

THE HERALD

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 1907.

SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 A YEAR.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY

JAMES McISAAC

Editor & Proprietor

Please send in your subscriptions.

Sessional Notes.

It was about 4.30 when the House met after the Easter holidays on Tuesday the 2nd inst.

Most of the sitting was occupied with matters of a routine character.

In answer to a question put some time previously by Mr. A. J. McDonald, Mr. Peters submitted the following information:

AMOUNTS DUE BANKS 31st DEC. 1906:

Canadian Bank of Commerce \$95,875.95

Bank of New Brunswick 33,816.89

Royal Bank of Canada 21,361.76

Bank of Nova Scotia 1,502.41

155,557.01

INCREASE OF SALARY:

Alder Diehaut from \$300 to \$350

George S. Imann " 250 " 300

Henry F. Wright " 150 " 200

George Westley " 150 " 200

Henry Smith " 600 " 700

John E. Campbell " 600 " 700

Matthew Gallant " 550 " 600

John D. McMillan " 600 " 650

Isadora Bode " 550 " 600

George S. McLeod " 550 " 600

Wm H. Stewart " 500 " 600

Theodore Ross " 1000 " 1200

Minnie E. Hinchey " 400 " 500

Kenneth McKay " 600 " 700

During the evening sitting the debate was resumed on the resolution introduced some time previously by Capt Read and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. A. J. McDonald.

The debate was resumed by Captain Read, who tried to claim credit for his Government and his party in connection with the question of the subsidies.

Mr. Mathieson, in the course of an excellent speech, pointed out that Captain Read had such a fashion of contradicting nearly all the statements he ever makes in the House, that when he was done he had generally said but very little.

He showed that if clause D, introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier would safeguard our Province in the subsidy matter, no thanks therefore were due the delegates to the conference, or to the Government.

The delegates did nothing towards the introduction of that clause; they knew nothing about it until they saw it published.

They took the lowest amount any province could possibly get and they made no report to the House. But the Province was fortunate in having three able opposition members in the House of Commons.

These members pressed the matter so strongly and so persistently upon the attention of the Leader of the Federal Government that Sir Wilfrid at last introduced clause D.

If we shall be saved, it shall be by this clause. Mr. Lefurgey on March 14th gave notice of his question as to whether or not we would receive our per capita subsidy on our maximum population.

On the 21st he asked the question and Sir Wilfrid told him the matter was engaging the attention of the Minister of Justice.

On the 22nd Sir Wilfrid gave notice of his intention of amending his address to the King by adding clause D. All this showed that no steps had been taken to ensure to us our per capita subsidy on our maximum population until the Leader of the Federal Government had been forced to amend his address, in consequence of the representations pressed upon him by the Opposition members from this Province.

How different was the conduct of Premier McBride of British Columbia, from that of our delegates. He had obtained a special grant of \$1,000,000 for his Province and laid the foundation for future claims. He laid before the Legislature a full report of his actions as the representative of his Province at the conference; but we have no record from our delegates, except the record of their expenses that will be found in the Public Accounts. Mr. Mathieson expressed his doubt as to the efficacy of clause D to safeguard our rights. It gives us a color of claim and for whatever there is in it we are under no debt of obligation to our delegates to the conference.

Mr. Fraser pointed out that the Premier had promised to make a report to the Legislature and to the country; but no such report had been made. The reports of the speeches of the delegates had been suppressed. So had the strong speech of Mr. Morson. Why did Sir Wilfrid Laurier find it necessary after consideration to add a clause to the address? Be-

cause our rights were not otherwise safe guarded. This fact of itself proved beyond a doubt that the contention of the Opposition was right.

Mr. Prowse said that the Government, in the course they were pursuing were showing great weakness. They should at once concede to the Opposition the honor of having helped them out of a difficulty.

If the Opposition had not shown up the matter, as they had, our case would have gone by the board. He considered the delegates had shown great disrespect to the Legislature by not presenting a report. Why was not section D put in by the delegates?

Mr. McKinnon argued that Mr. Mathieson's contention was correct, in maintaining that we were not secured by the terms of the Provincial Conference. This was admitted by the Leader of the Federal Government in his statement on the 21st of March, that the matter was under the consideration of the Minister of Justice and by bringing down the following day section D in amendment to his address to the King.

Mr. McKinnon showed that the Province was not yet in a position to make ends meet; but he was not surprised our delegates accepted the terms.

The House divided on the motion and amendment. The amendment was defeated and the main motion was carried on a strict party division.

On Wednesday afternoon Mr. Mathieson resumed the debate on the resolution of which he had given notice some time previously. The resolution is as follows:

"Resolved that it is expedient that a Special Committee be appointed by this House to prepare for presentation to the Government of Canada a complete and accurate statement of all the claims of this Province for larger sums than would fall to this Province under the Resolutions of the Conference held at Quebec in 1902 and to additional consideration and recognition. And in particular (but without in any wise limiting such claims in number or amount): (1) The claim of this Province to receive from Canada an increase of Subsidy to meet the increased expenditure of this Province since Confederation for Education, Public Works, Agriculture, Asylums, and the other urgent demands which modern conditions impose, so that this Province may receive on this ground the same advantages as are agreed to be given to the other Provinces of Canada on the proposed rearrangement of Provincial Subsidies. (2) A claim for damages accrued since the settlement between said Governments in 1901 up to the present time on non-fulfillment of the Terms of Union as respects the maintenance of efficient steam communication both winter and summer between the Island and the Mainland. (3) The right of this Province to be placed upon the basis of an assumed population of at least 150,000 for the purpose of calculating its subsidies and representation until its actual population should exceed that number, inasmuch as the failure of this Province to attain that population is owing to the default of the Dominion. (4) The claim of this Province to a fair adjustment of Transportation Rates so far as the same are under the control of the Government of Canada. (5) The restoration to this Province of its original number of representatives in the Federal Parliament. (6) Continuous communication with the Mainland by the best means that can be devised."

In support of this resolution the Leader of the Opposition made a most powerful speech of about two hours and then adjourned the debate. He pointed out the incalculable importance to this Province of the appointment of the committee asked for by the resolution. As the speech will be published in extenso later on, we will not refer to it at any greater length just now.

On Wednesday evening Premier Peters delivered what is generally known as the budget speech. This speech, however, bore so little resemblance to a budget speech that no one would have known it was such, if the Premier had not so called it. The budget speech is understood to be a statement from the Government of the public finances. The financial transactions of the Government for the past year are supposed to be reviewed, and the estimates of receipts and expenditure for the current year are expected to be compared, and the ways and

means by which the revenue is to be raised are expected to be made known to the people's representatives. In all these respects, the Premier's speech was a disappointment. He said nothing of the ways and means by which the revenues for the current year are expected to be raised. He did candidly admit that the deficit for the twelve months of 1906 was \$70,806. If he had added the \$10,000 interest accrued on loans account he would be pretty near correct as to the deficit. It will be remembered that in reviewing the public accounts we placed the deficit at something over \$80,000. The Premier's admission bears out this estimate. The Premier spent most of his time scolding the Opposition for their course in relation to the subsidy matter. He was very indignant at the thought that public meetings should have been held and resolutions passed asking the Legislature to safeguard the interests of the Province, and that the people should petition the Legislature for the same purpose. He said the petition of between three and four thousand people was thrown into the waste basket. The right of petition is implanted in the forefront of our charter of liberty and the Premier of this Province despises such petitions and throws them into the waste basket. Let our free-born, liberty loving electorate remember this indignity when he again asks them for their votes.

Mr. Mathieson, Leader of the Opposition followed the Leader of the Government and easily rose to shed the Premier's speech. He said that it was in no sense a budget speech, inasmuch as it makes no reference to the resources of revenue or the objects and amounts of the proposed expenditure. But the Premier made one candid statement when he said there had been a deficit last year of over \$70,000. From this it could readily be seen that we shall not, even should we get the increased subsidy, be able to maintain the present scale of expenditure and make ends meet, to say nothing of remitting any of the taxes. But we were morally bound to remit the tax on Commercial Traveller's, in accordance with the arrangements made at the Ottawa Conference. In proof of this Mr. Mathieson read from the "Return of the Interprovincial Conference." At page 14, "Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier referred to the previous discussion on the provincial tax on commercial travellers. The chairman of the conference announced that this question had been considered by the Inter-Provincial conference, and that the various premiers had come to the conclusion to propose to their Legislatures the repeal of this tax." This was the assurance obtained by Sir Wilfrid Laurier from the chairman of the Conference and this report is signed by the two secretaries. That seemed to leave the matter beyond the possibility of doubt. Again, on page 30 of the "minutes and proceedings in conference of the representatives of Canada and of the Provinces," it is set forth that "after debate it was proposed by the Hon. Mr. Roblin, and seconded by the Hon. Mr. Peters, that as a result of the deliberations of the conference with the representatives of the Government of Canada (1) the Conference recommends to each Legislature to abolish the special tax on commercial travellers, provided that this recommendation do not apply to any license payable under any Act concerning the sale of intoxicating liquors." Mr. Mathieson pointed out that Mr. Peters had admitted these minutes were "correct as far as they went." In the House of Commons Mr. Foster asked—"Was agreement if any was made at the conference with the Provincial Premier (a) as to the Provincial tax on commercial travellers; (b) as to the provincial tax upon companies chartered by the Dominion Government." And this is Sir Wilfrid Laurier's reply showing that he had a clear understanding that the Commercial Traveller's tax to be remitted wherever imposed. Sir Wilfrid said: "My hon. friend, (Mr. Foster) will find the answer to this question in the report which has already been brought down giving the proceedings of the inter-provincial conference. I may tell him however that the premiers there present agreed, with regard to the provincial taxes upon commercial travellers to have that form of taxes repealed."

In view of these facts, how could the Premier allow the session to grow so old without making the first attempt to keep the promise made at the conference. This was disastrous; we can afford to be poor; but we cannot afford to be the faith of the Province. Hitherto we have strictly kept faith with Canada, although Canada has not kept faith with us. Let our record, in this respect, be maintained; let it not be changed to a record of shame! Mr. Mathieson severely castigated the delegates to the Ottawa conference for their failure to safeguard our rights. He then referred to the public meetings that had been held in different parts of the Province, and the conduct of the Government regarding them. Splendid meetings had been held at Kensington, Vernon River and Moss, although Mr.

Peters was not there to meet his constituents. The Premier did not think the people worthy of being addressed upon large questions of public importance. Another crime in the estimation of the Premier was petitioning the Legislature to safeguard our rights. Between three and four thousand electors, Conservatives and Liberals, had been guilty of this crime, and their petitions had been thrown into the waste basket. If the people don't obtain redress they will have revenge. Mr. Mathieson next detailed the facts concerning the per capita subsidy and Laurier's address to the King for the amendment of the British North America Act. He brought fully into view the cause that impelled Sir Wilfrid Laurier to the above, to wit: to enlarge it by adding clause D. If we are to receive our per capita on the maximum population it will be in virtue of that clause. Mr. Mathieson severely criticised and condemned the Government for other features of their policy. He condemned them for their waste of public money and other suspicious circumstances in connection with the hay account, and concluded by comparing the expenditure of the Conservatives with those of the Liberals. He pointed out that the present Government collected more taxes in one year than the Conservatives did in twelve.

After Mr. Campbell had spoken, Mr. Kitchin took him severely to task. He showed how utterly the Commissioner of Public Works had failed to carry out his frequent promises to repair a number of roads in the vicinity of Souris. Last fall it was almost impossible to cross Souris Beach. As a matter of fact boats had to be used to get the Commissioner's office to remedy this condition of affairs. For years Mr. Kitchin had been asking him to improve a piece of road that ran along the bank at Fortuna. The bank had broken away, and it is necessary to extend the road further in. About thirty-five dollars would be sufficient to secure the maintenance more than once promised to attend to this he has not done so. The Commissioner had gone to see the road and knew the great inconvenience the people were suffering. But they are Conservatives and the Commissioner will not pay the trifling land damages required. In the face of this the Commissioner has the audacity to open a road at Souris of paying \$200 to open a road at Souris and to the public interest, but for the accommodation of one individual. As a Liberal, Mr. Kitchin enumerated numerous instances in which the Commissioner had failed to attend to roads necessary for public convenience, but had been lavish of the public money for the convenience of party favorites.

Subsidy Debate in the Commons.

MR McLEAN'S SPEECH.

Mr. A. McLean, I move that an additional allowance of \$100,000 be granted to the province of Prince Edward Island. The Finance Minister said tonight that these resolutions formed a treaty between the provinces. Now I do not agree with the Finance Minister in that statement. I think that the assembled wisdom of this parliament is better capable of judging of the requirements of the provinces than are four or five premiers of the respective provinces meeting together. In 1887, certain resolutions, and we are told tonight by the premier that these are the resolutions upon which is based this address to His Majesty now under discussion. These resolutions are in fact twenty years old, and since they were passed the requirements of the various provinces have changed very materially. In 1887, it would have been a boon to the province of Prince Edward Island to obtain an increased grant of \$70,000, but to offer that province today \$70,000 of an increase is simply a farce. As a matter of fact it is not \$70,000, it is only \$60,000; because some four years ago an arrangement was made between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion that as soon as the Hillsborough bridge was completed the \$10,000 subsidy which was payable to the province of Prince Edward Island should be retained by the Dominion in order to meet certain expenditure which was made upon that bridge for local traffic. So we are in effect only receiving about \$60,000. What was the object which the fathers of confederation had in granting these subsidies? The first resolution which was submitted to the conference was moved by Sir John Duns, in those words: "That the best interests and the prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a federal union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles of justice to the several provinces."

You see the principle was to be justice to the several provinces; but what do we find since these principles entered the confederation? At that time a large unorganized territory that had been purchased from the Hudson Bay Company was given to the people of Canada at an expense of something like \$1,500,000. There you see the finance terms upon which the provinces entered the Dominion were changed. Since the four original provinces formed the confederation, there have been added Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Alberta and Saskatchewan have received grants of money and of lands far in advance of what the maritime province have ever received. Saskatchewan and Alberta have received even the sum of \$1,030,000. What is the financial condition of those provinces at present? Last year Alberta had a surplus of \$473,252, and this year she has a surplus

of \$473,202. Now it is proposed to add to that surplus the sum of \$130,000. These provinces are indeed put upon a splendid footing, far better than the old provinces ever enjoyed. What is the condition of the people of the maritime provinces? A great many of them emigrated to those provinces in the years 1775 or 1776, and had to live out homes for themselves. They have worked upon their homesteads; they have raised families; but the population of those provinces has not materially increased during the last four years.

What became of the surplus population of these three provinces? The people have gone west and they have gone to the United States. Because of the fact that these men have raised families and that their families are in the Northwest it is asked today that great sums be taken out of the public chest of this country and given to the North west and that the maritime provinces shall be paid sufficient to maintain them decently. What did Sir John Macdonald say? He said they were to be maintained in a proper manner, so that they could make their revenue and expenditure meet and in order that there should be no result in direct taxation. What is the result in Prince Edward Island today? Instead of being able to run the government without direct taxation the people are being taxed out of the place. All kinds of taxes are resorted to. The taxation on land last year amounted to between \$80,000 and \$90,000 and notwithstanding the fact that there was, during the years 1904 and 1905 an average deficit of \$57,433.30 this government refuse today, according to the statement made by the Minister of Finance, to allow in the readjustment of the subsidies, a sufficient sum to enable the government of Prince Edward Island to make both ends meet. Including the payment of \$10,000 towards the Hillsborough bridge and an increase in the debt of \$25,000 the deficit during the present year will be something like \$69,633.32 and we are told that the sum of \$70,000 will be sufficient to enable this province to make both ends meet. What is the condition of affairs in Prince Edward Island? During the year 1904 there were 28 vacant schools. Why? The province was unable to pay the salaries of the school teachers and they went elsewhere. They went to Saskatchewan and Alberta where the salaries are twice as much as the people of Prince Edward Island can afford to pay. I think that when the condition of affairs is exposed this parliament should grant to the people of Prince Edward Island a sufficient sum to enable them to run the government in such a way that they would have a surplus as the people of Alberta have a surplus or else balance their accounts. In the report made by the superintendent of education during the year 1906 to the Legislature of the province of Prince Edward Island he says: "The great difficulty with which we have to contend is the small salaries that we pay our teachers. Mr. Bennett, who was acting inspector for Prince county schools for most of the last year, says: 'The increasing number of vacant schools in the county was strongly impressed upon my mind when I had been at work for but a short time. Mr. Kiehr, the inspector for Queen's county, refers to the payment of the teachers and the fact that the best teachers are leaving the profession. Mr. McCormack, the inspector for King's county schools, says, 'The question of vital importance to us at present is the securing of a sufficient number of teachers to hold schools for any thing of teaching school. Many schools are now vacant. There is just one effective agency that will remedy this matter and that is the payment of larger salaries.' How can the government of Prince Edward Island pay larger salaries when this government cannot allow a larger sum to meet the deficits of that province? They have 28 or 30 vacant schools this year because they cannot get teachers at the present salary and the debt is \$895,853. What will the condition of affairs be in that province twenty years hence? I think this is a matter that the Prime Minister should fairly and squarely look at. I do not think that the premier of Prince Edward Island fairly represented the condition of affairs at the conference. He did not make any representation at all notwithstanding the fact that a resolution was passed in that conference in 1906 requesting that a statement from the different provinces be presented for consideration. The premier of Prince Edward Island did not present any statement at all although the premier of British Columbia and the premier of Ontario did so. The premier of Ontario made a statement of the condition of affairs in that province and I will just read for the education of the Minister of Finance an extract from that statement: "You are no doubt thoroughly familiar with the grievances of which Nova Scotia complained at the time that province claimed better terms. You will remember also that as late as 1886 the grievances of Nova Scotia were still an issue in that province, when the local revenue and physical environment of that province passed a resolution declaring for better terms or secession. The Hon. Mr. Fielding, the present Minister of Finance, was leader of that movement and in the resolution in question set forth that the disabilities of Nova Scotia complained in 1868, and since existed and had become accentuated by the lapse of time. While no formal settlement of these grievances took place, nevertheless it is well known

that the Dominion government made concessions which appeared the discount and we have heard nothing more of it. There are, therefore, most substantial precedents to justify our course. It was upon that ground that Nova Scotia was conceded further subsidies from this parliament, namely, that it had a surplus of available revenue. We received under the original terms of confederation something like \$161,000 from this parliament. We received in addition \$20,000 for another matter of damages and \$80,000 for the non-fulfillment of the terms of union. We receive altogether some thing like \$211,000 and we are asked to accept \$70,000 additional. What is the percentage of increase which was given to the other provinces?"

Increased subsidy for Govts. and Percentage of increase

Ontario \$160,000 200

Quebec 170,000 242 6-7

Nova Scotia 150,000 215 1/2

New Brunswick 130,000 260

Manitoba 130,000 260

British Columbia 115,000 328 4-7

P. E. Island 70,000 233 1/2

Alberta 100,000 200

Saskatchewan 130,000 200

Quebec general increase per capita, Prince Edward Island per capita, Ontario per capita, Quebec per capita, Nova Scotia per capita, N. W. Brunswick per capita, Manitoba per capita, British Columbia per capita, P. E. Island per capita, Alberta per capita, Saskatchewan per capita

Quebec gets \$429,855.40 increase; Nova Scotia gets \$47,657.20 increase; N. W. Brunswick gets \$7,385.60 increase; Manitoba gets \$81,962 increase; British Columbia gets \$61,987; Saskatchewan gets \$6,210. Alberta and Prince Edward Island are the only provinces that do not get an increase on the per capita basis. I hold that Prince Edward Island is entitled to as much consideration as British Columbia, which came into confederation on terms that it should get the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it got the Canadian Pacific Railway at great expense to the people of Canada. Prince Edward Island refused to come into confederation in 1871 and entered after a great deal of negotiation in 1873 and five years afterwards it was found the terms granted her were not sufficient to enable the affairs of the province to be carried on. Since then Prince Edward Island, like the other provinces, has been knocking at the doors of the Dominion treasury, and it is now absolutely necessary that Prince Edward Island should receive an increased subsidy to enable her to make both ends meet. The Prime Minister tells us that this is a final and unalterable settlement of the subsidy question. If that be so, then it is for the representatives of Prince Edward Island to have to go to the provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia, and to the present time or thereabouts as British Columbia. It is this an unalterable and final settlement, as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance tell us, then we cannot claim any damages for the non-carrying out of winter communication since 1901. I can only repeat that the mercantile community and the farming community of Prince Edward Island are to-day at daggers drawn with the Dominion government because of the existing condition of affairs. They pay three times as much for the transportation of their freight as do the people on the Intercolonial Railway for the same distance. The farmers of Prince Edward Island have to pay 10 and 12 cents per 100 pounds more for their corn meal, bran, etc., and they receive 1 or 2 cents a pound less for their pork and beef than do the farmers on the mainland. The rates charged for the three short hauls are excessive. It has been publicly stated that in 1906 the farmers of Prince Edward Island lost \$700,000 for want of proper transportation facilities; in March and April, 1906, \$200,000 were lost on potatoes alone for the same reason, and this season I venture to say that \$500,000 or \$600,000 has been lost by the Prince Edward Island farmers because of the stoppage of navigation. I believe that a further sum of \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 would about represent the inconvenience and loss which the travelling public has sustained during the last six weeks or two months. Let us take the freight rates on cheese for example— Mr. Speaker. Does not the hon. member think that this is pertinent to the question of transportation rather than to the motion before the House? I am giving reasons why I think should induce the government to grant further consideration to Prince Edward Island, but in view of your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I shall drop that subject for the present. Let us look at the expenditure on public works and other services. In 1873 the expenditure of the province on education and public works, administration of justice, legislation, executive council, charities agriculture and papers was \$155,532.27, and to-day it has increased by \$120,707.67. The Dominion government believes that by granting \$70,000 they will put Prince Edward Island in a position to make both ends meet, but they have not taken account of the fact that the Dominion government in 1887 and 1889 have given them bonds to this amount. There is not a part of a system about it. They have simply taken those figures which were put on paper by those men twenty years ago and asked the government to accept them, although we have the statement of the Finance Minister to-night that he did not know how they were made up. No man in Canada knows how they were made up. They were the result of a compromise, and I wish to remind the premier that Prince Edward Island was not represented at the conference of 1887, neither was British Columbia, but they sent a statement. It was stated to-night that British Columbia assented to the subsidies granted in 1887. It did not, and has not to this day. It is true it accepted what this parliament agreed to give, but it contended that it was entitled to more. Not a member from British Columbia was spoken on this subject, and we have the evidence of an election which was held in that province a month or six months ago, and as to what the feeling of the people there is. It shows that they are not satisfied with the subsidies proposed to be granted by the resolution. This is unfair. There should be a fair portion of the taxes, that Ontario has borne the burden in the past and will in the future. I do not agree with the member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) that the provinces by the sea do not pay a fair portion of the taxes, that Ontario has borne the burden in the past and will in the future. The duties are paid in Montreal and Toronto and are credited to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but the people of the maritime provinces pay these duties eventually. I think Mr. Speaker as it is nearly three o'clock when honest folks should be in their beds, I shall conclude my remarks.

Meet Me at the Always Busy Store.

Stanley Bros.

Dress Goods

We can't say too much about our New Dress Goods Stock.

FOR VARIETY FOR QUALITY FOR COLORS FOR WEAVES

And for Reasonableness in Price it certainly eclipses any previous show

At 40c. to 60c. per yard

You will be surprised how the makers could turn out such elegant goods at the price.

Other qualities from

75c. to \$1.65 per yard.

Your Most

Critical Inspection

Invited!

STANLEY BROS.

was at that time sufficient for the province to last for all time to come. What is the condition of affairs there today? All the wool feed is gone and we have to resort to coal, so that we actually pay to the province of Nova Scotia our share of those royalties which amount to something like \$12,000 a year. We have no lumber; we have to go to the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick for our lumber. If we want stone to build our roads we have to go to Gaspe in Quebec or to Wallace, in the province of Nova Scotia; we are not in a position to build permanent roads in Prince Edward Island, because we have not the stone, and we have to import the stone from the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick at a great expense to the people of Prince Edward Island. This is one of the matters which I wish to ask the premier to take into consideration: I do not think it fair to ask the people of Prince Edward Island to pay a share of the increase of \$229,451 to the province of Ontario or a share of the increase of \$429,855 to the province of Quebec, while we only get what is conceded to us by the conference of 1887. These men have forgotten that conditions have changed, and as the hon. member for North Toronto said, they have taken account of the fact that the Dominion government in 1887 and 1889 have given them bonds to this amount. There is not a part of a system about it. They have simply taken those figures which were put on paper by those men twenty years ago and asked the government to accept them, although we have the statement of the Finance Minister to-night that he did not know how they were made up. No man in Canada knows how they were made up. They were the result of a compromise, and I wish to remind the premier that Prince Edward Island was not represented at the conference of 1887, neither was British Columbia, but they sent a statement. It was stated to-night that British Columbia assented to the subsidies granted in 1887. It did not, and has not to this day. It is true it accepted what this parliament agreed to give, but it contended that it was entitled to more. Not a member from British Columbia was spoken on this subject, and we have the evidence of an election which was held in that province a month or six months ago, and as to what the feeling of the people there is. It shows that they are not satisfied with the subsidies proposed to be granted by the resolution. This is unfair. There should be a fair portion of the taxes, that Ontario has borne the burden in the past and will in the future. I do not agree with the member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) that the provinces by the sea do not pay a fair portion of the taxes, that Ontario has borne the burden in the past and will in the future. The duties are paid in Montreal and Toronto and are credited to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but the people of the maritime provinces pay these duties eventually. I think Mr. Speaker as it is nearly three o'clock when honest folks should be in their beds, I shall conclude my remarks.