

HONORABLE MR. MCPHEE SPEAKS ON THE BUDGET

(Continued from page four) Credit Where Due.

There is another thing to be borne in mind. We were entitled out of this total grant to only \$27,000. We received \$40,000 a year, owing, as our Premier said, to the generosity of the other two Maritime Premiers. Don't you think that we can thank Premier Stewart for the extra \$13,000? It is not a matter of money, apart from the consideration of who assisted in getting out of the railway grant, we can thank him for adding \$13,000 to our revenue, because his very presence in the Premier's office, his fight that he made. It was because he worked hand in hand with them and was instrumental in bringing that close co-operation which has all these years existed between the three Maritime Provinces since Conservative Governments came in. Don't you think it was because of that that they were willing to give him some tangible evidence of their confidence? That is the origin of our surplus. We are proud of its origin and we are proud of the man who made its attainment possible. (Loud applause.)

Another gratifying feature of the financial situation this year is that we are able to show a substantial decrease of about \$18,000 in the total liabilities, including capital or highway expenditure. This is a movement in the right direction. We are not asking you now to take this out, or something else out, and figure up on the rest; but we say, if you take the liabilities last year, and take into consideration every expenditure, capital or otherwise, you will find a substantial decrease of about \$18,000 in the liabilities of the Province.

Then there is the other increase in subsidy which we are about to receive, of \$125,000. Strange to say, the Leader of the Opposition is not willing that any credit should go to our Premier for this, either! He says we would have got it in any event, even if we had no Premier. The observation I have made in regard to the \$40,000 apply even more strongly in this case. It is not necessary for me to state the details which have been made in regard to the position of the Leader of the Opposition so far as our claims are concerned. I think it must be very strongly impressed upon him, if he is capable of receiving in this kind of a public statement about the lack of interest and support he received in regard to this matter when the Liberal Government was in power, the legal minds on his own side of the House, and the Leader of the Opposition was one of these "legal minds."

But there was one thing which was rather amusing. That was in the Budget Speech of the Leader of the Opposition, when he stated that he was going to show that he could do just as well as our Premier did towards a further realization of our claims. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the matter is still open, that next summer, when the Inter-provincial Conference is called, our Premier will go to Ottawa and that he will bring the same ability and persistent devotion to duty to bear in further presenting our claims, as he has done in the past. But the Leader of the Opposition says, "If I am given the chance, I will do it." Well, now, when the people of this Province are deciding who would be the best man to further realize on our claims, would you influence their decision? Will they say, "We will send a man who from the beginning of his political career until now has kept this aim clearly in mind, and who has already done something;

we will send a man who has success behind him!" Or will they send the man of whom his own Leader says that he could get no assistance? Which man should the people send?

Tax Reductions.

Premier Stewart has received, to some extent at least, a reward for his devotion to the interests of the Province in regard to our federal claims. He has been able to bring down a Budget which will be memorable in the history of this Province. It has been well said that a public man in this Province receive year to year, because his very presence in the Premier's office, his fight that he made. It was because he worked hand in hand with them and was instrumental in bringing that close co-operation which has all these years existed between the three Maritime Provinces since Conservative Governments came in. Don't you think it was because of that that they were willing to give him some tangible evidence of their confidence? That is the origin of our surplus. We are proud of its origin and we are proud of the man who made its attainment possible. (Loud applause.)

The tax reductions affect our farmers; there is a reduction in the Land Tax of twenty per cent. They affect our wage earners; there is a raising of the Income Tax exemption from \$750 in the case of single men and \$1,000 in the case of married men. They affect the owners of motor vehicles; there is a reduction of fifty per cent in the auto license fees.

There are other important features in the Premier's Budget announcement. One of the most important, to my mind, is the largely increased appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. During the past few years our people have been prospering in an agricultural way, and I think that the time is now for efforts along every line of agricultural improvement. One particular line which is being stressed and for which an additional appropriation is being made is for herd improvement. We have a disease-free area; we have attained to a high standard in cheese and butter production, and our people are becoming conscious of what they are able to accomplish. We have in many lines of production attained to a distinct standard, as in our seed potatoes, our poultry and eggs. It will be well if our farmers and producers, generally, can make this their policy—to send out from their farms the best quality of goods of every kind possible. We can accomplish this only by starting on the ground floor and working up. I think herd improvement is a step in that direction. It has been decided that the Department of the Government be directed along educational lines and in assisting the farmers in the purchase of herd sires.

Assistance is also being given to the poultry industry, and \$1,000 is being voted for the Poultry Congress which will meet this season. This will offer a splendid opportunity to this Province to advertise our products. We have been awarded one of the outstanding booths at the show, and I believe that it will be of incalculable benefit to people here.

Horticulture, which has been so neglected, we intend to revive. An experienced, capable man will be obtained for this purpose, and I am sure that the cranberries, which my hon. friend from O'Leary referred to will be taken care of, as well as larger fruits.

It is an encouraging sign that something is to be done for our fisheries. It was rather difficult for us to decide just what assistance it is best to give our fishermen—just what form it should take; but this idea of educational assistance is something which will certainly be useful to them. The manner of curing fish, the best methods of putting up the product and marketing it, can be taught with good results.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer before I conclude. I do not know whether it is proper for discussion on the Budget Debate, but considerable latitude is allowed in this debate, and members of the Opposition and on this side of the House have dealt with the subject. It is a matter of new policy, and I feel that every one should take his stand on this question and state his reasons for his position. I refer to the policy of this Government in connection with the sale of liquors. For a considerable number of years this Province has had Prohibition. That has been the law under both Governments, Liberal and Conservative. The Prohibition Act has been administered by an independent Commission, composed in the first instance of clerks, and later of laymen. I know I can speak for the Government, and I think I can speak for the past Government, when I say that at all times the Prohibition Commission was absolutely free from governmental interference. No one can contradict that statement. It has been pointed out tonight that the Government has been charged with failure to enforce the Act, that conditions would be better if we enforced it. Of course, that is just political criticism. The enforcement of the Prohibition Act was in the hands of the Prohibition Commission as well under this Government as under former administrations. The Commission under this Government put on more inspectors; they had more convictions. I think they made a more determined effort to deal with their duty of carrying out the operation of the Act. But I am ready to confess that they have not succeeded.

It has been said that the discrepancy into which the Prohibition Law has universally fallen can be laid at our door, because this independent Commission appointed by this Government has failed to enforce the Act. Let us for a moment consider what conditions were when this Government came in. I have here a statement made by a leading citizen of Charlottetown, dealing with conditions as they were on January 13th, 1923; that is, at a time shortly before the present Government took office during the closing months of the Bell regime, lived by the Rev. Mr. Raymond at a Union Prayer service which took place in the Baptist Church on the night of Jan. 12th, 1923. Mr. Raymond is reported as follows:—

Prince Edward Island boasts that it is the first Province of the Dominion to adopt a prohibition law. When a thousand miles from here the speaker had heard of the highest praise in terms of the highest praise in this account. "But what do we find when we live here? A state of conditions which is a shame and a disgrace to any province or any country. You will find in the city of Charlottetown more than you will find it in any city in the Dominion of Canada, and no apparent attempt to check it. I do not know what instructions are given our police nor do I know how well the instructions are carried out, but I do know something of the difficulties which face those who try to enforce the law. I say to you that the conditions of life in this city and province in regard to the drink traffic and a blot on the landscape of the Dominion."

Commission made honest effort.

Those were the conditions existing when this Government took office. The Commission which was appointed has made an honest and sincere attempt to carry out its duties; it has made an honest and sincere attempt to enforce the law. And it has failed. It has failed and we have recognized its failure. We have recognized the impossibility of its succeeding. We have recognized the fact that during a long period of time in this general and universal want of confidence in the Prohibition Act, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we believe in putting our cards on the table. We believe in dealing with conditions as we find them, and telling the people where we stand. And because we believe those things, the members on this side of the House—many of them for a long time sincere and practical Prohibitionists—have admitted that Prohibition has not worked, and they are willing and anxious to do something else which has every prospect of success. (Applause.)

Why do we introduce Government Control? Not only because Prohibition has failed to accomplish what its advocates believed, but because in its wake it has brought whole trains of abuses. We know of the drinking of moonshine throughout the country. Every person knows that in many places in the Province home-made liquor of a very strong and injurious quality is being continually manufactured, and that this liquor is accessible to boys and girls who are approaching mature years. They see their parents participating in the breach of the law and this stuff made available just like any other article of household use. We are aware of that condition, and we are not afraid to come out and say that we are aware of it and to attempt to deal with it.

We realize another condition—that apart from moonshine altogether, the smuggling of liquor has increased. We know that in spite of the earnest efforts of our Prohibition inspectors they have not been able to cope with this difficulty because public opinion was not with them, because the public was ready to take advantage of liquor being introduced through illicit ultimate sources. We recognize this condition. We are not afraid to face it, and we are attempting to deal with it.

Abuses under Prohibition

There are other abuses: I might refer to one of them. My profession is the profession of law. It became my duty at different times to prosecute violators of the Prohibition Law; I was retained by the Prohibition Commission to do this on several occasions. This, I am sure, is the experience of every lawyer who had anything to do with the enforcement of that Act, that men brought to Court to give evidence in connection with offenders against the Prohibition Act were much more ready to perjure themselves than in connection with any other matter which might be brought into Court. That is something, I feel sure, that no lawyer will deny. What was the reason for that condition of mind in witnesses? Why were they ready to perjure themselves in connection with the Prohibition Act and not in connection with any other matter? BECAUSE THEY REALIZED THAT THROUGH THE LENGTH AND BREADTH OF THE PROVINCE THE ACT WAS BEING TREATED AS A FARCE. That universal state of mind was bound to affect them. But men in connection with themselves in connection with the Prohibition Act would very soon acquire the habit of perjuring themselves in other matters. This leads me to perhaps the strongest reason why Prohibition should be done away with.

There has arisen in this Province a disrespect and disregard of the Prohibition Act. It is due, as I said before, not at all to any failure on the part of the Prohibition Commission to attempt to enforce it. I think they all tried to do their duty; but they have failed, and the disrespect and disregard for the Act has been on the increase. This attitude of mind towards one law

Commission made honest effort. Those were the conditions existing when this Government took office. The Commission which was appointed has made an honest and sincere attempt to carry out its duties; it has made an honest and sincere attempt to enforce the law. And it has failed. It has failed and we have recognized its failure. We have recognized the impossibility of its succeeding. We have recognized the fact that during a long period of time in this general and universal want of confidence in the Prohibition Act, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we believe in putting our cards on the table. We believe in dealing with conditions as we find them, and telling the people where we stand. And because we believe those things, the members on this side of the House—many of them for a long time sincere and practical Prohibitionists—have admitted that Prohibition has not worked, and they are willing and anxious to do something else which has every prospect of success. (Applause.)

Why do we introduce Government Control? Not only because Prohibition has failed to accomplish what its advocates believed, but because in its wake it has brought whole trains of abuses. We know of the drinking of moonshine throughout the country. Every person knows that in many places in the Province home-made liquor of a very strong and injurious quality is being continually manufactured, and that this liquor is accessible to boys and girls who are approaching mature years. They see their parents participating in the breach of the law and this stuff made available just like any other article of household use. We are aware of that condition, and we are not afraid to come out and say that we are aware of it and to attempt to deal with it.

We realize another condition—that apart from moonshine altogether, the smuggling of liquor has increased. We know that in spite of the earnest efforts of our Prohibition inspectors they have not been able to cope with this difficulty because public opinion was not with them, because the public was ready to take advantage of liquor being introduced through illicit ultimate sources. We recognize this condition. We are not afraid to face it, and we are attempting to deal with it.



THE RELIEF OF FORT VERCHERES BY A.G. DOUGHTY, C.M.G., D.E.S.L., DOMINION ARCHIVIST.

THE RELIEF OF FORT VERCHERES

Almost every girl and boy in Canada knows the story of Madeleine de Vercheres, but it can never be told too often, nor better than in her own words, in the letter she wrote for the wife of the Governor of Canada.

Madeleine was the daughter of the seigneur of Vercheres, a small settlement on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, about twenty miles below Montreal. In October, 1692, the young girl of fourteen years of age was left in charge of the fort, her father being absent on duty at Quebec and her mother having been called to Montreal. With her were her two little brothers, ten and twelve years old, an old man of eighty, a servant, a few women and children, and two soldiers. The fort was simply a square enclosure of palisades about fifteen feet high, formed by tree trunks planted in the ground, pierced by loopholes, and further protected by bastions or small towers at the corners. Outside was also a strong loopholed blockhouse, connected with the fort by a covered passage.

On the morning of the 22nd of October the Iroquois burst from the neighboring forest upon the settlers at work in the fields surrounding the fort. Madeleine, with the servant, was at the boat landing on the shore, about one hundred and fifty yards distant, when she heard the shots and perceived the Indians rushing toward her. She raced for the fort with bullets whistling about her ears, but she outran her pursuers and reaching the open gate closed and fastened it securely. There is an air of quiet triumph and satisfaction in the matter of fact way in which she tells how she calmed the panic of the women, how she berated the two soldiers who were hiding terror-stricken in the blockhouse, and animated her little brothers with her own heroic courage. The little garrison began to fire from the loopholes, the cannon roared to warn the surrounding country of the attack, and the spirited defence deceived the Indians into the belief that the fort was strongly manned, and they hesitated to attack directly. For a week the siege continued, but night and day Madeleine was on the alert and inspired her little company with her own resolute and cheerful courage. She went alone herself to the landing place to conduct a settler and his family who were seeking shelter in the fort. She says, "I thought that the savages would suppose it to be a ruse to draw them toward the fort so that we could make a sortie upon them. They did suppose so. I made the settler's family march before me in full sight of the

enemy. We put so bold a face on it that they thought they had more to fear than we. The whole defence was a superb piece of bluff, directed by a strategic wisdom remarkable in a child of fourteen, and worthy of an experienced veteran.

At last relief arrived. Madeleine's own words tell the story with dramatic brevity. "I was dozing, with my head on a table and my gun lying across my arms. The sentinel told me that he heard a voice from the river. I went up at once to the bastion to see whether it was Indians or Frenchmen. I ask 'Who are you?' One of them answered 'We are Frenchmen. It is Monsieur de LaMonsie, who comes to bring you help.' I caused the gate to be opened, placed a sentinel there, and went down to the river to meet them. As soon as I saw Monsieur de LaMonsie, I saluted him, and said, 'Monsieur, I surrender my arms to you.' He answered gallantly, 'Mademoiselle, they are in good hands.' 'Better than you think,' I returned. He inspected the fort and found everything in order, and a sentinel on each bastion. 'It is time to relieve them, Monsieur,' said I; 'we have not been off our bastions for a week.'"

This is the episode illustrated in the picture. Beyond the fort the eastern sky is bright with dawn; on the river, ruffled under the fresh autumn breeze of the morning, the birch-bark canoes of the relief party are approaching the shore. Madeleine at the landing place returns the salute of the officer. She wears the low-crowned soldier's hat of the period, one side of its broad brim turned up. A white kerchief is thrown over the shoulders of her tight-fitting bodice, which has a short flaring lapel over the hips and a row of buttons down the front. Her skirt is full and reaches about to the ankles. Low buckled shoes and dark woolen stockings complete her costume. All her clothes are of coarse serviceable materials. The officer wears a long-skirted coat with three rows of buttons down the front, connected by gold braid. The sleeves are enormous wide cuff which is turned up to the elbow and shows a deep linen ruffle which falls over the hand. A similar ruffle falls from his neck. A wide white sash is tied round his waist with the ends hanging from a bow on his right side, while a leather belt over his right shoulder supports a sword which hangs on his left. His wide breeches are decorated with a silk bow tied at the outside of the knee. His hat bears a long feather curled round the crown on the flat brim from front to back. The soldiers are similarly dressed, though without sash and gold braid.

EMPTY—WAS TO INCREASE THEIR OWN SALARIES. It was a duplicity that brought on them the condemnation of the country. (Applause.)

Before passing on the Budget for Public Health is gotten under had intended to refer to one way it will be our policy and our pleasure as a Government to contribute to the utmost extent of our which had been entirely neglected revenue towards these most important matters. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

Leary (Mr. Dennis) this afternoon attempted to flood the country with liquor. You know, Mr. Speaker, that on the contrary we are attempting to remove from the country the poisonous flood of liquor, success of the seed potato growers is due to the Liberal flood-gates; we are trying to deal with the situation as MEN, and we are taking this stand, because we believe it is right. (Applause.)

It has been said that we should have prepared or passed a law before we went to the country on this issue. But suppose we had put through a law in this House? What very men who now say that what we should have done would be the very first to call us autocrats, and say we did not give the people a chance to decide for themselves. (Applause.) We wish to give the people that chance. We are not so tenacious of the little office we have here that we are afraid to take a chance on the policy we believe to be right. (Applause.)

The member from O'Leary dealt at considerable length with the finances. I do not intend to pursue the member from O'Leary, but his meanderings through the Public Accounts; but there was one remark of his which in the light of subsequent statements became most amusing. He gave us a little account of the honesty of Conservatives and attitude which should characterize a public man towards the House and towards the people. After he read that little sermon he came out with that boast about what the Bell Government did for the potato growers. Then he went on to speak about the "Little Tax" and to compare it with our proposed Educational Tax of 1919, to our disadvantage. Don't forget that the great difference between the Conservative taxation policy of 1919 and theirs of 1920 is that we were honest and they were not. What we intended to do, and took them into our confidence, telling them how much revenue we needed to get and what we would do with it; and that they went out and told the people that increased taxes were unnecessary, and then came back and taxed them without their consent? (Applause.)

He forgot also to mention the important thing in connection with the "salary grab". No one thinks that the members are too highly paid. That was never criticism. The criticism was this—AND THAT WAS THEIR FIRST ACT WHEN, AS THEY SAY, THEY CAME IN AND DISCOVERED THAT THE TREASURY WAS

"Have You Tested My Blood, Doctor?"

"YES, I have." And what is the result? "Not very satisfactory." "What seems to be the trouble?" "Well, your blood is thin. It does not contain enough of the nutritive qualities to properly supply nourishment to the nervous system." "But I am not nervous." "No, you are not, in one sense. Your hands do not tremble. You are not easily startled or excited. But nevertheless your nerves are not in good condition. There is not enough nervous energy in your system to work the machinery of the body." "Perhaps you never thought of the vital organs of your body as requiring any motive power—any propelling energy—but they do, and this force comes through the nervous system." "Because nervous energy is lacking there is weak functioning of the vital organs. The digestive fluid does not flow properly in the stomach, and you have nervous indigestion—the action of the liver and bowels is slow and weak, and you suffer from constipation. And so it may be with other organs." "What do you think of using Dr. Chase's Nerve Food?" "There's nothing better. You know we doctors prefer to prescribe our own favorite treatments, but I have seen such splendid results from the use of Dr. Chase's Nerve Food by my patients that I no longer hesitate to recommend it."

Dr. Chase's Nerve Food

60c a box all dealers or The Dr. A. W. Chase Medicine Co., Limited, Toronto 2, Canada.

RAMSAY'S PAINTS and VARNISHES

Supreme in Quality since 1842

For Sale by STANLEY, SHAW & PEARSON