The Paper That Covers Prince Edward Island Like The Dew

THE CHARLOTTETOWN GUARDIAN

The People's Paper Read by Everybody

All The News Worth Reading All The Ads Worth Printing

Charlottetown Guardian, Three Cents. Morning Guardian, Founded 1887.

CHARLOTTETOWN, CANADA SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1921

Annual Subscription, delivered $6.00. By Mail, Canada, $5.00. U. S. A., $6.00.

Author Charges British Officers With Espionage

LONDON, April 27—The British press comments on Captain Peter E. Wright's book, attacking British army officers, range from carefully reserved statements to bitter denunciations.

"He does not hide his official secrets," says the Daily Mail. "His pages are full of strange disclosures."

General Maurice, one of the officers named in Captain Wright's work, states in the Daily News that "His attacks are venomous and his mistakes numerous."

The Morning Post makes perhaps the most violent attack on the book and its writer of any other journal. "We have rarely read a book," it says, "which manages to compress within its less than 200 pages more misstatement of facts and more perverted deductions from such facts as are occasionally correct."

Captain Wright himself has apparently not been frightened by the storm he has raised or by the threats of libel actions to be taken against him. He has even taken the occasion to reiterate his charges against Field-Marshal Robertson, General Maurice, and Colonel Repington, declaring that he knows his charges are libelous and that he is anxious that the men he has accused bring action to try to refute his accusations.

These charges, in Captain Wright's own words, are that the officers he accuses "combined for personal motives to publish in the press and betray to the enemy essential military plans of the Allies during the height and crisis of the war." He further claims that the articles in which these plans were divulged further recommended to the Central Powers the best methods for frustrating the Allied offensive which was to be carried out by the British armies in the East."

The persons he has named have not as yet taken any public notice of the charges reiterated in his book and in the press by Captain Wright.

More About Our Pine

SIR,—In 'Guardian, April 19th, is a letter from Mr. F. Sanderson, replying to Resident's, of April 15th. His statement—"If Resident has a sense of honor, he will publicly apologise for casting insinuations, dragging in names, etc., is a little premature. Let us see. This piece of road-claring was sold at public auction by overseer McKinnon on Jan. 27th last. It was knocked down to Mr. S., not to his four sons, as they were not present at said sale. It can be proved from easily procured evidence that the auctioneer stated on that day, that the pine must "by no means" be cut. There has not been since Jan. 27th, any public auction sale of this piece of road. Hence, Mr. S's., four sons could not buy, and therefore could not give away and tree upon that road. Will Mr. S. kindly tell WHEN and WHERE any second auction tookplace? I apologise for my ignorance of it.

Mr. S. states that the pine was "absolutely worthless." I have heard bidders, who attended that first and only public sale, say that had they known that the pine could be cut they would have bidden $10 lower at least. This is their idea of that "absolutely worthless" pine. Mr. S., probably knows that any large living tree, as the pine was, if only from the aesthetic point of view, cannot be deemed worthless. In order to further show the incorrectness of his statement, I wish to point out that if the tree had been insect eaten, or partly decayed, it, considering the price of coal, was far from worthless as firewood. The lower part of the tree was more than 2 ft., in diameter. A small portion of its centre was decayed; the remainder could be sawn into valuable lumber. Several logs could be taken from it; even its wide-spreading branches were of value. Mr. S., further says the "absolutely worthless" tree was given away to Mr. Roy Coles I am not "dragging in" this name; that was done by Mr. S., in issue of April 19. Resident did not know, until he saw Mr. S's letter, who took the pine. Mr. Coles must have performed a large amount of labor on this worthless article, and he did so in order that Mr. S's sons might "avoid the necessity of burning it where it fell!! I can't believe that Mr. Coles, a busy man, whose grounds are already full of valuable lumber waiting to be sawed for the public, would without any recompense cut and haul away for any man, that absolutely worthless stuff, as scrub bushes etc., to save trouble of burning; I apologise for not knowing that all this work was done for nothing.

I stated in my last letter that likely Mr. McKinnon and Mr. S. would bear witness to the fact that the tree was not to be cut. Again, no insinuation was meant, I will omit Mr. S.'s name if he wishes it; I can put the names of two reliable men in its place. It is up to Mr S., to prove that the pine was not ornamental, couldn't be used as firewood, was not and could not be sawn into lumber of any worth.

He must clearly show how the contract of Jan. 27th became a contract between the Government and his four sons under different conditions. Until he proves these four things, I deem it a waste of time to reply to any future letter of his concerning above matters.

With a sense of honor and the square deal,

I am, Sir, etc.,
RESIDENT

SENATOR MURPHY DISCUSSES RAILWAY

In Debate on the Railway Problem of Canada Senator Murphy, Tignish, Took Prominent Part.

The Senate resumed on April 13, consideration of inquiry of Hon. Mr. Casgrain:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the railway problem in Canada and especially to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and inquire if it is the intention of the Government to abandon the arbitration proceedings.

Hon. P. C. MURPHY: Honourable gentlemen, I give credit to my honourable friend from De Lanaudiere (Hon. Mr. Casgrain) for bringing this matter to the attention of Parliament.

An Hon. SENATOR: Louder.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: Some honourable gentleman says "Louder." That shows the acoustics of this building.

Before proceeding I should like to point out that there were two almost analogus motions on the Order Paper. The honurable gentleman from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Tessier) introduced a motion almost analogous to the one I am now discussing; and last night the honourable gentleman from Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turiff), speaking on the other one, are discussing practically the same thing.

The railway situation in Canada to-day demands the consideration of every serious-minded citizen. I congratulate the honourable gentleman from the Gulf (Hon. Mr. L'Esperance) and the honourable gentleman from Stadacona (Hon. L.C. Webster) on having brought to the attention of the House the importance of having Canadian products find their outlet through Canadian ports. They elaborated their arguments and gave their reasons, and I agree with them that if we are ever to become a nation in a true sense we must have ports and we must have population. In order to understand this question we must know the economic conditions. I wish to compliment my honourable friend from Simcoe (Hon. Mr. Bennett) upon the way in which he dealt with the case. He gave reasons why the Canadian Pacific railway got the business and carried it to Canadian ports, although our own Canadian National railways have more lines throughout the country.

For the benefit of the people of the West we have grid-ironed the West with railways which are at the present time a financial curse to us. It is admitted on the best authority that we are at least fifty years ahead of our time in this respect and that if we are not to lose our nationality and be submerged in keeping up a pace commensurate with this "wild west" building of railways, we must increase our population. I am free to admit that our population was greatly increased by immigration between 1900 and 1910; but, because of the quality of that immigration, measured by the standards of to-day, I do not know what its total benefit has been to Canada. We find today that we have to restrict this rapid inflow; and, in a word, we are "handpicking" immigration, by means of the money test. I do not believe in this test. In my opinion physical and mental fitness should be the only test. Money counts for very little. It may depreciate fifty per cent in a week owing to exchange conditions, and while I would exclude imbeciles, mental degenerates and those physically unfit to be fathers and mothers of the future citizens of Canada, I do not think a man should be excluded because he has not $250 in his pocket on arrival in quarantine at Quebec. I just want you to consider for a minute, some of you gentlemen who to-day can count your money by the millions, where you would have been if your ancestors had been dumped in the Gulf of St. Lawrence or deported back to the fatherland at the time they struck quarantine, either at New York or at Quebec, simply because they did not have a certain amount of money.

However, this is not the question. In introducing what we now know to be a millstone around the necks of the people of this country a celebrated man uttered what seemed to me at the time to be a classical blasphemy when he used the phrase, "we want to have something all-Canadian, East and West, within our own territories," and when he held up his hands in pious admonition to the majority of his supporters—who knew his policy was wrong—and said: "Would to God we are not now too late."

Now we have the actuality. We may be too late; but we have got ourselves into such a position that we must do something to save the situation. We did our best; every one shouldered the burden. We have taken over the Canadian Northern railway, which, it is admitted passes through the best territory in Canada. We took it over because of the crisis in Canada's affairs—a crisis in the history of the world. We had to save our credit, and we did that which, under ordinary circumstances, perhaps sober-minded men would not have done. We also took over the Grand Trunk railway, and I am free to stand up here in my place and say that I voted in favour of taking it over, but with trepidation, because I anticipated just what has occurred. Financial figures and financial ciphers and workers behind the scenes put a burden upon the people that they would not have accepted if they had known what it meant. But we do not want to haggle over that. We have taken a responsibility put upon us by our ancestors.

There is an East and a West. I do not mind my honourable friend from De Lanaudiere, who was discourteous to the member from Boissevain (Hon. Mr. Schaffner) and myself the other day and who in a half-hearted way, ungraciously allowed the question from the honourable member from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien). In answer to the question of that honourable gentleman, "Did you support that policy?" my honourable friend opposite, said, "I not only supported it, but I made the longest speech in Parliament in favour of it." It is no trouble for the honourable gentleman to make a long speech; he could not do anything else.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: That was on the Navy question.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: My honourable friend reminds me of the moose which, when it wants to sit down, travels round and round and round the other way until it comes to the place where it wants to sit down, and then sits down. His speech and his attitude are well described by our late colleague from Halifax, and I do not think as a physiological student, that I could even admit the opening complimentary phrase of that gentleman.

However, we have this octopus of a railway situation on our hands, and we might as well act as men and grapple with it in the best way possible. It is a serious situation, a situation that makes thinking men sit up in the face of present world conditions, where exchanges are all awry and when we do not know from day to day what cataclysm may be brought about by a clash between labour and capital.

The honourable gentleman from Standacona (Hon. L. C. Webster) and the honourable gentleman from the Gulf (Hon. Mr. L'Esperance) are capable of looking after the ports of the Upper St. Lawrence; but I have something to say for the Maritime Provinces.

The question of public ownership has been brought into this debate and its efficiency criticized. As the fathers of public ownership we in the Maritime Provinces should necessarily have some voice in this matter. We are the original public owners as far as railways are concerned. As far back as 1836 a railway was built in Nova Scotia, which was subsequently extended to Levis in Quebec and left hanging in the fields for God knows what reason for many years "Inefficiency again," you may say; but latterly it found its way, by devious means well known by some of my honourable friends, to the commercial metropolis of Canada.

Public ownership with us gave every satisfaction, whether it was efficient from a business standpoint or not. I want to draw the attention of honourable gentlemen to the fact that the building of the Intercolonial railway to Levis was not a commercial proposition but was in conformity with the terms of Confederation of the Maritime Provinces; and, more than that, in the beginning it was a military road and was built not as a commercial proposition. Therefore its gradients and curvatures are bad in many places, all making for extra cost in maintenance. It was run for a long time as a political machine—and even political machines are not all run wrong. I do not know that there is any improvement. It was at least as good under so-called political machine conditions—and I am not now talking politics—as it is to-day with

Continued on Page Four

THE NECESSITY FOR DISCIPLINE

"Ruralist" Gives Some Sound Advice for Guidance of School Teachers.

CLASS MANNER—(Cont'd)

(3) Our third point is **cheerfulness**; it is the sun of life, whether in the classroom or out. The teacher who is wanted is the one that comes to school with a smile, in spite of ups and downs, bad weather or poor health, and gives a smiling "good morning" to all, and in return receives a smiling "good morning, Miss G."

The day thus started is far more apt to run along smoothly and work seem lighter, than if one came in a disconsolate, grumbling manner and sees only the blue side of things. "Oh! what a poor fire!" "Oh! my, what a horrid amount of mud and snow on the floor!"

Smile it away; smile in the very face of provocation. If the floor is dirty, or if the fire is poor, grumbling never cleaned a floor or put on a fire. Better appoint one to fix each up and when this is done, just give a nice talk on what should be done and how things should be kept, not how they should not be done or kept. Remember I told you before that the power of suggestion is a wonderful factor in securing right.

"Now, when I came this morning I did not exactly like the way the fire was put on or the mud on the floor. Now should this be? Tomorrow we are going to light the fire so as it will be burning brightly at nine o'clock and so have the room nice and comfortable to work in and so we may start work at once, and not have to wait till the fire gets on and we get warmed, and the floor! Does mother allow us to carry in mud like that? No? Now then, we are going to see how tidy we can keep our floor and we are going to brush our shoes before we come in. Aren't we? Now up hands who is going to help keep our floor clean by carefully brushing their boots? You all are, that's fine!"

Do you not think that this will produce better results than faultfinding? I do, and have drawn my opinion from experience.

Cheerfulness is one of the very most necessary assets of life, much more of the schoolroom. It brightens a wet day and polishes the dull monotonus round of lessons and work.

Dear little immature brains quickly grow weary of number work or reading lessons, rest and brighten them up by reading a jolly little story or telling a funny little anecdote. Laugh whole heartedly with them, for a good wholesome, genuine laugh is a wonderful medicine for both old and young, for both health and brain.

Something amusing happens, let the children laugh and laugh with them; they will like you all the better for it. There is no need of posing as a goody-goody; for gloominess is **not** goodness, but next to sin it is the most undesirable of all traps.

In the recreation? Does cheerfulness and good-fellowship prevail? Are the children really playing a really good, wholesome, fair game? Or, are they running wild, tormenting or bullying one another, or listlessly passing the time, all the while unsupervised? Is this promoting cheerfulness? Just the opposite: forming sullenness and dislike for one another, and in the latter dispiritedness.

Cheer! The very word sends a tingling feeling running all through you. Bright, sunshiny ways, ennobling lightheartedness and courage which show that we possess faith in God. For if we are glum, are we giving due thanks to God for his beneficence, and are we not tampering with that most dangerous of all tools—Despair?

We knkow what duties are required of us, or if we do not we should know, and then it is our duty to execute cheerfully and joyously that work which lies in our path for us to accomplish. St. Paul says: "Serve the Lord with joy." And by "serving the Lord" is meant not only religious devotions, but principally our small every-day duties of life.

Now, we are all going to be cheerful are we not? We are going to pass over with a smile those little irritating incidents and keep on flourishing our banner triumphantly till the One who gives us life to flourish it calls us to an account.

Remember that lesson in the hygiene book which says: "Cheerfulness is as contagious as any infectious disease, and a wry face may create and 'spread gloom where formerly was sunshine." Oh! how true are these words, my dear fellow teachers! And can we not, all of us, with a little perseverance, cultivate in ourselves this most beautiful of virtues—Cheerfulness?

The teacher who is forever pitying himself or herself and reflecting on how little thanks they get for their pains, or how scant their remuneration, or how disadvantageous their circumstances, would confer an inestimable boon on the teaching profession if they would quietly withdraw, and give room to someone who has a better idea of duty.

We **do not** want such a complaining one; they **do not** want to help us in our big work, or seemingly do not; so no one will weep very broken-heartedly when they bid us adieu, to take up what **they** think better work.

The real fact is they are **selfish!** They are always thinking of themselves and not of or for others; they want everything **their** way and never stop to consider that they are making others pay dearly in order that they may gratify their selfishness, i.e., in making these others listen to their complaining, and look at them doing things unwillingly. Oh, these selfish mortals with sunless minds! Am I such? Ask yourself the question.

(4) Our next point is, not suspicious. I knew of a parent once who had a couple of well-behaved good-meaning daughters; but this parent, although admitting them to be good, always had a very manifest suspicion that all would not be well i fthey were left to entertain their own company. Whether it was because this parent did not do what was proper in younger days and suspected the children of like conduct I do not assume to know, but, however the result was that a deep channel was formed between their sympathies and many a pang of pain did it cause these filial hearts, when they felt that they were suspected and mistrusted of that which they would not or did not think of, let alone stoop to do; and time is no healer of lost faith or alienated sympathy and this parent was building up for herself a sorry old age, because of her suspicious manner.

But these were really good girls; no pain-racking knowledge of faithlessness could throw them off their pedestal of propriety. Now suspicion does not always meet with such results, moreoften, the one suspected, however innocent, feels injured to such a degree or becomes careless to such a degree that he thinks: "Well, I am suspected of doing this, and I might as well do it; I'll receive the same desserts anyway," and so is led, rather mildly helped, to do wrong. Just so in the classroom if we are always suspicious, the child, seeing your lack of faith even when he is doing right, things he might as well do wrong. Perhaps he never once thought of cheating at his work, but your suspecting manner and the devil's evil temptations suggested to try cheating when he meets a barrier. And so you are really the cause of what you were so solicitous to prevent; the result of your trying to prevent what was not there.

Have faith in the child, and he will try to measure up to your standard of trust.

Remove anything out of the child's reach which might tempt him to cheat.

"Willie are you looking on Jane's paper?" will probably suggest to Willie that it might be a good plan to look on Jane's paper, and compare or copy answers, particularly if Jane's work is nearly always correct.

Why not say: "I want to see everyone's face turned toward me? I think that you do not like me when you turn your back on me like that, now, you do not want me to think that do you? Well, we are going to set down nicely in our seats and be very busy." Here is not a hint that anyone is cheating, but if you have suspicions this will remove the cause.

We must be very careful to hide our real motive when correcting dishonesty in work; if one method is not suitable, try another, but all the while never hinting that you doubt any child's honesty.

If the dishonesty is manifest, it should be made an example of and get the child to promise on his word of honour to amend his ways at once, if it reoccurs after having given him a chance, then it is time to act, and a good severe punishment is the only medicine.

Your can throw many little opportunities in your pupils' way to show them that you have faith in and trust them.

For instance, let them correct their own dictation, or number work once in a while, only marking the errors; or let them put down their own stars on the honor roll or write on a slip of paper at the end of the day, how often they have talked when they should not have. Such little opportunities as these will foster and promote frankness and honesty.

Many a career is spoiled, many a life wrecked, which might have been good, for want of some one to trust in and to trust. "No one cares! What's the use of my caring!" and away they go on that pitiable downhill cause.

On the other hand, almost superhuman things have been accomplished by persons, mainly because some one trusted in them and

Continued on Page Six

HON. MURDOCK KENNEDY CHALLENGES MR. LEA

In a Vigorous and Able Speech the Member for Bradalbane Shows the Insincerity and Unreliability of the Bell Aggregation.

MR. M KENNEDY continued the debate April 20th, in one of the best speeches he ever delivered in the House.

The Hon. Commissioner of Agriculture, he said, had taken up a great deal of the time of the House on the subject of his department. He had talked for a long time, and members had gone home very little the wiser. He professed to be an agriculturist. The people of the Province when they elected him, thought so too. Now they are saying:—What has he done for us? He's imposed taxes on us, that's all. We expected different things from "the Farmer Friend!" The people were so disturbed that they tried to start a farmer's party—a third party. They had a good man as temporary president (Mr. J. A. Dewar) but they decided on another man in Bedeque whom they thought probably would capture more votes on the other side of the House. The intentions of this third party are really political as proved by its operations in other provinces. There is no room for three parties in this province or in Canada, the speaker maintained. Referring to the figures quoted by honorable members on the other side of the House in their budget speeches Mr. Kennedy thought it remarkable that few of them seemed to agree. The taxation question has occupied much of the attention of the House and a great deal has been said about the fatherhood of taxation. The first Act in this province was introduced by Sir Louis Davies and from the Davies administration originated the debt in this Province. Then the Davies Government because of that Tax Act were chased out of power. The Sullivan Government came in and ruled the country for nine years without any taxes and left only a debt of $128,000 but the Liberals claimed it to be $172,000. Admitting that it was that much, continued Mr. Kennedy, they then proceeded to pile on the taxes and they increased their debt up $1,072,000; making a net increase during their term of $900,000 and this in addition to $600,000 taxes they collected.

HON. MR. HUGHES had made a statement that he had served under seven Premiers, but it does not make much difference how long you served—it is what you do. What for instance is the record of the last Liberal Government? They imposed the tax bill! We were told through the Liberal Press of this Province that two good laying hens would pay the tax of the farmer. I would like the Commissioner of Agriculture to bring down those hens, continued Mr. Kennedy.

MR. LEA maintained that two fair laying hens would pay the average farmer's tax.

MR KENNEDY:—Well you may have them on your farm but I don't see them around the country. That Government have collected $600,000 in taxes besides the $900,000 they sunk the country in debt. What did the people get in return? One or two bridges! Thy left nothing to show for this $1,500,000 in any shape or form. As luck happened there was a change of Government. Our friends on the other side of the House had sent many delegations to Ottawa including the member for the second district of Queen's, at a big expense to the country without any result. But when we came in the first delegation that went to Ottawa, including the present leader of the Opposition, brought back $100,000 a year. Our friends never mention this matter now. We started with this $100,000 as the basis of our improvements. We never increased taxation but took your taxation as we found it and made it work.

MR LEA maintained that the Conservative Government had increased the road taxes.

MR. KENNEDY:—This increase necessitated by the increased wages to road laborers was the only one made. I am satisfied that no member can gainsay that. After doing business for eight years we left a small deficit of only $43,000 after the most harrowing period of the world's history and which was a splendid record. The Conservative Government went out of power not because the people changed their views but because the Liberal party went to the country with statements that were untrue.

The Hon. Members are now finding fault with the Guardian newspaper because that paper is not giving them space enough. This was a foolish criticism, he believed.—Because the Guardian does not write editorials to suit their views they seem to lose their heads altogether, and come into house like bears into a den. The Guardian speaks its mind plainly. To take up the time of the House in criticizing the Guardian for this is a ridiculous proceeding and should not be allowed. The people of this Province are cognizant of the facts, and are judging for themselves the actions of the Government. What are they doing? They are simply waiting to get one good crack at you and you know it! What did your own friends tell you at the indignation meetings called? They could not make their wishes any plainer than by passing resolutions at their meetings, could they? They know that you never fulfilled your promises. Do you think the taxpayers of this Province are fools? If a meeting had been called in my district at any time to tell me that I had gone back on my word, and asking my resignation, I would simply pass in my resignation before the meeting could adjourn. But this is not the system followed by the Hon. Members. Instead of bowing to the wises of the people they are brasing it out. In nearly every district meetings have been held and in many of them requests for members resignations were passed. Did they resign? The Hon. Commissioner of Agriculture himself called a meeting at Tryon. Is it not so that at that meeting a resolution was passed asking him to resign?

HON. MR. LEA — "Absolutely no!

MR. KENNEDY—"Well, I am positive that a resolution was passed. There was even a report abroad that in order to get clear of the meeting the Hon. Commissioner had to put on a woman's skirt.

MR. KENNEDY took up the question of the public debt. In 1918 the interest on the debt was $49,000. In 1920 it was $56,498. Does that look as if the debt is going down? Mr. Kennedy maintained that this was a fair way to judge of the public debt by taking the interest of both years and comparing it.

At the last election the Patriot was out with scare headlines to say that the Highway Bills proposed by the Arsenault Government was going to ruin the country. What are our friends saying today on that subject, he continued? It is said a leopard cannot change his spots, but our friends are changing theirs over night. They are boasting so much about their cleverness in getting the highway grant from the Federal Government, that it would be interesting to compare their sentiments now and their denounciations when in opposition.

MR. KENNEDY read the following article upon the Highways project published in the Patriot, July 10, 1919.

"Owing to the gross short-sightedness and incapacity of our local government we get this grant only under pretty stiff terms because the Island has to put up 60 per cent of the amount to be expended on such highway improvements in order to get the other 40 per cent from the Dominion Government.

"An agreement is entered into between the Dominion and Provincial Governments to that effect. The agreement contains such provision as to the cost, specifications or otherwise, as the Governor and Council may approve. Before we get a single dollar from the Dominion Government for road work the Island must first undertake to start road building and pay 60 per cent of the total cost or in other words for every $40 the Dominion Government gives up we have to put up $60. The total amount that the Dominion Government is going to advance the Island will be the $80,000 already referred to and about $37,000 per capital allowance, making a total of $117,000 a year for five years. In order to get this we would have to put up $175,000 a year for five years.

The question is, What provision has Premier Arsenault made for raising this $175,000 per year?

"How is he going to get the money?"

"He publishes a long and exhaustive manifesto, but says never a word as to where the $175,000 is to come from, which we haveto raise each year or in all $875,000 for five years."

"How is the Island going to pay the 60 per cent in order to get the 40 per cent?"

"We await the answer."

Again in the Patriot for July 12 of the same year.

"There are several questions which the electors should ask every conservative at the meetings:—

"Will you support a Government which undertakes $60 for every $40 paid by the Dominion Government for road buildings, under the Highway Act? (The Dominion Government undertakes to give us $80,000 as an initial grant and pay $37,000 per capita allowance making $117,000 in all. To secure this, the Island must pay $175,000 per annuam for five years or $875,000 in all.)

"Where is the money to come from?"

Again in the Patriot, May 13th, 1919 the Highway vote is denounced as:—

"Another infernal scheme involving the Province in hundreds of thousands perhaps millions."

"How do these statements suit our friends now? I cannot tell that, but I know how I would feel in the same position. Now my honorable friends are patting themselves on the back for it.

It is only necessary to take up the public records to show that every department since the change of Government the country has gone behind. In Agriculture it has gone behind $13,318; in Falconwood, $30,406. This is the difference in the figures of the report between 1918 and 1920. The year could not be fairly taken for comparison because the financial statement made up to September gave no just estimation of the year.

Our friends have boasted about what they are doing for education. Have they forgotten about the Prince of Wales College strike? Do they know what the closure of that college meant to the Province! Through shortage of brains and lack of judgment the college was closed. And it was one of the greatest mistakes ever made by a Govrnment in this Province to allow it to be closed!

MR. LePAGE—"They were only home for a week.

MR. KENNEDY—"They were home long enough to interrupt their work. Very serious harm has been done by the closing of it at all. The Government is also boasting about the small number of schools that are closed at the present time. I know some schools where girls are teaching who never went to Prince of Wales College or any other college—this is how the Government is keeping schools opened.

MR. LePAGE—"Tell us their names."

MR. KENNEDY—"If you will promise to right the matter I will tell their names.

MR. GALLANT—"It won't hurt you to tell us their names."

MR. KENNEDY—"You know their names, or should know them.

MR. KENNEDY upon further request, submitted the name of one school and of the young lady teaching it. The teacher had never received a college education. I can supply you with some more names if you want them, he said, but you know all this yourselves.

MR. KENNEDY concluded by exhorting the members to closer co operation for the public good.

HON. MR. CROSBY moved the adjournment of the debate and the House took recess.

London Society Circles Shocked By Lady Astor

LONDON, April 28.—Lady Astor, at one of the most fashionable weddings in recent years here yesterday shocked some of her hearers by suddenly announcing in very audible tones:

"It took me twenty years to get into society and only ten minutes to get out. I mingle with the proletariat now.",

The occasion was the marriage of Miss Esther Lascelles, known to her friends as "Mollie" Lascelles, and the Earl of Dalkeith, eldest son and heir of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensbury. The wedding was attended by half the British peerage, headed by the Prince of Wales and his brother's Lady Astor's son, Honorable Michael Langhorne Astor, six years old, was one of the bride's pages.

The new Lady Dalkeith is the daughter of the late Colonel William Lascelles, of the Scots Guards, and Lady Sybil Beauclerk, sister of the Duke of St. Albans. The bride's paternal grandfather, Sir Frank Lascelles, long time British Ambassador at Berlin. The fascinating young lady, has made a great matrimonial catch, for when in the natural course of events her husband succeeds to his father's titles and estates he will be very wealthy.

Lord Dalkeith, Walter John Montagu Douglas-Scott, twenty-seven years old, is a captain in the Grenadier Guards and served at the front in France throughou the Great War. Afterwards for a few months, he was aide-de-camp on the staff of the governor-General of Canada. He is regarded as an amiable and compassionate young man and is a close friend of the younger members of the Royal amily. Indeed the gossips had it at one time that a marriage between Princess Mary and Dalkeith would not displease her Royal parents.

GIVEN UP AS LOST

LONDON, April 28—The Italian steamer Monte San Michele, which left New York February 2 last with a cargo of grain for Genoe, has been given up as lost and was today added to the grim list of "missing ships" which is posted by Lloyd's. The Mone San Michele was a ship of 6,500 tons gross register, and carried a crew of 45 men, signed on in Italy. She was built 1919 and was originally known as the War Odessy.