts are made in the very latest styles. The material is just the right weight for this season at the year. There are about 15 skirts in the lot, all well finished and perfect fitting. Come in to day and have a look at them.

F. Perkins & Co.,

The Millinery Leaders, SUNNYSIDE.