

THE HERALD

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1907.
SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 A YEAR.
PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY
JAMES McISAAC
Editor & Proprietor

Please send in your subscriptions.

The Public accounts of the Province for the nine months ended 30th September 1906, have been submitted to the Legislature. According to the Government's own showing the deficit for the nine months is \$27,971.54, and the debt of the Province \$795,771.34. We will review the accounts next week.

Sessional Notes.

The Legislature has been two weeks in session and in that time has accomplished the herculean task of passing the address in reply to the speech, which His Honor the Lieutenant Governor, delivered on the opening day. Ordinarily the passing of the address is but the work of two or three days; but the fact that the Government have on this occasion succeeded in getting it through at the end of a fortnight seems to have afforded much joy to the faithful followers of the Premier. That they got a bad scare during the discussion was manifestly evident from remarks that fell from the Leader of the Government himself. But it remained for the Patriot, the Government organ, to indicate the feeling of relief produced by the final passing of the address. The organ was fairly beside itself, it simply went into hysterics and gave free expression to its idiotic malignity.

As we have already pointed out, the Leader of the Opposition in his speech following the mover and seconder of the address, in powerful words and logical argument pointed out the untenableness of the position occupied by the delegates, judging by the reports we have before us. He showed that our delegates could not possibly have done less than they did. As a matter of fact they might as well have stayed home, for the \$70,000 additional to our specific subsidy was agreed upon at the Conference of 1887, at which we were not represented at all. It came as a matter of course, in accordance with the scale of increases agreed upon at that conference. Where our delegates failed was in not putting in special claims for our Province in view of our special position. The opportunity to do this was afforded by the very first resolution passed at the opening of the Ottawa Conference. British Columbia's claims to special consideration were put in by Premier McBride and were, to some extent, considered and allowed. One hundred thousand dollars a year extra, for ten years were voted for the Pacific Province. Had our delegates put in a claim for one hundred and twenty thousand a year for our increased cost of education, public works, asylums and other public institutions since Confederation, it could not reasonably be refused. That was not the only particular in which our delegates failed to safeguard the interests of our Province, as was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition. Most indefensible of all, they failed to safeguard our Province, so far as receiving our per capita allowance on our maximum population is concerned. In consequence of this inexcusable negligence of our delegates we stand to lose \$5,000 a year forthwith, and to lose still more according as our population may decrease. This is what will happen if the conclusions of the Ottawa conference are crystallized into law and form the basis of an amendment to the British North America Act. All these points were vigorously pressed home by the Leader of the Opposition.

In his reply, the Leader of the Government spoke long and loud, and digressed in many directions; but he failed to convince his listeners that he and his co-delegate had done, or tried to do, the best they could for Prince Edward Island. The Premier declared that the only financial question discussed at the Conference was the matter of the specific subsidies for government and legislation. If that were so, our delegates might as well have been home, for these specific subsidies were not a matter of dispute. They had been agreed upon at the Quebec conference of 1887, and have not since been changed.

True, he said, the question of the per capita allowance came incidentally. But he failed to explain why he voted for the amendment of resolution C, by which Alberta and Saskatchewan were included, with Manitoba and British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island dropped therefrom, although he and his colleagues were armed with a resolution of our Legislature, passed last session, to specially guard our rights in this particular.

Mr. Morson followed the Premier and in a most comprehensive speech showed the weakness of the position assumed by the Leader of the Government and the untenable ground occupied by him. He first pointed out the Premier's inconsistency regarding the public meetings held in different parts of the Province. When the Premier was invited to attend the public meeting at Kensington, he declined on the ground that he did not think that a proper place to hold such a meeting. If a meeting were called at Charlottetown he would attend it, he said. Since then he had said, in answer to requests to attend other meetings, that he should report to the Legislature before reporting to any meetings. But, in the face of this he had sent out a report of the proceedings of the conference, and more than that, had attended meetings in the first district of Queens at a by election and had defended the doings of the conference. The financial results of the conference had been the chief question discussed at these meetings; at one of these meetings the Premier had said he expected the increased subsidies would appear in the Dominion estimates this year. But they have not thus far. Mr. Morson brushed aside the sophistry indulged in by members on the Government side, relative to the \$70,000 giving Prince Edward Island more per capita than any other Province. This subsidy was not calculated on a per capita basis at all. It was an allowance for legislative and government and a Province with a small population costs proportionately more for these purposes than one with a large population. Mr. Morson wanted to know why it was that the Premier and Mr. Hughes did not carry out the expressed wish of this Legislature in its amendment last year to the resolution of 1902. This was for the purpose of safe-guarding our rights to our per capita allowance on the maximum population. Could the delegates explain why the direction of the Legislature in its session of 1906 was not carried out? The Premier of British Columbia and Ontario put in their special claims and because Premier McBride kicked he got a million of money for his Province. What did our delegates get? Nothing but the increase allowed by the resolutions of 1887. What did they try to get in addition thereto? Nothing. Referring to the declaration of the Premier to the effect that nothing was discussed except the specific increases for government and legislatures, Mr. Morson asked if that were so, how was it that British Columbia received a hundred thousand a year; how was it that the amendment relative to the per capita tax was amended in favor of Saskatchewan and Alberta; how was it that Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia are to get over a million dollars for purposes other than government and legislation, while Prince Edward Island gets not one cent?

Hon. Mr. Hughes followed on behalf of the Government. He had been one of the delegates to the Ottawa conference and he felt the time had come for him to unburden himself of the heavy load of responsibility he carried in that connection. It was curious to notice that his version of the conference proceedings differed materially from that of the Leader of the Government. Evidently they were getting into a tight place and the story must be varied. Mr. Hughes did not deny that the question of the per capita allowance had been discussed. As a matter of fact he said this question had been discussed for several days. He said the Island delegates had urged the application to Prince Edward Island of the amendment to subsection C, intended to secure the subsidy on the maximum population. But Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Fielding and Mr. Aylesworth would not agree with them and told them it was not necessary. So rather than disagree with those members of the Dominion Cabinet, our delegates withdrew their opposition and allowed the resolution to be unanimously amended to admit Saskatchewan and Alberta along with British Columbia and Manitoba. The members of the Dominion Government, the parties to the

other side of the contract, prevailed and got the best of the bargain. Mr. Aylesworth and others of these gentlemen told us before now that they could win for us the restoration of our six representatives in the Dominion Parliament. Mr. Aylesworth took our money and lost our case. Now he is receiving his money from the Dominion treasury and he puts us on the way to lose our case again, and our delegates take him at his word. In this way the rights and claims of Prince Edward Island are once more sacrificed.

Mr. Murdoch McKinnon after referring to the importance of the question under discussion, said the delegates were quite angry because meetings had been called in different parts of the Province to discuss this question. It was his opinion that the best the delegates could do about these meetings was to let them alone. He pointed out that we had a report of the conference, which was a good report and officially published. But the delegates wanted to discuss this report. The reason for that would be found between the covers of the report. The Premier could not get away from the fact that delegates had been sent from every Province to press their respective claims; but there was nothing to show that our delegates even mentioned our claims. We are to get merely the terms of the resolutions previously passed, subject to a decrease of subsidy on account of increase of population. Why did not the Premier have our Province added to the four safe guarded, instead of coming here and telling us they were not allowed to alter the resolution?

Mr. Prowse made a valuable contribution to the debate on the subsidy question. He pointed out that Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia had put in special claims; but Prince Edward Island had not put in any claims in writing. For this they should be censured. Why did they not? Up to the present they have failed to show us that they had safe-guarded the interests of this Province. He considered it very doubtful that we would get the seventy thousand dollars in the near future. It will not be paid until all the Provinces are united on the matter, and it has yet to be shown that British Columbia will agree to the terms. Our delegates had ample opportunity to present special claims. Why did they not do so? If our delegates could not have persuaded their co-delegates to recognize our claims, they should have done as Premier McBride of British Columbia did, walk out the door. Our delegates took the word of Mr. Aylesworth and Mr. Fielding. These gentlemen, said Mr. Prowse, have already been mistaken and they may quite possibly be mistaken again.

Mr. Fraser said he doubted in his mind as to whether or not our delegates had given away our rights in the matter of the per capita subsidy, and he felt sure not a man on the Government side of the House was without doubt on that matter. If our delegates had done all their duty they should have no objection to submitting what they had done to the people at public meetings. He did not think the Premier had yet explained this matter to the members of the House. The printed report was before us and this shows that we are not safe guarded as Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta are. The question is have they dropped us out of the class we were in or have they not? The delegates got nothing more for us than was assigned to us in the arrangement of 1887 at which we were not represented. The Leader of the Opposition and his fellows have a duty to perform in this matter. Our delegates were asked to put in a special claim; but the records show they did not do so. Mr. McBride put in a special for his Province and was supported by his Province for so doing. He went back to his people and in a general election was triumphantly sustained at the polls. Why did not our delegates press for our rights as McBride did?

Shortly before noon on Thursday the committee stage of the discussion was reached. The Government evidently felt relieved when matters had so far progressed and doubtless felt that not much more would be heard on a subject so disagreeable to them. In this they were disappointed; for not sooner had the chairman made his formal announcement than Mr. Mathieson announced to pour in a vigorous onslaught on the Government batteries. In scathing language he showed up the utter failure of the delegates in the duty to our Province and detailed the large amounts of money and the large increase of territory granted to Manitoba since that Province entered the Confederation. As the Leader of the Opposition continued to pour his hot shot into the Government ranks, the latter were astounded at amount of information presented, all of it against their credit at the Conference. Mr. A. J. McDonald followed the Leader of the Opposition and contributed a most interesting and instructive speech to the discussion. He said he was the only member in the House, who had been there during the debates relative to our entering Confederation. He pointed out that those who negotiated the terms at that time, were anxious to relieve the Government of the day from financial embarrassment and allowed our Province to make a financial bargain disadvantageous to us. The delegates of the present Government found themselves in a similar position and allowed our rights to be sacrificed in the hope of getting a little money to help themselves out of the wretched financial

position into which they had brought the Province. The debate was continued in excellent style by Mr. Morson and Mr. Fraser; but for want of space we cannot give any extended report. When the chairman put the clause Mr. Mathieson moved the following amendment: "RESOLVED That all the words after the word 'Legislature' in the eighth line of the second paragraph be struck out and the following substituted in lieu thereof: "But we regret that our representatives at the said Conference failed to assert our rights on the per capita subsidy on our maximum population and to present our claims for further sums than those set out in the Quebec Resolutions, and for additional consideration and recognition, and we trust that this Assembly will at the earliest possible time formulate and present to the Government of Canada a statement of our just demands in that on the same being presented to a successful conclusion the necessity for direct taxation upon the lands of this province may be completely done away with and our other grievances removed."

The amendment was lost in committee on a strict party vote. When the speaker took the chair Friday morning and asked for cooperation in the name of the committee, Mr. Mathieson again moved his resolution submitted in committee. This is the rule on these matters. When the division was taken the vote, on strict party lines was: For the amendment 9; against the amendment 13. This is the only vote recorded in the Journals of the House, with the speaker in the chair it manifests its loyalty, by hysterically shouting "Seventeen to seven."

MR. FOWLER GIVES NOTICE

The member for Kings began by reminding Mr. Ross of his fruitless journey with the bag to British Columbia, and then gave him and his friends in the Government camp notice to change their methods. He declared that if any member had charges to make against his public conduct he was prepared to meet them and defend himself. Further he was prepared to meet them if they had anything to say as to his private business transactions or personal character. But he warned Sir Wilfrid Laurier that the discussion of private character would not be one sided. He would himself deal with ministers and members on the other side, calling a spade a spade. If Cabinet Ministers were absent through "indisposition," he would show what kind of indisposition it was. In short he wanted it understood that Ministers and Members who lived in glass houses would find stone throwing dangerous, and declared that if private character were to be discussed he would deal with Ministers and others in their various relations to—wise, women, and girls.

INDEPENDENT ADVICE  
So the matter rested for two days when Mr. Bourassa, who from his independent attitude takes a serene pleasure in the troubles of ministers, rose to a question of privilege and declared it to be the duty of the government to force these charges and counter charges to an issue. He asserted with truth that the dignity of Parliament had been gradually lowered during the last ten years, and held that the honour of the government and the dignity of the House forbade the questions raised to remain as they were. On one hand several members had repeatedly insisted that a group on the Opposition side were unworthy to sit in the House. If that were true the statements should be definitely made and pressed to a conclusion. If it were not true the insinuations should stop. Again it had been suggested that members and ministers were guilty of private immoralities and public offences. That should be pushed to a conclusion.

FURTHER CHALLENGES.  
Mr. Bennett followed this by a reference to Mr. Carvell's threat, and quoted the Montreal Star which said Mr. Carvell should either make good his words or acknowledge himself "a cowardly slanderer and a bully." Mr. Bennett said he had been waiting a fortnight for Mr. Carvell to make his charges, and he was now prepared in the House or out of it to endorse the language of the Star.  
MR. FOSTER SPEAKS.  
Mr. Foster took occasion to say that he too held insinuations should stop or charges begin. He had been told before the House met that his mouth would be closed for this Session, but he had clearly shown that no man had power to close his mouth when there was something that he ought to say. He had been waiting for the House to meet that his mouth would be closed for this Session, but he had clearly shown that no man had power to close his mouth when there was something that he ought to say. He had been waiting for the House to meet that his mouth would be closed for this Session, but he had clearly shown that no man had power to close his mouth when there was something that he ought to say.

THE OPPOSITION POSITION.  
Sir Wilfrid Laurier was apologetic. He deprecated any references to matters under investigation, and was opposed to insinuation at any time, but he did not agree with Mr. Bourassa that the time had come for a general inquiry. Meanwhile he would do his best to restore the dignity of the House.  
In ringing tones Mr. Borden told the Premier that if it should appear that a member had done anything unworthy of his position in the House he was ready to assist to probe the matter to the bottom. There should be an end of slurs and insinuations. He would say further in regard to the insurance investigation that the opposition party in the House intended to have it dealt with before the session closed, and would see that the session did not come to an end without it.  
The result of the whole discussion was to clear the air. Probably back bench supporters of the Government will now be kept under better control.  
A REAL CHARGE OF GRAFT.  
Meanwhile the Conservative members are not dealing in semi-obscure threats. They are coming forward with direct and specific charges. Last week it was Robins Irrigation deal. This week another case of land graft was exposed. Mr. Heron, member for Alberta, a man thoroughly acquainted with the ranching interests, proposed the resolution of censure. He moved that "the circumstances attendant upon the acquisition of and disposal of the Galloway Horse and Cattle Company of grazing lease No. 259 reflect discredit upon the Government and should receive the disapproval of the House."  
The circumstances as set forth by

Ottawa Weekly Letter.

Heart to Heart Talk.  
Ottawa, Feb 23rd, 1907.  
This has been a rather lively week in the House of Commons. There were two warm debates on personal insinuations, one motion of want of confidence, the beginning of an inquiry into Mr. Hyman's resignation something doing in the Public Accounts Committee, a serious trouble to the Minister of Labor over his Conciliation Bill, involving a direct question of veracity between him and the Parliamentary agent of the Railway Brotherhoods and a Prince Edward Island day which included an indirect attack on the Finance Minister by one of his colleagues. Two cases of graft were exposed this week.  
O'WARDLY METHODS.  
In the debate on the address Mr. Devlin, from the Government side threw out personal insinuations against Mr. Foster and other members. On several occasions since slurs and insinuations have been thrown at Opposition members. Mr. Carvell recently flung out the insinuation that Mr. Bennett would be put upon his defence. On Tuesday of this week Mr. Ross, of Carleton, one of the Government delegates sent with Mr. McGinnis to British Columbia, in the vein attempted to drive Premier McBride from power, made a similar reference to Mr. Fowler, of Kings.

Up to that time Conservative members had accepted these sneers without return and waited for any definite charges or statements that might be made. But Mr. Fowler suddenly assumed the aggressive, and proceeded to break up the conspiracy of covert slanders.

MR. FOSTER SPEAKS

Mr. Foster took occasion to say that he too held insinuations should stop or charges begin. He had been told before the House met that his mouth would be closed for this Session, but he had clearly shown that no man had power to close his mouth when there was something that he ought to say. He had been waiting for the House to meet that his mouth would be closed for this Session, but he had clearly shown that no man had power to close his mouth when there was something that he ought to say.

THE OPPOSITION POSITION.  
Sir Wilfrid Laurier was apologetic. He deprecated any references to matters under investigation, and was opposed to insinuation at any time, but he did not agree with Mr. Bourassa that the time had come for a general inquiry. Meanwhile he would do his best to restore the dignity of the House.  
In ringing tones Mr. Borden told the Premier that if it should appear that a member had done anything unworthy of his position in the House he was ready to assist to probe the matter to the bottom. There should be an end of slurs and insinuations. He would say further in regard to the insurance investigation that the opposition party in the House intended to have it dealt with before the session closed, and would see that the session did not come to an end without it.  
The result of the whole discussion was to clear the air. Probably back bench supporters of the Government will now be kept under better control.  
A REAL CHARGE OF GRAFT.  
Meanwhile the Conservative members are not dealing in semi-obscure threats. They are coming forward with direct and specific charges. Last week it was Robins Irrigation deal. This week another case of land graft was exposed. Mr. Heron, member for Alberta, a man thoroughly acquainted with the ranching interests, proposed the resolution of censure. He moved that "the circumstances attendant upon the acquisition of and disposal of the Galloway Horse and Cattle Company of grazing lease No. 259 reflect discredit upon the Government and should receive the disapproval of the House."  
The circumstances as set forth by

Mr. Heron, and further explained from the public documents by Mr. Ames, Mr. Bristol, Mr. Macdonnell, Mr. Lusk and the leader of the opposition are as follows:  
A MYSTERIOUS LESSEE.  
On the 27th of May, 1902 an application was made to the Department of the Interior on behalf of H. P. Brown of Montana for a closed lease of 60,000 acres, west of Bow River. The concession was granted March 6, 1903, the applicant to pay in advance 6 months rental or \$603.81. Mr. Brown did not sign the lease or pay the rent. He was not visible. But in December 1903 his lease was included with those of McGregor and Hitchcock (of whom much has been heard already) in the irrevocable leases, good for twenty one years. In January 1904, the Department wrote to Mr. Brown's address asking him to sign the lease and pay the rent. Mr. Brown was never heard from though frequent letters were sent him during two years, until he owed \$2,400 rent. Meanwhile ranchers wanted this land but were told that it was taken. It is clear that if Mr. Brown was missing something with a political pull was holding down his lease.

MR. OLIVER MENTAL CHARGES.  
Mr. Sifton went on and Mr. Oliver became Minister. He decided that Mr. Brown must lose his concession if he did not appear and pay his back rent. At this critical moment A. J. Adamson, M. P., one of the parties to the Saskatchewan-Land deal, visited the Department and proposed an assignment from Mr. Brown to the Galloway Horse and Cattle Company, of which Adamson was President. This assignment was dated September 17th, 1903 so that Mr. Adamson had been carrying it about during the two years that the department was ostensibly looking for Brown, and keeping genuine cattle men out of the limits. But Adamson was not satisfied with what he had. He wanted all the assets of the Galloway and a new lease started at that date. Mr. Oliver explained that the department was not giving any more twenty one year leases. He offered a new revocable lease dating from 1906, or Brown's twenty one year lease if he would pay the rent that Brown owed on the Adamson lease. The revocable lease and the Minister made the rent payable from that date.  
ENTER THE BROTHER-IN-LAW.  
The country has heard a good deal, in connection with these land deals, of Mr. Adamson's brother-in-law Mr. Turill, M. P. After Mr. Adamson had made his choice and got his revocable lease, Mr. Turill appeared to the Minister. As a result Mr. Adamson's revocable lease was changed to a twenty one year irrevocable concession. This change was made in March, 1906, and Mr. Adamson was not asked to pay Mr. Brown's back rent. As soon as this lease was made satisfactory to Mr. Adamson and Mr. Turill, the Galloway Company sold it to Mr. John Cudrey of McLeod. It was reported that Mr. Cudrey who is a large cattle owner paid \$25,000 for the concession. Mr. Cudrey had tried to get a grazing lease in his

own name but found there was none for him. His only chance was to wait until the favorites had obtained the lease and then pay them their rate off. The Galloway Horse Company came into existence in 1904 and disappeared in 1906. It never had any horses or cattle. Its headquarters was hundreds of miles from the grazing country. It was apparently organized for the purpose of getting this lease and selling it. The only three names subscribed to its memorandum are those of A. J. Adamson, M. P., of J. M. Adamson, his wife, who is a sister of Mr. Turill, M. P., and A. J. Bell who is a cousin of J. M. Adamson, and Mr. Turill.  
MCGREGOR ONCE MORE.  
Mr. Adamson seems to have peddled this lease about trying to sell it for \$200,000. Finding it could not be sold well as a revocable concession, he got it changed to its present form. Mr. Brown had never been heard from. Though he claimed to be in Montana, his first letters reached Ottawa the day after they were dated. This is explained by the fact that the legend "per J. D. M." appears under Brown's signature. J. D. M. represents J. D. McGregor, the hero of the Grand Forks Cattle Company concession, the chief character in the Robins Irrigation deal, former campaigner in Brandon, sometime House inspector and mining inspector in the Yukon. Mr. Adamson and his associates seem to have invested \$650 plus the cost of two or three letters and of the Adamson and Turill interview with the Minister.  
Mr. Cudrey, who is to use the land, has been held up for some \$25,000 while the grantees and middlemen got the plunder. The whole 60,000 acres has been shut out from use for four years while this deal was maturing.  
A LAME DEFENCE.  
The Government defence was altogether inadequate. The Minister of the Interior practically admitted everything. He confessed that he changed his mind, forgiving Mr. Adamson his back rent and giving him an irrevocable lease, all out of tender consideration for the claimant. He pleaded that it was necessary to be lenient with ranchmen and settlers, which plea has little to do with the case, since Mr.

Meet Me at the Always Busy Store.

Stanley Bros.



Ladies' & Children's Cloth Coats, Fur Coats, Ruffs, Muffs, Caps, Collars And Mitts.

All at 65 cents on the Dollar.

This is your chance to get your Coat or Fur Cheap.

- \$6.00 Coats for \$4.00, \$7.50 coats for \$5.00
\$10.50 Coats for \$7.00, \$12.00 coats for \$8.00, etc.
\$30.00 Fur Coats for \$20.00, \$37.00 now \$25
\$48.00 Fur Coats for \$32.00, \$60.00 now \$40.00

Neck Furs, Caps, Muffs, All Prices Less One Third. Do Not Delay—Buy To-day.

STANLEY BROTHERS.

Fall and Winter Weather!

Fall and winter weather calls for prompt attention to the Repairing, Cleaning and Making of Clothing. We are still at the old stand, PRINCE STREET, CHARLOTTETOWN. Giving all orders strict attention. Our work is reliable, and our prices please our customers. H. McMILLAN.

Snappy Styles Solid Footwear.

Ladies! Here is your chance, one week only. Box Calf Boots, neat, up-to-date. Cheap any time at \$2.25, now \$1.50, all sizes. These Boots arrived a few days ago, a little late of course, but they are yours at the above price. See them anyway. A. E. McEACHEN, THE SHOE MAN, QUEEN STREET

Advertisement for Epps's Cocoa, describing it as a delicious drink and a sustaining food, and mentioning the name Epps's Cocoa.