

Prince Edward Island received grants of land from the British crown, but three-fifths of these lands were bought out by the tenants and local government prior to confederation. A sum not exceeding \$800,000 was set apart under the terms of confederation for the purchase of these lands and \$45,000 was to be paid annually by the Dominion. The commission reports that nearly this whole amount and the \$45,000 annually, has been lost to the province, so that it has received no benefit from the arrangement.

The same can be said about the railway claim. Something like \$4,700,000 was placed to our credit on entering confederation and the cost of the railway, which was built at that time in Prince Edward Island at a cost of \$3,000,000, was charged up and deducted from the federal allowance on which we expected to receive interest from confederation on, the result being that we have lost the interest on that \$3,000,000 ever since. The question has been brought up of the return of the railway lands in British Columbia to that province. We do not object to the return of those lands; but we say that if those lands are returned to British Columbia, it would be just as equitable to return that sum of \$3,000,000 to the credit of Prince Edward Island, and to have the province receive the interest on that money from year to year.

There are many other claims that could be advanced but time will not permit me to take them up at the present time. No doubt those matters were fully dealt with by the Premier of Prince Edward Island at the inter-provincial conference; but there is just one question to which I wish to refer, and that is the return of the natural resources to Alberta. We find that those natural resources are at the present time worth to that province more than \$2,000,000. We admit that according to the statement that has been produced it costs about \$2,000,000 to administer those resources. We also find that those resources in the last five years have increased in value by more than \$1,000,000. The surface of the natural resources of Alberta has hardly been scratched, and as time goes on those resources will become more valuable as their development progresses. We trust that when the question of an adjustment of the subsidies to the different provinces is being dealt with, those matters which I have brought to the attention of the house will be given due consideration.

Hon. JOHN A. MACDONALD (Kings): Mr. Speaker, as this is but the second time I have attempted to make a speech in this [Mr. A. E. MacLean.]

house, I am rather afraid I have so much to say that I shall not have an opportunity of saying it within the forty minutes at my disposal.

I should like to devote a moment or two to the remarks of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacLean) who has just taken his seat. If a tariff is a hindrance to an increase in population, why has the hon. member so consistently supported a government which maintains a tariff? Further, in regard to his statements as to population increase and decrease in Prince Edward Island, he was very far at sea in stating that the decrease in population in that province commenced immediately after the national policy was adopted. That is not so. In the census of 1891 the population of Prince Edward Island reached its highest peak, and that was thirteen years after the national policy was adopted. Consequently his argument that the adoption of a protective tariff started a decrease in the population of Prince Edward Island was not correct. As a matter of fact the first decrease in the population of that province commenced in 1901, five years after the Laurier government took office, and the decrease, as shown by every census since that time, has continued steadily. So that his argument in that respect does not appear to have much weight.

As regards his argument that a tariff increases prices, I wonder how he reconciles that statement with the fact, examples of which we see every day, that the United States, the most highly protected country in the world, has on most of its products the lowest prices to be obtained anywhere, prices so low that they can ship their manufactured products into Canada in very large quantities and pay a tariff on them on the way in. As regards his argument in connection with bounties, I do not think he can claim that paying bounties to industry is any part of the Conservative policy.

In regard to seed potatoes and his correspondence with the tariff commission of the United States, he will find, as every other country finds and has always found, that the United States is not going to open its doors to competition with its own people. The United States takes care of its people, manufacturers, farmers and every other industry or person, and I think the hon. member for Prince will find that out before he finishes his correspondence with the tariff commission of the United States.

The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Beaubien) spoke about the arguments from this side of the house being more or less arguments in favour of immigration for the