

A SHAMEFUL RECORD OF BROKEN PLEDGES

(Continued from Page 8)

have they done in that regard? So far as we have been able to find out, they have not even communicated with Ottawa, or the Federal authorities on the matter. Unless something is done at this session of the Legislature we can certainly charge them with failure to implement their solemn promise to the people. It should be considered that when a political party comes before the people of this Province and pledges itself as the Liberal party did in 1927 on this subject, some attempt at least would be made to implement that promise if it is at all possible. Even if this Government had decided that it was impossible for them to consider the scheme financially, they should have come into this House and told us so. They should have given us the information, and their reasons, so that the people would know the facts for themselves. But the idea in this case, as in many other cases, seems to be to let this plank dangle in the air and do service at another election. We know that at the last election it was of considerable service; it was always facing those who were opposing my hon. friends, and it may be that we shall hear of it again when the time for another contest comes around. I think, however, that this matter should have some consideration at this session of Parliament. If there is nothing going to be done, at least let us have that much information. Will the Government have the frankness to tell the people that they will not put this plan into operation? Then we shall know the position we are in. (Applause.)

The Educational Problem

There is another matter on which I wish to make a few remarks; that is the educational question, which has been receiving considerable attention at this session. The question probably has assumed a different form than at previous sessions of the House, which may be accounted for by the manner in which the teachers have been pressing for an increase in salaries. Had they not increased the final effort, and threatened to strike, it is possible that this also might be another matter left dangling in the air. Up to the present time, a compromise has been arranged between the Teachers' Federation and the Government to have a Commission investigate the whole educational system and also to make suggestions to the Government whereby the teachers may be paid a living wage.

I notice that when the leader of the house was dealing with this matter of our educational problem, when he touched on the matter of salaries as he did on two occasions, he was very careful to tell us about the low salary paid to the Prime Minister of this Province. In the Draft Address he dealt with this matter, and also in the budget speech. He told us that the Prime Minister's salary was the lowest of any Prime Minister in Canada. I do not contradict him on that matter, but I think he might also have told this House, as we all know that the leader of the Government, but that he has reached out and taken a second, with another very fair salary of \$1500 added to the \$2,000 which he receives as Prime Minister. And that is not all, Mr. Speaker, I would not bring this matter up if it had not been used so strongly, to my mind, to show that the teachers' salaries were probably high enough. I think that the idea which prompted my hon. friend to use this illustration. But there is a third salary which he receives by way of indemnity during the session. True, it is not very large, but we all receive that amount and it alone is almost equal to the average salary paid to the school teachers throughout this Province. That makes three salaries which he is receiving; but that is not all. Added to that again is another indemnity for loss of time in attending the trustee meetings at Falconwood Hospital. Besides that there is still a little more; free travelling expenses for instance and a fine car to drive around in at the public expense. I have time and again heard the Premier when he was in the Opposition criticize the then leader of the Government for using a car at the expense of the country, and if that accusation was just and fair then it is just and fair now. (Applause.)

Motor Cars and "Blood Money"

Furthermore, the leader of the Opposition today when he was leader of this House was accused time and again on public platforms by political men and by understrappers who were hired and sent out to talk about this very car, that it was bought from the profits of the Liquor Commission. I am surprised today, Mr. Speaker, to think that the present leader of this Government would even drive in a car that had come out of the "blood money" of this country, let alone use it for his own pleasure and sport. (Applause.)

We all admit, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers' salaries are not high. I do not believe there is any reasonable man in this Province who will say that the teachers are paid a living wage. I have taken some little interest in the educational affairs of this Province, and I have noticed time and again the enthusiasm and energy that the school teachers in the majority of cases throughout the Province put into their work and it is indeed most discouraging to a good many of those people to know that there is no prospect for a livelihood for them, or of making their profession a life work in this Province. When this Commission does meet, they must take into consideration not only the entire school system but they must see to it that our public school teachers who are taking care of the youth of the land will be properly paid. There are some excellent school teachers leaving the Province year after year because they cannot make a livelihood here, and we should have a system whereby those good teachers would be retained. It is a noble profession, but you cannot expect any man to sacrifice the chances he has in life, no matter how public spirited he may be, for a profession in which he cannot make a decent livelihood.

Government Unprepared

The answer has been given to the school teachers that the funds of the Province are not adequate to pay them an increase. It was also stated that an increase to the teachers would mean an increase in taxation on the farmers. It has even been said on the floor of this House, that it would be held against the teachers that they had threatened to strike. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a certain sympathy with the teachers throughout the Province. However, the same people who have felt sympathy with them may have realized that the finances at the present time were not sufficient to give them an increase in salaries. But what has been the Government's attitude with reference to this matter? They knew that there was dissatisfaction a year ago among the teachers with regard to their salaries. They should have prepared themselves so that when this threatened strike was about to come off they would be in a position to meet the teachers and at least compromise on their salaries. They could have done this had they gone to the proper source, that is to the Federal Government, and pressed our claims in such a way that we would have had results.

Prohibition and Smuggling

There is another matter which has been referred to by nearly every speaker, though in different ways. That is Prohibition. I am not going to argue the pros and cons of the subject at this time, Mr. Speaker. The question of Prohibition vs. Government Control is not the question before the House at the present time. That was decided in 1927, and it is again to be decided, we have been told, in July of this year. But what I wish to point out is that this Government pledged itself to enforce Prohibition 100 per cent. They are pledged to stop smuggling. There was to be no such thing as smuggling after the Saunders administration was elected. That was the promise on which they gained power, that they would make this Province dry; "as dry as the Sahara desert," according to the local Liberal organ at that time. The leader of this House stated on several occasions that the smuggler would be put out of existence entirely; that it would be easier for a camel to pass through a needle's eye than for a smuggler to land a dollar's worth of booze on the Prince Edward Island shore. Those may not have been his exact words, but that was his meaning, and that is what the people understood. Now let us see what has been done in that regard.

Has smuggling entirely ceased? A short time ago an honorable gentleman from this Province—a prominent Liberal—made the statement on the floor of the Senate Chamber at Ottawa that there was still a great deal of smuggling going on; that it had demoralized entire communities in this Province. That must have been quite a revelation to some people who believed my hon. friends that there was no smuggling under

the Saunders administration. We know that the prevention of smuggling is a difficult matter. I agree with what one of the members of the Government said the other day, that it is almost impossible. However, in the campaign of 1927 we were assured that our coasts would be patrolled by a fleet of motor boats and speed craft of all kinds, that these boats would connect up with a land force of from fifteen to twenty-five policemen of the very highest class, and that through the combination of these two forces, assisted by a powerful Commission and a specially interested and vigilant class of legislators, the smugglers would absolutely be put out of business.

Laxity of Enforcement

We all know that this promise has not been fulfilled, and that the smuggling of liquor is going on. If there was only \$130,000 worth of liquor consumed in the Island, that would not be a very great amount. In fact, it would be a reduction on what was consumed the previous year of about \$10,000, if it were not for the fact that there has been a reduction in price. The present Government claims that it has reduced the price from two and a half to ten per cent; on some lines of booze they have reduced it two per cent and on some others they reduced it as much as twelve per cent. However, the fact remains that even this amount of \$130,000 of liquor consumed at reduced prices does not represent what has been drunk in this Province, since we have not accounted for what the smuggler and the bootlegger has sold.

The Point I Wish to Make is This:

Has the Government fulfilled its promise to the people that they would endeavor to the best of their ability, to prevent smuggling on the shores of this Province? Last year, during the summer and autumn, smuggling, as we know, was carried on at an extraordinary rate. So glaring was it that even the mouthpiece of the Liberal party, the Patriot, had the courage, in one of their new items, to state that the beautiful weather which was then prevailing had enabled the smuggler to land his goods without any hindrance on the North Shore. No doubt the editorial pen slipped when that item went in or the censorship must have relaxed to enable this comment to be made. At any rate, it was a true statement of the conditions which prevailed last summer.

An Example Nearer Home

It was rather amusing yesterday to listen to one of the hon. members in condemning Government Control. He made the statement that over at Port Elgin, or Bale Verte, or perhaps in both places, he had seen, or someone had told him of having seen, a man going into a place under Government Control and in ten minutes he was able to get three bottles of booze.

Hon. Mr. LePage: Correct.

Mr. McLure: Well, if he had worked rapidly, and if he had enough cash, he should have been able to bring out more than that in that time.

Hon. Mr. LePage: I guess that is all the money he had.

Mr. McLure: That may be. However, the hon. member from Rustico need not go to the neighboring province of New Brunswick to get information of that kind. If he would take up a watchful position on some of the streets of Charlottetown he would be able to see some men go into a rum shop and in less than three minutes he could see more than three bottles of booze come out of that place. Why travel so far afield for information, when you can get it at your own door? I was rather surprised at the hon. member from Rustico going so far to bring out a fact that he could see every day right in the city of Charlottetown.

Hon. Mr. LePage: Question.

Mr. McLure: Question, he says! The other day I was an eye-witness myself to three men going into a rum shop and in less than two minutes, by the tick of the clock, those men came out, each apparently with a bottle—how many more you couldn't tell, because their grips were full. It may have been one or it may have been a dozen. And I am sorry to say that two of them were members of this Legislature—not on this side of the House. I had no intention, Mr. Speaker, of saying anything about anybody going in for a bottle of booze, but I want to show that we don't have to go to New Brunswick or Ontario for a few illustrations with reference to this matter.

Premier Saunders: I think my hon. friend, since he has made that statement, should clear up the matter and give us the names of those

Mr. McLure: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to give those names on the floor of this House.

Hon. Mr. LePage: You can't insinuate.

Mr. McLure: I am not insinuating anything, but I can give the Premier the information privately. We all know the conditions. The Premier himself is aware of them, I am not holding it against any man, myself; neither does he. I would not have mentioned this matter, but why go to the other provinces looking for a little information that we can always find right at home.

Liquor Consumption

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to argue the pros and cons of Prohibition or Government Control. Prohibition is the law of the land at the present time, and the Government has pledged itself to do all in its power to do away entirely with the drink traffic. Let us look for a moment at the amount of liquor consumed in this Province last year through the Government vendors; \$130,000 worth. We have not been able to get very much information with regard to this matter. I do not say it is too much liquor; there may have been a good many sick people, and I think that almost every doctor prescribes liquor for some of his patients. There may be some who do not have alcoholic patients, but we never hear of any medical man who is not prescribing liquor to some extent at least; if there are, we should like to know. From the little information that we have been able to get from the Liquor Commission the records show that almost every doctor in this Province has been taking up his full quota of prescriptions. That is the condition, according to the information that this House has. And that is under Prohibition as administered by a Government that is pledged to stop all drinking other than for medicinal purposes.

I do not believe that any member of this Legislature will say for a moment that \$130,000 worth of liquor is used in this Province for medicinal purposes. If it is, the doctors must be prescribing a little drop for almost every patient, because it means that from the babies in the cradle to the old people throughout the Province, we are all consuming about \$1.50 worth of liquor per capita per year.

But that is only part of the story. If that was all the liquor consumed in the Province it would only be a mere bagatelle. Nobody knows, and nobody can estimate the amount of money that is spent in alcoholic drinks in this Province. I think perhaps it is a safe bet to say that five times that amount is consumed. I would base that on the smuggling that takes place around our Province. Hon. members of this House who live near the coast-line know for themselves the amount that is smuggled in that direction. However, I am not going to say very much more with respect to this prohibitory law. In July of this year we are promised a plebiscite. That plebiscite may go one way or the other, and it will then be a matter for the people to decide.

The Plebiscite

We were informed yesterday by an hon. member of the Government, that this Government would be quite prepared to adopt Government Control if the plebiscite went that way. I was rather surprised to hear that

work. But we know that he is only auditing the revenue and expenditures; he is not given the same commission that an external auditor is given; his work is entirely different. Consequently, while he may audit correctly the ordinary expenditure and revenue, he is not given that authority to enquire into the different departments as to what is accruing for the year and the contracts that have not been paid. I might refer to one instance, just to show the necessity of an external auditor's report.

Liquor Assets

The External Audit of 1927, schedule F 5, page 16, shows that there was on hand at the Liquor Commission stores an asset in the shape of goods and in cash of \$36,000 or thereabouts. \$16,000 of that amount was in cash in the Royal Bank; the balance was liquors on hand and paid for. In the same year, at the end of December, 1927, external auditors, Messrs. W. L. Poole and H. A. C. Scarth reported that this asset of \$36,000 had increased to \$45,000. About \$23,000 of this amount was then in cash in the Royal Bank. That was the report at the end of 1927, and we accepted it.

Now we come to the year 1928. During that year the Liquor Commission had a business of \$130,000 in sales and about \$10,000 in fines—a total of \$140,000. It is reasonable to assume that if the Paton Commission in 1926-27 could make a profit on \$160,000 worth of liquor of some \$37,000, this Government or this Liquor Commission must have made, on the same basis, \$40,000 possibly more. Of course we have no account to go by, but that is, I think, a moderate estimate. Add that \$40,000 to the \$45,000 assets on hand at the end of 1927, and you have \$85,000 of the assets of this Province to be accounted for. Yet when the Public Accounts came down this year there was no record of this money in any shape or form. We know that \$45,000 of those assets were there on Dec. 31st, 1927, as shown by their own external audit. We have had no explanation as to where this money has gone, or the increase in profits that has accrued. Yet my hon. friends will say that there is no need of an external audit. Here is a shortage in the accounts of the assets of this Province of over \$80,000, and I claim that it was the duty of the Government to have furnished a statement of this account to the House. (Applause.)

While the Premier was delivering his Budget speech a few nights ago he went into a great many details, and drew one very fine point between debt and liability. I am not going to argue that point with him, only to say that debts and liabilities are neither of them desirable. None of us want them in our personal business, neither should we want them for our Government.

With respect to the debt, the Premier told us that there was only a deficit of some \$1,559,115. I do not see why they did not turn that into a surplus of seventy-five or ninety thousand dollars. It was just as easy from their method of book-keeping to show a surplus as it was a small deficit. However, that difference between ordinary expenditure and ordinary revenue is not the true statement of our indebtedness. We may talk as we please, and we may camouflage this statement and the other statement, but we cannot get clear of the fact of our provincial liability. Our debt is increasing every year. During the past year it increased over \$200,000. The Public Accounts themselves show an increase of \$192,000 and I am quite sure that if we had before us the report of the External Auditor it would show that the liabilities were increased at least \$40,000 or \$50,000 more. For if my hon. friends had no unpaid bills, why were they afraid to have an independent audit of their books? (Applause.)

The External Audit

The leader of the Government told us that his reason for not having an External Audit was that it cost \$500. One other hon. member of this House stated that it was not worth that much; that it was only a kind of graft that was thrown out on certain occasions by all Governments, and that we can very well dispense with it altogether. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not look upon an External Audit as a means of giving a little "graft" to some party heeled. Capable men have been employed on these audits in the past, and it was a certain satisfaction to the public as well as to this House to know that an impartial audit was being made showing the exact financial position of the Province. The Premier and the members of his Government have laid themselves open to the severest criticism when they did not give to this Legislature and to the people of the Province the advantage which an External Audit affords of investigating the financial accounts.

Mounting Liabilities

I have nothing to say with regard to our Provincial Auditor, Mr. John Anderson. I believe that he is a capable man, and well able to do his

work. But we know that he is only auditing the revenue and expenditures; he is not given the same commission that an external auditor is given; his work is entirely different. Consequently, while he may audit correctly the ordinary expenditure and revenue, he is not given that authority to enquire into the different departments as to what is accruing for the year and the contracts that have not been paid. I might refer to one instance, just to show the necessity of an external auditor's report.

Mounting Liabilities

The members of this House know that our farmers at the present time are not in a position to pay increased taxes. And we are getting increased taxation now from our interest charges alone, which is surely sufficient. I think some hon. gentleman made the statement the other day that the taxation from interest alone is 12 cents per acre for every acre of land in Prince Edward Island. We cannot get away from the fact that our debt is yearly increasing and that the amount of interest is becoming more and more a burden upon the taxpayers of this Province. Last year it amounted to \$117,000, which is almost \$1.50 for every man, woman and child in the Province. Next year it will be considerably more. It is a big interest to pay, and I think the Government will be well advised to go slow in their spending operations and consider that our debt is now sufficiently large for the income of our people.

Taxation Pledges

The leader of the Government, during his budget speech, said that the provincial debt had been increasing year after year. In the last year and five months, as we know, it has increased by almost half a million; and what is going to be the result? The Premier touched on that subject very gingerly. He said that all these debts would eventually have to be funded, and it would mean increased taxation. We on this side of the House, and the people generally do not want to hear those whisperings about increased taxation. Both parties have pledged themselves to

reduce taxation. The Conservative party under the Stewart Government implemented their pledge and reduced taxation on the farmers by 20 per cent. They also took off that obnoxious tax known as the Bell-Saunders Poll Tax. It is surprising to me, Mr. Speaker, to hear members of this Government who will still get up and talk about that wonderful Poll Tax. Why, it was the most just, the most equitable, the fairest of all kinds of taxes; and the leader of the Opposition was criticised very severely the other day for taking it off the Statutes; or, in other words, for implementing a promise that he had made. The Conservative party looked upon that Poll Tax as the people looked upon it, as an unjust tax, and that is why they relieved the people of paying it. As I said on the floor of this House before, if the members of the Government are sincere in what they say about the Poll Tax, I challenge them to place that tax on the Statute Books of this Province again. (Loud Conservative Applause.)

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: It would be no use. You would take it off.

Mr. McLure: Certainly we would take it off. Why wouldn't we take off an unjust tax that you people had put on.

Mr. Horace Wright: You haven't shown the injustice yet.

Mr. McLure: The people showed that it was unjust when they voted my hon. friends out. (Applause) As I said when I was interrupted, if the leader of the Government and the members on that side of the House were really sincere, if they believe that the Poll Tax was the fairest and most equitable of all the taxes, why do they not put their sincerity into action and re-enact the Poll Tax at this session? (Applause.)

"D. T." Governments

If you go back for a number of years, Mr. Speaker, you will find a remarkable history in connection with debt and taxation in this Province. In fact, you might well describe the Liberal Governments as the "D.T." Governments. I do not mean by that that they have had Delirium Tremens. They may contract that too if they continue buying \$130,000 of booze and selling it without profit! But the D.T.s, as applied to the Liberal Government and the Liberal party means this: If you will go back to the '90's or further and follow up the political history of both parties, you will find that Liberal Governments always stand for Deficits and Taxation. Take our present deficit and the deficits that have accumulated, or the taxation that has been put on the Statute books. Almost 90 per cent. of all the deficits and nearly 95 per cent. of all taxation has been given to us by the Liberal party. Consequently we on this side of the House, when we hear whisperings of increased taxation, like to come out squarely and say, as we said last year to the leader of the Government, that we will not stand for increased taxation. (Loud Conservative applause.)

Improving With Age

I said, it is hard to discuss the Public Works Department when we have not heard from the Minister himself; but when the leader of the Government was speaking on the Budget he stated that it was an asset to this Province to buy the road machinery. They spent \$100,000 or the greater part of that amount to purchase this machinery, and I have never known it to be figured out the way the Premier figured it in his speech. He said that the machinery was worth more now than when they purchased it. I suppose my hon. friend had been looking over the Public Accounts and saw where some \$8,000 had been paid for repairs on those machines. Possibly he knew that another \$15,000 of repair work had been done which has not yet been paid for. He added this \$15,000 and \$8,000 to the \$100,000 and argues by this extra cost, that the machinery is worth more today than when it was purchased. If that will continue for the next five years it will be a revelation because if machinery like that can improve in value every time it is repaired it will be a wonderful asset to the Province. However, I do not think any member of the House can swallow a dose like that.

Falconwood Herd

I have touched on a few matters brought up in connection with the Budget debate. It is impossible to follow them all, or to go back over the notes of the various speeches, for I would be taking up more than my share of the time of this House. There are just two other items I wish to mention, however, and one of them is with reference to Falconwood farm. One of the members on the other side of this House made the statement that this farm had produced a surplus profit in cash this year of some \$500 or \$600. We are glad to hear that. Personally, if the Minister of Agriculture was in his seat, I would congratulate him on it. But there was something else in the statement I refer to which I could not understand. The impression was created by the hon. member of the Government who discussed this matter that prior to this Government coming into power there was nothing but scrub cattle at Falconwood farm. We all know that it is only a year and a half since the present Minister of Agriculture took over that farm. How in the name of goodness could the stock improve in that short time from scrub cattle to the most famous herd of pure bred animals on Prince Edward Island? I ask, Mr.

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

reference to the finances that takes us into a field of which we have heard very little so far this session; as that is the Public Works Department. We have heard nothing from the head of that Department, but I hope that at a later date we shall have a full report as to the work that has been carried on during the past year. I suggested on the floor of the House in 1924, 1925, 1926 and again last year that it would be in the interests of the debate if the portfolio members, in tabling their reports, would make a definite announcement of the policies of the Government at the same time. I would make the budget debate much more important to us all. I cannot see why the heads of these departments should lag behind, because it only means that those of us who have to speak before the Ministers are not in a position to criticize the work of the departments, or even to commend it. That is my position with respect to the Minister of Public Works, for I am going to commend him now.

When this Government started out on a new road policy, and expended \$100,000 on road machinery, they unfortunately threw away or discarded all the old machines, which they had to scrap to make room for the new. Now I suppose my hon. friend will say that is a criticism, but I will come to the recommendation in a few minutes. They were trying out a new system; they believed that the road drag was a nuisance. The Stewart Government had some 200 or 300 of these drags on hand and they discarded them all. Now the hon. Minister of Public Works is having road drags made, and I am credibly informed that he has gone back to the Stewart policy of road making and road dragging. (Applause) I want to commend him for seeing the error of his ways in discarding the road drags and that he is man enough to come back and inaugurate the road drag system, because, Mr. Speaker, we all know that there is no better method of keeping our roads in repair and giving them a good, hard surface than by dragging if it is properly done at frequent intervals throughout the season.

"D. T." Governments

If you go back for a number of years, Mr. Speaker, you will find a remarkable history in connection with debt and taxation in this Province. In fact, you might well describe the Liberal Governments as the "D.T." Governments. I do not mean by that that they have had Delirium Tremens. They may contract that too if they continue buying \$130,000 of booze and selling it without profit! But the D.T.s, as applied to the Liberal Government and the Liberal party means this: If you will go back to the '90's or further and follow up the political history of both parties, you will find that Liberal Governments always stand for Deficits and Taxation. Take our present deficit and the deficits that have accumulated, or the taxation that has been put on the Statute books. Almost 90 per cent. of all the deficits and nearly 95 per cent. of all taxation has been given to us by the Liberal party. Consequently we on this side of the House, when we hear whisperings of increased taxation, like to come out squarely and say, as we said last year to the leader of the Government, that we will not stand for increased taxation. (Loud Conservative applause.)

Improving With Age

I said, it is hard to discuss the Public Works Department when we have not heard from the Minister himself; but when the leader of the Government was speaking on the Budget he stated that it was an asset to this Province to buy the road machinery. They spent \$100,000 or the greater part of that amount to purchase this machinery, and I have never known it to be figured out the way the Premier figured it in his speech. He said that the machinery was worth more now than when they purchased it. I suppose my hon. friend had been looking over the Public Accounts and saw where some \$8,000 had been paid for repairs on those machines. Possibly he knew that another \$15,000 of repair work had been done which has not yet been paid for. He added this \$15,000 and \$8,000 to the \$100,000 and argues by this extra cost, that the machinery is worth more today than when it was purchased. If that will continue for the next five years it will be a revelation because if machinery like that can improve in value every time it is repaired it will be a wonderful asset to the Province. However, I do not think any member of the House can swallow a dose like that.

Falconwood Herd

I have touched on a few matters brought up in connection with the Budget debate. It is impossible to follow them all, or to go back over the notes of the various speeches, for I would be taking up more than my share of the time of this House. There are just two other items I wish to mention, however, and one of them is with reference to Falconwood farm. One of the members on the other side of this House made the statement that this farm had produced a surplus profit in cash this year of some \$500 or \$600. We are glad to hear that. Personally, if the Minister of Agriculture was in his seat, I would congratulate him on it. But there was something else in the statement I refer to which I could not understand. The impression was created by the hon. member of the Government who discussed this matter that prior to this Government coming into power there was nothing but scrub cattle at Falconwood farm. We all know that it is only a year and a half since the present Minister of Agriculture took over that farm. How in the name of goodness could the stock improve in that short time from scrub cattle to the most famous herd of pure bred animals on Prince Edward Island? I ask, Mr.

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

There is another matter with ref-

Public Works

reference to the finances that takes us into a field of which we have heard very little so far this session; as that is the Public Works Department. We have heard nothing from the head of that Department, but I hope that at a later date we shall have a full report as to the work that has been carried on during the past year. I suggested on the floor of the House in 1924, 1925, 1926 and again last year that it would be in the interests of the debate if the portfolio members, in tabling their reports, would make a definite announcement of the policies of the Government at the same time. I would make the budget debate much more important to us all. I cannot see why the heads of these departments should lag behind, because it only means that those of us who have to speak before the Ministers are not in a position to criticize the work of the departments, or even to commend it. That is my position with respect to the Minister of Public Works, for I am going to commend him now.

When this Government started out on a new road policy, and expended \$100,000 on road machinery, they unfortunately threw away or discarded all the old machines, which they had to scrap to make room for the new. Now I suppose my hon. friend will say that is a criticism, but I will come to the recommendation in a few minutes. They were trying out a new system; they believed that the road drag was a nuisance. The Stewart Government had some 200 or 300 of these drags on hand and they discarded them all. Now the hon. Minister of Public Works is having road drags made, and I am credibly informed that he has gone back to the Stewart policy of road making and road dragging. (Applause) I want to commend him for seeing the error of his ways in discarding the road drags and that he is man enough to come back and inaugurate the road drag system, because, Mr. Speaker, we all know that there is no better method of keeping our roads in repair and giving them a good, hard surface than by dragging if it is properly done at frequent intervals throughout the season.

"D. T." Governments

If you go back for a number of years, Mr. Speaker, you will find a remarkable history in connection with debt and taxation in this Province. In fact, you might well describe the Liberal Governments as the "D.T." Governments. I do not mean by that that they have had Delirium Tremens. They may contract that too if they continue buying \$130,000 of booze and selling it without profit! But the D.T.s, as applied to the Liberal Government and the Liberal party means this: If you will go back to the '90's or further and follow up the political history of both parties, you will find that Liberal Governments always stand for Deficits and Taxation. Take our present deficit and the deficits that have accumulated, or the taxation that has been put on the Statute books. Almost 90 per cent. of all the deficits and nearly 95 per cent. of all taxation has been given to us by the Liberal party. Consequently we on this side of the House, when we hear whisperings of increased taxation, like to come out squarely and say, as we said last year to the leader of the Government, that we will not stand for increased taxation. (Loud Conservative applause.)

Improving With Age

I said, it is hard to discuss the Public Works Department when we have not heard from the Minister himself; but when the leader of the Government was speaking on the Budget he stated that it was an asset to this Province to buy the road machinery. They spent \$100,000 or the greater part of that amount to purchase this machinery, and I have never known it to be figured out the way the Premier figured it in his speech. He said that the machinery was worth more now than when they purchased it. I suppose my hon. friend had been looking over the Public Accounts and saw where some \$8,000 had been paid for repairs on those machines. Possibly he knew that another \$15,000 of repair work had been done which has not yet been paid for. He added this \$15,000 and \$8,000 to the \$100,000 and argues by this extra cost, that the machinery is worth more today than when it was purchased. If that will continue for the next five years it will be a revelation because if machinery like that can improve in value every time it is repaired it will be a wonderful asset to the Province. However, I do not think any member of the House can swallow a dose like that.

Falconwood Herd

I have touched on a few matters brought up in connection with the Budget debate. It is impossible to follow them all, or to go back over the notes of the various speeches, for I would be taking up more than my share of the time of this House. There are just two other items I wish to mention, however, and one of them is with reference to Falconwood farm. One of the members on the other side of this House made the statement that this farm had produced a surplus profit in cash this year of some \$500 or \$600. We are glad to hear that. Personally, if the Minister of Agriculture was in his seat, I would congratulate him on it. But there was something else in the statement I refer to which I could not understand. The impression was created by the hon. member of the Government who discussed this matter that prior to this Government coming into power there was nothing but scrub cattle at Falconwood farm. We all know that it is only a year and a half since the present