CONSERVATIVE ROUND SCORED IN THE BUDGET DEBATE

3rd Prince Representative Hits Out From Shoulder

Mr. A. F. Arsenault Examines Some Of The Fallacies Advanced As Arguments In Support Of The Saunders Administration And Finds Abundant Material For Good Humored Sarcasm And Trenchant Analysis.

The following speech was delivered in the Legislature during the Budget Debate by Mr. A. F. Arsenault Conservative member for 3rd Prince. Mr. Arsenault began his speech on Monday evening, April 8th:

Mr. Speaker: I was delaying in my remarks as I thought that the Minister of Public Works would speak first.

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: I will speak when you are done.

Mr. Arsenault: I didn't want to appear too anxious because, as it is now, I think that whatever defence has been put up by the leader of the Government has been destroyed by the leader of the Opposition, and there remains very little to answer. However, **it is our duty on this side of the House to criticize the actions of the present administration. That is one of the duties of the Opposition, to criticize them and to watch every step they make and call to their attention their errors. And I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it has kept us very busy.**

The Minister of Public Works has chosen not to speak just now, I presume that when he thinks there will be no more Opposition members left to criticize or answer him he will arise, as he did last year. However, we can foresee a similar speech to the one he made at the last session. **Perhaps he will not feel so elated this year, and his speech, although it will make the Chamber resound with his loud, deep voice, will be more or less like the foam on a glass of beer.** Perhaps I should not speak that way, lest I should scandalize the hon. leader of the Government and his fellow members, and send them to their room—for a glass of water. (Laughter.)

A BROKEN PLATFORM

There are certain ways of judging of the efficiency of the Liberal party during the past year, Mr. Speaker. One of them is to refer to their platform of 1927, and see how they have kept their promises, and which promises have been broken. **By their platform the Government undertook to carry on the affairs of the province with the revenue at their disposal and make revenue and expenditure meet.** As a matter of fact, they thought they would have a deficit of $15,000 last year. Instead, they came out with a deficit on ordinary expenditure of only some $1500. **We can judge of the accuracy of that statement, however, by the fact that we were refused an external audit this year.** In my experience in the House, I do not remember any other occasion when this audit was refused. In 1923, the first year I was in the House, Premier Bell did not bring in the external audit until the last of the session, after being pressed to do so; but there was never any year under the Bell Government that the audit did not come out. The Premier has stated that the external audit would tend to confuse matters and in the same breath he said that after all it was only a reproduction of the statement of the Provincial Auditor, as he gets his figures from him **and the** comparative statements are made under his co-operation. **How, then, could it tend to confuse matters? I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it would tend to reassure our people throughout the Province that the financial statement as tabled is a true statement; and a great many people do not believe that that showing of a $1500 deficit is correct.** In fact we know of many bills outstanding, which should have been paid before the last of January and which were not paid. **The external audit would show the amount of such bills and would really indicate the correct financial statement of the Province up to the last of December, 1928; and at this date we have not got such a statement, though we are still fighting for it.**

LIBERAL EXTRAVAGANCE

Let me refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the time when the Liberal party took power in August, 1927. They carried on for four months, and at the end of that year they showed, according to their own books, an increase in the debt of the Province of $159,000. And remember, we had left them in August a surplus of $70,000. They **spent our surplus and spent all the taxes collected during the following months, and came out with a deficit of $159,000.** It was a fine beginning! And what do we find last year? **We find that again they have increased the debt of the province, this time by $192,000, notwithstanding that the external audit is not forthcoming: which means a total increase of debt in one year and four months of $351,000.**

Now they come out this year and say: We budgeted last year for a deficit of $15,000 and we came out with a net deficit of only $1500; therefore you should give us great credit. But, Mr. Speaker, we remember the days of the famous Bell administration, when they were trying hard to conjure a modest surplus every year, ranging from two to five thousand dollars, and how easily those surpluses were manipulated, simply by changing expenditures in certain departments to their highways grant. They had a chance, by adjusting their expenses and charging it to such an account, of regulating those surpluses, large or small. This is what is happening today, for we have the words of the Premier and we have also the statement in the Public Accounts that the Government borrowed $150,000 to gravel the roads. **Of that money they spent $83,000, leaving a balance of $67,000 which they placed in current revenue and expended on other works not authorized by the statute that authorized them to borrow that money for the purpose, and purpose alone of gravelling the roads.**

The Real Deficit

They also borrowed $20,000 to build a ferry at Cardigan. They expended of that $20,000 the sum of $14,000, **leaving a balance of $6,000 which again they placed in current revenue and expended on other works.**

Thn they borrowed $100,000 to buy road machinery, and they spent of that $100,000 only $91,000; **and again they placed the balance in current revenue.**

These amounts, totalled, would leave them with a deficit of $84,500, without the unpaid bills—bills which must be paid and which, if we can judge of the contracts going on last fall, **would bring their deficit up to some $133,500.** We have no external audit; we can only surmise by the figures we can get from their books; but we are fairly positive that we are within the amount when we so state.

Now, financially, is that a good record for this Government? Certainly not. In 1924 it is true that the Stewart Government had a deficit of $23,095, and that in 1925 we had a deficit of $49,605. We admitted our deficits. We got out external audits every year to show how we stood. But in 1926 what happened? We went to Ottawa and we obtained more subsidy and railway grant, and came out that year with a surplus of $22,000. In August, 1927, as I said before, we left a surplus in the treasury of $70,000. And were we collecting as much money as they are at present? We find that all our collections in 1926 amounted to $747,000. We cannot say that 1927 was all our year, of course, because part of it was under the administration of the Liberal Government; but that year only $738 was collected. This year the ordinary revenue collections amounted to $827,000—some $80,000 more than we had.

Provincial Subsidy

Keeping these facts in mind, Mr. Speaker, let me read certain clauses of the platform of my hon. friends in 1927:

"At the inter-provincial conference to be assembled this fall we will, if returned to power at the ensuing election, exert our utmost endeavor in pressing our claims for increased subsidy for our Province."

That was their promise; and I suppose perhaps they did. But what did we do in 1926? We went to Ottawa; I was one of the members of the Government who accompanied Premier Stewart on that occasion, and at that conference we met Mr. Rouel, who suggested that the Maritime Provinces had to get together and decide on what basis that money which was available there ever since Mr. Bell was leader of the House, would be divided. Mr. Stewart met the premiers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and after a conference with those men we secured $40,000 a year in lieu of railway taxation, whereas on a mileage basis we were entitled only to $27,000, thus getting $13,000 a year more than we were really entitled to. **And that amount, in four years, makes $52,000 that the people of this Province can thank Premier Stewart for.** (Applause.)

Besides this we presented the brief for increased subsidy, and it was admitted at that conference that it had been called as a result of the efforts of Premier Stewart in making the first move in this matter. Premier King said in effect: "I have appointed the Duncan Commission; they will visit your Province, take information and evidence from you on those claims, and you will go before them." The King Government was therefore compelled to adopt this clause in the Duncan report and give us this $125,000 as an interim payment pending the final disposition of those claims. For the result we can thank Mr. Stewart in large measure. We can thank also the different Boards of Trade and the many public spirited citizens in this Province who furnished evidence and facts before the Commission.

We had a brief for increased subsidy at the conference to which I have referred. We did not display it as a formidable document, with lovely covers, well bound and printed to the number of 2000 copies. We didn't go to that expense. The brief that my hon. friend the leader of the Government talks about— the brief that he presented with the assistance of "Attorney General Inman" and Mr. Claire Campbell, cost this Province over $1300. **Mr. Stewart presented his brief himself, assisted by some other members of the House. He did not have to be assisted by Mr. Campbell or any other outsider; and he came back from that conference with $40,000 of the railway grant, and owing to our presentation of those claims before the Duncan Commission we were paid another $125,000 a year increased subsidy.** (Applause.)

Returns Empty Handed

My hon. friend the leader of the Government attended the next inter-provincial conference of 1927, and he had prepared a long brief. It took him an hour and a half to read the headlines at that conference, and it took "Attorney General Inman" another hour and a half to do his part; and I think my hon. friend the Premier told us that this brief occupied the longest time of any matter at that conference. **And what did they receive? Nothing!** They came home and told us that all they received was anticipations. It is true that Premier Gardiner told them he would not mind giving us $100,000 or $200,000 a year, and in return our Premier promised to do everything he could to amend the British North America Act. But so far from receiving that $100,000 or $200,000 my hon. friend has not even suggested means whereby the machinery that will ultimately try the validity of those claims can be got together. We have heard Mr. Stewart, on the floor of this House, suggest that there should be a board of experts, **and immediately the leader of the Government comes back, the next day, and says that is just what he was talking about!** (Laughter.)

When we asked the leader of the Government to table the correspondence he had with Hon. Mr. Robb or any members of the Federal Government in connection with increased subsidy, he said: **"It is not in the best interests of the public to have this information tabled just now."** He is not even as good as the late Premier Bell used to be. When we asked him to table the correspondence he had on this matter, he tabled a couple of letters. One of them showed that he had written to the Premier of New Brunswick about calling a conference, and that the Premier of New Brunswick had replied that he was contemplating retirement and could not be bothered taking up the matter. He also tabled a letter from Premier Murray of Nova Scotia. But in the present case we have not even a letter to show that there was anything done. **Perhaps my hon. friend was told by the Ministers at Ottawa not to be too hard on the Liberal Government, that we are getting a car ferry and he must not press the Federal Government too much, and that if he was a good boy he might get a Judgeship out of this.—perhaps.** (Laughter.)

Increasing Interest Charges

While this was going on, Mr. Speaker, while the pressing of our claims was being neglected, while nothing was being done that we have any knowledge of our interest charges have been increasing. **We are now paying $117,000 for interest, and interest alone; or in other words we are paying about one-seventh of our total revenue in interest.** And yet we are increasing our borrowings every year. It is quite true that the Stewart Government borrowed some money, but for what purpose? To continue our highway programme, because at that time we were getting 40 per cent of our actual expenditure on the roads from Ottawa. In other words, we were really paying only 60 per cent of the actual cost, and it was perhaps prudent and wise for us to borrow money for road work under that arrangement. But during our four years we built permanent works out of ordinary revenue to the extent of $164,000 and I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the Government that can build permanent works out of ordinary revenue is certainly an efficient Government.

Hon. Mr. LePage: Could you name the things like that you did?

Mr. Arsenault: Culverts and bridges and things like that. If you ask the hon. gentleman to your right he will give you the information. I can get it for you. There are a few works in Rustico, I believe.

Hon. Mr. LePage: There were no bridges built in Rustico, you can be assured of that.

Mr. Arsenault: We are assured that the Mathieson Government pursued that policy of building a certain amount of permanent works every year from ordinary revenue, and we find that the Mathieson Government built on an average $36,000 a year of permanent works out of ordinary revenue, or in all about $288,000. And they did this without taxing the people—not like the Bell Government, which increased the taxes about $170,000 a year over the Mathieson regime.

Increased Jail Expenditures

So much for the finances. I have shown that this Government has not been very successful in financing the Province. Now I wish to come to the administration of justice. We find that in 1926 the Department of Justice cost this Province $42,000. In 1926, our last full year in office, this department cost $37,199.43, or a difference of $4,893. Why was this? the Attorney General Mr. Stewart, was conducting that department personally. He was not employing as many Liberal attorneys to assist him. The present Premier is employing too many—or perhaps not enough; because we find that there are only a couple getting all the plums, and some others are beginning to complain. For instance, they have been bragging about the conditions in the jails. I took the trouble to enquire about the jail in Summerside, and I find the following increase in expenditures: For meat, in 1926, we paid $148. Last year the meat bill for that institution was $350. So they must be getting some good meat there, and a lot of it.

Dr. W. J. MacMillan: Prison fare!

Mr. Arsenault: They can't be keeping fast days. (Laughter.) Groceries, in 1926, cost $600. We thought that was high, but last year they spent $1200.

Hon. Mr. LePage: You used to let them out.

Mr. Arsenault: Not in Summerside. We never let them out. For medicine, again, we paid $3 in 1926, and last year they paid $61.

Dr. MacMillan: A lot of sick fellows!

Mr. Arsenault: Bread cost $104 in 1926; last year $209. **Here is the point, Mr. Speaker: We are paying a lot more money for the upkeep of our jails, owing to the fact that there are many prisoners and the upkeep seems to be increasing every year. We are providing for the comfort of those offenders under the Prohibition Act and the country is paying for it, and yet the Premier does not wish to take one cent from the Prohibition Commission to defray that expenditure. The least the Commission should do is reimburse the Province for keeping their prisoners there and buying groceries and such things at the public expense.** (Applause.)

Old Age Pensions

Another plank of the platform of my hon. friends which we claim has been broken is in connection with the Old Age Pensions. Their pledge was as follows:

"Appreciating the action of the Liberal Government at Ottawa in passing the Old Age Pensions Act, we anticipate establishing it in this Province in a manner consistent with the revenue."

Has that ever been done? Nothing last year or this year; and we might say they have got to establish it, even if they can only give every old gentleman in the Province twenty-five cents a year. **They will have to do something, be it small or large. They will have to carry out that plank, or they will hear from us every year.** (Applause.)

My hon. friends might say that they have not the revenue. Yet we are asked to vote an amount of $30,000 for a Sanatorium. They have the money for that. It may be a better purpose; **I do not deny that; but at the same time they should carry out their pre-election platform before venturing into other matters.**

Promise Re Railway Grant

Another promise they made was the payment of an equitable portion of the railway grant in lieu of taxes to the City of Charlottetown and incorporated towns. What has been done in this connection? **Nothing paid last year; nothing paid this year.** I am sure the hon. member from Summerside who entertained us to a lengthy dissertation on speed on the Draft Address, if he wants to keep up the pace, will see that this is paid; I am sure the hon. speedometer from Summerside will not stand for that, and will see that the money is paid to the town.

Mr. L. R. Allen: I do not think that my hon. friend can refer to a member of this House as a speedometer.

Mr. Arsenault: Pardon me, I meant that the hon. member was an authority on speed. There was no reflection intended. (Laughter.)

I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat. We miss him very much on this side of the House, inasmuch as he was a good debater, a man who knew the procedure of the House, a man in whom we could take pride in at least contradicting, for it always meant a lively battle. The rest over there—well, it is hardly worth while fighting with them! (Laughter.) We are sincerely glad to hear that the Minister of Agriculture is improving and will soon be out again, notwithstanding the hon. member from West River (Mr. MacPhee) and whatever opinions he may hold.

Agricultural Expenditures

Last year in the Department of Agriculture they spent $39,228. In 1926 we spent $35 390; or $3,837 less than the present Government. The Premier, when he spoke of the work of the Department of Agriculture, mentioned nothing new that he was trying to inaugurate in this Province. It is quite true that he discussed the taste of lambs and gave us a dissertation on the raising of chickens. But I was thinking, when he was speaking of these matters, how he used to abuse the leader of the Opposition for attempting to carry on as Acting Minister of Agriculture. "What did he know about farming?" My hon. friend wanted to assure the House, I suppose, that he knew some thing about chickens and lambs, and perhaps he intends, during the illness of the Hon. Mr. Lea, to be acting Minister himself. There has been no announcement to that effect, but I presume that he was preparing the ground.

In their platform, also, my hon. friends promised to encourage the breeding of horses. Nothing has been done in this respect, and it is unfortunate, because we find that at least twelve carloads of Western horses have entered this Province west of Kensington. That is a large number, and I think that something might be done along that line.

They also promised in their platform to do something to encourage the growing of cranberries and small vegetables, but, as already stated by the leader of the Opposition, they dismissed the only man the Province could procure at the time to look after that branch of agriculture, and nothing has been done to carry on this important work. We know that large sums of money are made through the cultivation of cranberries. I know farmers right in my section who are making two or three hundred dollars a year out of this business, and they are only picking their early crop. I really think something should be done, and that there are bright prospects for the cultivation of cranberries. The blueberry industry is also an important one, and nothing has been done by the Government in this regard.

Short Courses Abandoned

The short courses carried on by the Conservative Government have practically been abandoned. All we have left now are the domestic science courses for a few girls, and worse than that, our Minister has abandoned all the grants to local fairs. It is true that last fall, through some pull, the exhibitions were held, but the fact that the Minister is against them has had a demoralizing effect. **Our people know the feeling of the Minister and his Government, they know that he is against granting money to those exhibitions and they are not planning for the future.** Those exhibitions will be abandoned, Mr. Speaker; the Minister will kill them that way, and I believe it is a big mistake for the Department not to continue those splendid institutions which have done so much to encourage agriculture in this Province. I hope that this year my good friend from the Third District of Prince will not be as quiet as he was last year, and will say something on this subject. **I hope he will have as much courage as the hon. member from West River and will tell us his mind and not follow in the steps of his leader or let the splendid exhibition at Egmont Bay be abolished or languish through the threats of the Government to discontinue the grant.**

I need no discuss any longer the merits or demerits of the Minister of Agriculture and his staff. We have the words of the hon. member from West River, who is in the secrets of the department and of the Government, and he states that the Minister talks too much and he fails to see the utility or advantage of that department. We had better take his word, don't you think? He ought to know.

Hon. Mr. LePage: Your own leader stated it was of no use under your government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Under your Government; that is all I was referring to.

Over Emphasis on P[illegible]

Mr. Arsenault: We all agree with the hon. member from West River this year, when he says that we are not getting value for the money expended. I might say that perhaps in the past the Department of Agriculture has been a little neglected. We have been growing potatoes too much, I believe, and neglecting our live stock. There is a shortage now in our live stock and it will take two or three years before our farmers are in as good a position as they were a few years ago. Why should this be so? I believe that our Deputy Minister, although a good man in his position, has been stressing the growing of potatoes too much, along with some members of that Department. They have been encouraging our farmers by their example to grow more potatoes, advising them that they could never overrun the demand for seed potatoes. There has not been sufficient foresight in that department to regulate the activities of our farmers, in preventing them from running wild along one line. The Deputy Minister, of course, should love all branches of agriculture and not devote so much time to one department alone. I hope something will be done along that line in the future, and that the live stock branch will receive the attention it deserves. I do not believe there is at present sufficient co-operation with the live-stock inspectors or the farmers. Those men here who have a knowledge of the requirements of the really good farmers should visit our poorer sections and should show those farmers, in the first place, how to build proper stables; how to ventilate them, clean them up; how to feed their cattle; and with a little teaching I believe those farmers would progress very rapidly. After all, is it not a fact that we can grow great potatoes today because we have been shown how to grow them; how to plant, hill, harrow and dig them; how to cull them and grade them. **We have been successful because we have been shown the proper methods by these staffs of inspectors, and the same thing, I believe, applies to live stock.** Inspectors should be on the farms oftener, talking to our farmers, visiting their stables, and helping them to solve their problem.

Enforcement of Speed Laws

Continuing the debate on Tuesday afternoon, April 9th, Mr. Arsenault said:

Last evening I was dealing with the Administration of Justice and the Agricultural Department. There are still a few remarks with respect to the department of Justice which I would like to address to the Attorney General. I may tell you frankly that I do hate to mention these facts, but I think, for the general benefit of the administration of justice in Prince County, that some reference should be made to them. For instance in Prince County,—and I think this will apply to the other Counties as well—the speed laws are not observed properly. We are getting now to a stage when, owing to increased automobile traffic on our roads, there should be a stricter enforcement of traffic regulations. It is only a few years since we allowed automobiles to operate in this Province, and for some time the car owners and drivers were very careful. Owing perhaps to their limited number, accidents on the roads were fewer and less serious in nature than we have had during the past few years. We have now over 5000 automobiles in the Province, and our roads at certain times of the year are very dusty. I personally experienced, while going on a sandy, dusty road at twenty-five or thirty miles an hour, the effect of some one coming behind me and with practically no warning passing me at a rate of at least fifty or sixty miles an hour, causing a great cloud of dust to arise and blinding me and the occupants of my car, and thereby causing some "cuss" words, very often. Now this should not be allowed. It is true that some years ago we were only getting a small revenue from auto fees, and owing to our large borrowings and the funding of those receipts we could not afford to spend very much in looking after the automobile traffic in this Province. **But now, since the receipts have practically doubled, I think a larger appropriation should be made by the Department of Justice for the prosecution and punishment of motorists who exceed our speed limits.**

We find also that too many are allowed to operate a car when in a state of intoxication. This is a most serous matter. I think the Attorney General will have the support of every right thinking citizen in this Province if he will prosecute every offender along those lines. These cars are too dangerous an instrument to be placed in the hands of a man un[illegible] the influence of liquor.

[illegible] cars. I do not object to ladies driving; they are often very careful drivers, perhaps better than most men; but I know enough ladies driving in Prince County who should not be allowed to drive a car, and I know a good many men, too, who should never be allowed to get a license. They do not seem to have the least judgment or the least conception of speed, and they do not seem to have their car under control. **I think it is up to the Attorney General to see that these conditions are remedied. Instead of having twenty Prohibition inspectors, he should have a few of them to inspect cars, stop car owners and make them test their brakes.** You cannot find conditions of such carelessness in any other province. In the United States they will check your lights and everything, even to the judgment and eyesight of the chauffeur, to make sure that that man is not going to be the cause of annoyance and a threat to the car owners and the public in general.

A few years ago, under the Conservative Government, we inaugurated a system of policing our roads by hireing three or more men and providing them with motor cycles. They at least had this checking influence on reckless drivers, that they were being watched and caught now and again, and all who were travelling any distance were apt to meet them from time to time. **Last year I do not remember of having seen one of these men.** Where are they? They should be on our roads constantly. They are no good on the streets of Charlottetown or in Summerside, they should be out in the country. In the city and towns abuses like these can easily be checked, but on our country roads it is very necessary o be vigilant. **The motor cycle police should be on the roads every day and they should be very severe with offenders for over speeding or being drunk on the roads.**

Menace of Joy Riders

We have another condition which prevails in our County, and I believe it can be said of the other Counties as well, that too many young men will buy a cheap car, patch it up, and start joy-riding along our roads. They do not care whether they run into trouble; their car only cost fifty dollars and if they can get thrills by speeding along at fifty or sixty miles an hour they are going to do it. These men should be stopped. After all, the car owners of this Province pay a high fee, many of them have expensive cars, and why should they be exposed to the reckless driving of the other class I have mentioned? I think the Attorney General would be well advised if he were more strict with these offenders during the coming summer than he was last year.

Magistrate's Court, Summerside

There is another matter to which I wish to refer, and it has become the talk of Prince County. The people are simply scandalized by the conditions in some of our Magistrate's courts. I referred to this last year, but apparently it had no effect. The criticism among our people has been increasing; so much so that I think it my duty, as the only representative from Prince County in the Opposition, to divulge to this House some of the circumstances that exist.

For instance, we have a Magistrate by the name of Alexander Campbell; a good man. He has an office on the corner of Water Street and Summer Street, and in the same building, and adjoining his office with only a glass partition between, is the office of the Premier and Attorney General, and of Mr. Thane Campbell, his partner, a son of Mr. Alexander Campbell. Most of the prosecutions are brought before Mr. Alexander Campbell, and cases on behalf of the Crown are prosecuted by Mr. Thane Campbell, who is also a good man. **But don't you see that that very condition—the fact that the office of the son, the prosecuting attorney, and of the father who sits in judgment, are separaed by just a door and glass partition, while there may be nothing wrong, is bound to create suspicion and dissatisfaction?** Don't you think that the people generally are beginning to believe that there is something wrong, and that should be stopped? It is not well that our people should complain of these conditions. There are lots of prosecutions where a man is found guilty, and perhaps he might think he had a good case, and he goes back to his settlement and says: "What could I do? I was being prosecuted by Mr. Campbell, who prosecuted me before his father, and the father naturally would give some sympathy to the son and would be pleased to see him win his case; so he would naturally give judgment against me." These rumors are circulating, and people begin to lose their faith in the administration of British justice. That should be stopped. We have another Magistrate, Mr. Strong, who is well qualified to hear many of those cases. But no; they seem to persist in this course, and some lawyers are perhaps taking advantage of the situation. It is natural that a lawyer losing his case would say: "Well, how could I win, with the father sitting in judgment and the son prosecuting?" I know my hon. friend the Premier would not want that condition to continue if he thought there was anything wrong, and he would see that the number of cases prosecuted by the methods complained of would be reduced to the fewest possible.

Fox Stealing

When I was home last Friday I was accosted by a large number of fox men who visited my office complaining of a decision that had been given in that same Court a few days before. I do not wish to criticise the decision. It was perhaps all right according to law; but here is what happened: A man was charged with stealing a fox. He was caught with the goods, or identified, and his case was brought up under a certain section of the Criminal Code which provides, of course, for all sorts of thefts. It so happens that this section only provides penalties for the stealing of dogs, cattle or domestic animals of the value of $10 or over. At the time the section was framed, they had no idea of the value of a fox, and no provision was made for fox stealing. The defendant's attorney very wisely succeeded in bringing the case under this section, and instructed the man to take summary judgment instead of being brought to the Supreme Court. What happened?? This case was brought before Mr. Alexander Campbell. The defendant chose to be tried before the Magistrate, the Magistrate under that section tried him summarily and fined him $25 and the amount of the goods stolen. And what are the consequences? A man may come into my fox ranch and if he is caught he pays the value of the fox and $25. **If he is not caught he keeps everything.** That is a very dangerous state of affairs, where the fox ranches mean so much to this Province. This is now the time of year when it is easy to enter a ranch and steal a number of young foxes, **and the Attorney General, I think, should take steps to at least advise our people that any further thefts of foxes will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.** I understand the Attorney General was represented there by Mr. Thane Campbell, and no objection was raised as to the important decision of that Court. We have, unfortunately, too many men who are looking for a chance to make money out of stealing foxes. Some years ago we had practically an epidemic of these crimes, and our fox men had to get together and prosecute those thefts. **I suggest that the Attorney General look further into this matter and see that this sort of thing is not repeated in this Province.**

(Continued on Page 13)