

Get Rid of Lice!

the surest way is to dust the fowls with

Pratts Powdered Lice Killer

Sure death to poultry lice—harmless and soothing to the birds. Also kills bugs, moths, fleas and other insects on pets, plants, carpets, furs, and clothing.

Pratts Food Company of Canada, Limited

430 1/2 - Carlaw Ave. Toronto

MR. H. D. MCLEAN GIVES ABLE FINANCIAL REVIEW OF THE POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF THE TWO PARTIES

He Shows Clearly That the Bell Government has Taxed the Country Districts to a Much Greater Extent Than the Conservatives and Demolishes the Excuse of the So-Called Conservative Deficit of \$253,000 in 1919. He Presents a Masterly Array of Facts and Figures.

Speaking Monday afternoon, April 23, on the Budget debate, Mr. H. D. McLean, Conservative member for First King's, said: Mr. Speaker: During the present debate you have been bombarded with a considerable amount of eloquence and for the next few moments I think that possibly I can give you some matter for reflection without the eloquence. I am obliged to the hon. member for Belfast (Hon. Mr. Nash) for the information that the Captain of the Ship of State has been promoted to the position of Admiral, and like another famous admiral at the opening of the present action he has set his signal. It does not read like the signal of another admiral, that "Bell expects every man will do his duty." His signal reads: "Time and repetition are necessary to fix the great principles of his government in the minds of the people." The first great truth he wished to impress on the people was the so-called Conservative deficit of \$253,000.

The hon. member for Second Prince apparently was not satisfied with that; he would out-Herod Herod and endeavor to prove that there were three or more deficits, all different and varying in amount. In one part of his speech he said The Guardian was like a chimney sweep, and to prove that he brought in a great many figures to show that the Conservative Government between 1911 and 1919 had gone behind to the extent of \$253,138, made up by taking the total amount of surpluses from the total amount of deficits, which he claimed left a balance of \$458,586, and adding to that what he claimed was the amount of revenue uncollected belonging to the Liberals previous to December 2, 1911. The hon. gentleman has been in the House for eight years now and he should know better than this. He is by no means a new member and there are rumors that he is aspiring to the leadership of the party. I don't think it is to his credit to make misleading statements such as this. In the first place, why should he leave out the revenue due in 1919? Again he adds \$108,782 of a deficit of 1912. He should know by this time that when the Liberals went out the left revenues of \$64,000, but they had expended some \$83,000 more between September 30, 1911 and December 2, when they left office, and that besides this deficit they left liabilities at that time of \$52,000.

Th House divided on the resolution, the "ayes" being: Hon. Mr. Gordon, Messrs. Shaw, Campbell, A. J. McDonald, J. A. McDonald and Mr. Blanchard.

A vote was taken on that resolution and among the "ayes" was the hon. gentleman himself. Does he claim the proceedings of these days are fresher in his mind now than on that occasion, when he was condemning what the other night he was praising?

The Commissioner of Agriculture, in the course of his speech said that the former leader of the Opposition, now Justice Arsenault, admitted the Conservatives went back \$165,000 during their regime. I think it was \$145,000 he said, but this is the way he is quoted in the Patriot. Now the amount as set forth in the resolution in the Journals was \$43,000, so he was only about \$100,000 out, which really does not count for much with hon. gentlemen opposite. In that statement the road machinery, etc., and purchase of supplies for Falconwood and other places, made by the Conservatives and handed over to this Government was deducted. In the statement I gave last year and which has never yet been disputed, and which cannot be shown to be incorrect—these supplies are not deducted, and the increase in the liabilities of the Province under Conservative rule from 1911 to 1919, including four years, was shown to be only \$77,000 and that is just what it was.

WHAT THE PUBLIC WILL ASK.

The Premier points out that the first question the public will ask of his Government is why the additional taxes were imposed. The Government has a right to give the answer to that question plainly and truthfully, he says; and this is the answer he gives: First, because of the Conservative deficit and overdraft; second, to increase the salaries to the teachers; third, to fill the place of the auto fees taken out of the general revenue and capitalized into a highways fund; and fourth, to raise money to put the neglected public works into shape. He stated that nothing was further from their desire than to increase taxation, but as honest men selected and elected to conduct the country's business they had to ask the people for additional taxes. If that is his best answer I think the public will ask my hon. friends another question: When were they honest men, before or after the election? If before, were they honest men, when they promised to give the teachers increased salaries, and did not say that taxation was necessary? Were they honest with the public when they condemned the Conservative road policy as an infernal scheme? Or are they honest men now with the public as regards the \$253,000 deficit? Or were they honest when they proclaimed so loudly that the expenditures on the highways would not cost the farmers of the province one cent? We have not on this side of the House taken much stock of this deficit, I admit that. We believe we are dealing with an intelligent people. We consider it is something that will not fool the people. We have tried to show the exact state of the finances in September, 1919. We had a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee in the session of 1920 and we got some information from the Provincial Auditor. Some of the revenues he could only estimate at that time, and his estimate was disputed by the Government members. From the external audit of 1921 we got more information—not estimates this time of revenues due, but the amounts actually collected, together with those amounts this Government were so sure of as to count among their own assets.

The statement I submitted to the House last year showed from the disclosures in their own books that Messrs. Hughes and Hyndman had under-estimated the revenues due on September 8, 1919. That statement has up to the present time not been contested. I propose submitting it to the House again, and will give the page and place in the Auditor's report on which the figures may be found. But let us look first into this claim that there was a deficit of \$253,000 on September 8, 1919, and the first thing we have to settle is what is a deficit. This Government has a habit of contesting any assertion which cannot be proved out of their own mouths. So, for a definition of a deficit I will go to the Patriot newspaper of a few days ago, and we find this:—

"The Guardian adds to the ordinary expenditure the Government's outlay upon improved Highways, and boldly proclaims in startling headlines the big deficit of the Bell Government. Is this muddling with figures and garbling accounts or is it not? Of course, a deficit or a surplus is really made up upon ordinary revenue and expenditure for the current year."

DEFICITS AND SURPLUSES

Now then, with this definition of their own party press in mind, let us examine Mr. Anderson's statement, and we find it dated September 30, 1919. What does the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Anderson, say in his report? He says that "the Public Accounts show that up to September 9th when the present Government took control the actual receipts were \$429,054.70, and the actual disbursements \$566,396.51, showing a deficit of expenditures over receipts of \$137,341.81." He goes on then to deduct a portion of the revenue, a part of the subsidy—that has nothing to do with the showing of a deficit and the Patriot admits that now that the difference between the ordinary revenue and expenditure alone creates a deficit—the deficit then was \$137,341.81. That is all and nothing more. But there is something else to be said or shown. The expenditures up to that time were not all ordinary expenditures—the Public Accounts made up at the end of that year by this Government show that \$60,000 of the expenditure were for permanent works or on capital account. So the ordinary expenditure was only \$506,000 which again, according to the Patriot, would further reduce the deficit to \$77,341.81. Now what time of the year was that? It was in September, before the revenues of the year were collected. It does not show the finances of the province at that time whatever. We were told that this Government came in and found an empty treasury; and how they immediately went to the auditor to get a statement of the deficit up to September 8, but I find that this report of Mr. Anderson is dated September 30. A considerable time, it seems, elapsed before they got their returns, and only three days before the Bonshaw by-election, and I think if the Government felt that any such state of affairs existed as was described by them they should and would have called in the outside auditors, as had been done previously on two occasions.

I want, however, to look into the deficit a little bit more. The deficit of \$253,000, of course, was made up by adding \$116,243 of the subsidy to the amount of the deficit shown. That works out this way: if the Conservatives received \$429,054 for eight months and the incoming Government took \$116,243 of this from them it would leave the Conservative Government for eight months doing all the road work for the year, and supplying the public buildings and institutions with coal for the winter, paying Legislative grants, etc., for the twelve months, and doing all the heavy expenditures for the year with \$302,811 of revenue; whereas the incoming Government taking \$116,243 of the subsidy plus \$189,688 of the revenues would have \$305,931 for four idle months, with nothing to provide for but four months' salaries and the Exhibition grants, against \$302,811 for eight working months under the Conservatives. Is such a division fair? Is it reasonable? What will the people think?

(To be continued.)

THE REAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

There is one thing clear from this statement. He does not prove that the deficit in 1919 was \$253,000, and it is hardly reasonable to expect the people to believe there was this increase in the liabilities of the Province during their term of \$253,000, when the outside audit taken in 1911 showed that the liabilities then were \$1,019,000 and when, according to the outside audit in 1919, they were shown to be \$1,193,000, by Messrs. Hughes and Hyndman.

We have been accused of disputing the auditor's statement. This is not so. We have never disputed this statement, but I think the hon. gentleman from Second Prince has questioned it here when he makes a statement of this kind. The hon. member for Georgetown was the next speaker. I am sorry he has left his seat, because I wished to remind him that he did not follow the signal set by the Admiral—he sang out of tune—he broke the ranks—and wandered away from the deficit of \$253,000. He wandered from Great Britain to the Western Provinces, up to Heaven and back to the House again. He referred to a statement which he says was made by myself at the Montague meeting. At that meeting I happened to mention something about the sessional indemnity. I remember rightly the remark I made was that those who supported the Liberal candidate would not only whitewash the Salary Grab but would license the Government to give the salaries another boost if they saw fit. I was interrupted by a member of the Government. The head of one of the Government departments was on the platform at the time. He said: "You voted for the measure yourself." When I went to explain I was shut off by the chairman and told my time was up. I wished to state then, what I propose to state now, that in the first session I was in this House in the year 1916 my colleague, Dr. McDonald, and myself were approached by this same gentleman, now a member of this Government, with the proposition that we should endeavor to have the indemnity increased. We did not take any stock of the proposition at that time; the Conservatives were the guardians of the treasury then, and did not raise the members' indemnities then. If the Liberal government in 1920 decided to take a different line of action the responsibility rests on them, they can not shove it over on us. I do not consider that I am in any way responsible for the increase. I will take my share of the blame for not voting against it, if there is any blame attached to that; but I did not vote for it, as was stated, except that the custom of the House counts those who do not vote as affirming.

PREMIER BELL asked if the Leader of the Opposition had not joined with the Leader of the Government in voting for the increase when the resolution was introduced.

MR. MCLEAN said there was no vote taken, nor did he remember that the Leader of the Opposition joined in any way with the Leader of the Government. He had given his own individual opinion that the salaries were not large enough for the positions, and if the Government felt they were justified in increasing them they would have to take the responsibility.

PREMIER BELL contended he had joined in a resolution to that effect.

THEN AND NOW.

MR. MCLEAN continuing, said the hon. member for First Prince (Hon. Mr. Blanchard) had gone back as far as 1877 to condemn the Conservatives and from then onwards it seemed to all and they had never done anything for agriculture nor for the collection of taxes. In the journals of 1897 I find the following motion:—

"On motion of Mr. Shaw, seconded by Mr. Campbell, resolved that the House do come to the following Resolution: WHEREAS, the present Government gained power at the election of 1893 by leading the people to believe that the days of taxation were far off and by promising that through economy and reform to make their revenue and expenditure meet; AND WHEREAS that by certain resolutions submitted during several sessions of the Legislature and by the declarations of Liberal speakers at the late elections, both federal and local, the people were given to understand that free trade with the United States in the products of the soil would be obtained by the return of the Liberals to power at Ottawa; AND WHEREAS, owing to the most reckless waste and by extravagance in the various departments of the Public Service, they have seen fit to enact a system of taxation that is unfair and unjust and bears most unevenly on the people of this Province; AND WHEREAS that notwithstanding the enormous amounts collected in taxes during the past three years, the yearly receipts have not been equal to the expenditure, and as a consequence, a public debt of an alarming magnitude has been rolled up that threatens to jeopardize the future interests and well-being of this Province. THEREFORE RESOLVED that the present Government having violated the pledges made to the people previous to the election of 1893, and by their extravagant and unnecessary expenditures largely increased the burdens of the people, have therefore forfeited the confidence of the electorate of this Province."

STAG CHEWING TOBACCO has the lasting flavor that workers want. 2 big plugs 25¢

MARITIME WIRE FENCE Fence Sturdiness "Maritime" wire fences are stronger than ordinary wire fences. Made from High Carbon and Hard Drawn steel wire, specially imported from England on account of its superior galvanizing. "Maritime" fences are from 75% to 100% stronger than common wire fences. Sturdy enough and sufficiently high to hold the largest stock. "Maritime" wire fence is still woven small enough to keep in small animals. The absolute regularity of the weaving, equally distributes any strain or pressure which may occur. "Maritime" wire fences are always taut. Write for catalogue and price list. NEW BRUNSWICK WIRE FENCE CO., Limited. MONCTON, N.B.

If its PAINT or VARNISH We Have it! Refinish Your Car—the Berry Way Make the old car look like new—bright, clean and shining as the day you got it. Refinish it the Berry Way, any color you desire—no skill required. It is the easiest thing in the world with Berry Brothers Automobile Color Varnish. It produces a lasting finish—wash-proof and wear-resistant—which keeps its lustre a long, long time. Do It NOW! Color Cards FREE—giving full instructions for using Berry Bros., Auto-Color-Varnish We Sell "Rubber Set" Brushes Beer & Weeks "Rubber Set" Brushes

GREAT BARGAINS IN USED AUTO TIRES On May 1st. I will offer for sale 50 used auto tires which I have vulcanized during the winter months. All tires are guaranteed to be in first class shape and will fit all makes of cars. You are cordially invited to inspect them. On account of the advanced prices on tires this will be a chance for you to save money. EDGAR WHITLOCK Expert Vulcanizer 162 Kent St.

FARM FOR SALE

94 acres at Orwell Corner, Lot 65 acres cleared and under cultivation, remainder covered with hardwood and softwood. Good building in first class repair, small brook crossing farm, Church and school at front of place. One mile from station, stores, musse mud and seaweed.

If not sold privately it will be put up at auction on the premises on May 10th at 12 o'clock noon.

Apply to the undersigned owner or to his solicitors.

Owing to weather the above sale has been postponed from April 26 to May 10th.

K. J. & K. M. MARTIN, Charlottetown.

N. H. McLEOD, Ufg.

IN CHANCERY

CANADA. PROVINCE OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

In Chancery Before the Vice-Chancellor.

No. C 1536. Archibald J. MacAdam and another Complainants AND Peter McGarry and Others, Defendants

Pursuant to and by virtue of a Decreeal Order made in the above cause on the Twenty-fifth day of April, A. D. 1923, by the Honourable the Vice-Chancellor, I will set up and sell at Public Auction on the premises on Wednesday the Thirtieth day of May A. D. 1923, at the hour of Twelve o'clock noon

All that tract, piece and parcel of land, situate lying and being on lot of Township Number Forty-two in King's County, bounded and described as follows, that is to say:—

On the North by Curtis Road, on the East by land now or formerly in the possession of Ronald McDonald, on the South by land now or formerly in the possession of J. C. Underhay and on the West by land in the possession of Patrick Cox, containing Ninety-two and one-half acres of land a little more or less. Also all that tract, piece and parcel of land, situate lying and being on Township Number Forty-three

bounded and described as follows, that is to say:—Commencing at the Eastern side of Burke's Road at the distance of twenty chains South from the Southern edge of a reserved road called Curtis Road and running thence South along the Eastern side of Burke's Road Eight chains and Seventy-five links, thence by a right angle line East Twenty chains, thence by a right angle line North Eight chains and Seventy links and thence West by a right angle line to the place of commencement, containing Seven and one-half acres of land a little more or less, being part of the Southern moiety of One Hundred acres of land conveyed by the Commissioner of Public Lands to P. A. Cox by Deed dated the Second day of April, A. D. 1873. Also all that other tract, piece and parcel of land situate lying and being on Township Number Forty-three bounded and described as follows, that is to say:—Commencing on the Eastern side of Burke's Road at the Southern edge of a reserved road called Curtis Road, running thence along the Eastern side of Burke's Road South Twenty-five chains, thence East Twenty chains, thence North West along the same to the place of commencement, containing Fifty acres of land a little more or less, being the Northern moiety of One Hundred acres of land conveyed by the Commissioner of Public Lands to P. A. Cox by Deed dated the Second day of April, A. D. 1873.

A deposit of twenty per cent of the purchase money will be required from the purchaser on the premises being knocked down to him at the sale, the balance of the purchase money to be paid on delivery of the deed.

The sale will be confirmed by the court, without expense to the purchaser.

Dated this 26th day of April A. D. 1923.

GIL GAUDET, Master in Chancery

MacDONALD, ESQ., Complainants' Solicitor.

116648-428-48