

Aggressive Policies Outlined By Conservative Leader

(Continued from Page 1)

pared with the previous Government? I shall go into this matter for a few minutes, because it is quite interesting and illuminating.

CONSERVATIVE REVENUE

During our four years, our revenue, roughly, was a little over \$700,000. That was not a bad record in carrying on all the governmental services of the Province. Now, as you know, the revenue is made up of subsidy from Ottawa, and the balance from taxes, license fees, etc. We had been pressing for many years to get more subsidy from Ottawa. I shall not deal with that matter just now, except to say that we succeeded, during our term of office, in obtaining an additional subsidy of \$165,000 annually; so that must be added to the revenue enjoyed by this Government during all the time they have been in power. More than that when we went out of office we had motor license fees and gasoline taxes. At that time the number of motor cars in the Province was very limited; the tax on gasoline was a comparatively small item, and neither of these sources of revenue afforded very much more money. After they came into power the number of motor cars increased very greatly, as did the number all over Canada, and consequently the revenue, both from license fees and gasoline tax, was very greatly augmented.

I will ask you to pardon me for wearing you with figures, but I am going to make a comparison of the revenue collected by both Governments. I shall leave out, in both cases, the election years and refer only to the years 1924, 1925 and 1926 as against the years 1928, 1929 and 1930 under the present Liberal regime.

STRIKING COMPARISON

In 1924 the total ordinary revenue plus motor license fees and gasoline tax, was \$745,011.

In 1925 it was \$748,258, —almost the same.

In 1926 we received the first payment on the railway taxation which we had obtained as a result of the inter-provincial conference of that year, and so the revenue was increased in that year to \$852,000.

Now let us compare the years 1928, 1929 and 1930. I shall take the very same figures—the ordinary revenue, the motor license fees and the gasoline tax:

In 1928 the total revenue from these sources was \$979,078.73.

In 1929 it was \$1,052,411.24.

In 1930 it had increased to \$1,110,745.

Making an average revenue from these sources alone, under the present Government, of over a million dollars a year.

Our total revenue for the three years was \$2,345,269.

Their total revenue for the corresponding period was \$3,442,237.

In other words, they received \$1,096,968 more than we did, or an average of over \$365,000 a year more revenue than we enjoyed, to carry on the public services of the Province.

BILLION AND HALF BEHIND

Take that \$1,096,968 of additional revenue, add it to the difference between our debt and theirs, and you will find that they went farther behind during their period in office by a million and one-half dollars, than we did in the corresponding years of our regime. (Loud applause.)

I have shown how much they have gone behind, and how much more revenue they had. Now I want to make another comparison, to show just how they spent the money; that is, their internal householding as compared with ours, whether they were as frugal in taking care of the public services during that time; because I take it that the people will admit the public services have been taken care of just as well during our time—and I am putting it mildly when I say that.

ANOTHER COMPARISON

I shall take first the Department of Justice. In 1926, our last full year of office, this department cost \$37,119. Last year it cost \$49,795; an increase under this Government, of some twelve thousand dollars.

Agriculture: In 1926 this department cost \$35,393. Last year it cost \$58,332.

Education: \$280,662 in 1926; last year \$306,390.

Falconwood: \$105,579 in 1926; last year \$125,278; practically twenty thousand dollars more than in 1926, and the cost of living was not any greater. In fact, it was less last year; things could be bought cheaper. Notwithstanding that, it cost them \$20,000 more to manage Falconwood than it did in our corresponding year.

Interest paid on the indebtedness of the country. I am giving the figures now from the 1st and 2nd pages of the report of the Provincial Auditor: In 1926, \$74,646. In 1930, \$147,137.

Legislative grants: \$16,419 in 1926 \$30,476 in 1930.

Office of Provincial Auditor: Cost in 1926, \$2,470; in 1930, \$4,582; practically double.

Provincial Building: Cost in 1926, \$5,367; in 1930, \$8,624, or more than three thousand dollars of an increase, almost double the amount under our corresponding year.

If you have followed those figures you will note that in every department the cost was greater last year than in 1926; and I would invite your attention to this point, that the comparison can be continued all the way through; it is just an illustration of what was happening every year during their regime as compared with ours.

CONSERVATIVE ECONOMY

During our period of office we endeavored to practice rigid economy. I do not think it will be claimed by any person that we stinted the public services. Certainly it cannot be said, as it has been said of the Bell Government, that we neglected to pay the bills that should have been paid for necessary expenditures incurred. But we did exercise a certain amount of economy, just as a business man would do with his own affairs. And I may say now, that if returned to power we will continue to practice the same care and economy in connection with the public services of the Province. (Applause.) I think I have shown you that we are able to do it, that we have demonstrated, during the four years we were in power that we have the ability and the inclination to handle the business of the Province in that way.

I do not suggest for a moment that we should be parsimonious, that we should starve the public services. Those things are not included within the meaning of the phrase "rigid economy." It simply means that ordinary, business-like care and supervision will be exercised by the Government over all the different departments of the public services.

NO TAX INCREASES

Another thing of which I can assure you, is that there will be no increase of taxation on the people of this Province. (Applause.) I think that we have a record in that regard, that whenever it was possible we reduced the taxes upon the people of this Province; we gave them consideration on every occasion. And we have been blamed for that! We have been accused of injuring the country by reducing taxes! So far as that charge is concerned, we plead guilty to the extent that we did prevent this Government from squandering more of your money during the past four years. To anything further than that, we do not plead guilty. (Applause.)

When we took office in 1923 one of the planks of our platform was that we would press for further subsidy from the Federal Government, and upon attaining to that, that we would give the benefit to the people in reduction of taxes. We obtained an increased subsidy, and we kept our promise by reducing the taxes. We are accused—and just think of who accuses us!—of doing that for the purpose of pandering to the electors on the eve of an election; of endeavoring to "buy the people with their own money." Doesn't that come very finely from the lips of men who have done what this Government has done within the last few months? Are those the ones to cast a stone at anybody for buying votes? (Loud applause.)

The difference is this, that the present Government does not seem to understand what it means to keep its word to the people. That is what we did; we promised that if we obtained a certain thing, we would give the taxpayers the benefit. We obtained it, and we kept our word. And if we had been returned to power in 1927, I am free to say that you would not find the finances in the condition in which you find them today. (Applause.)

LIBERAL INCONSISTENCY

Let us see what was done at that time. You will remember that a reduction of taxation was made in the session of 1927, just prior to the election, because it was just shortly before that that we obtained the additional subsidy. In fact, it had not then been received, but we were sure that it would be received, and we accordingly proceeded to implement our promise. Let us see what the attitude of the Liberal members was at that time. Mr. Saunders was then leader of the Opposition, and here is what he said on behalf of the Liberal party,

on the floor of the Legislature, as reported in the Patriot of March 19, 1927:

"As leader of the Liberal party, I want to say that one of the planks of the platform of the party if returned to power will be at least a reduction in the auto tax and a downward revision of taxation generally. I make this statement and repeat it so that there may be no mistake about it."

The assurance is repeated, practically in the same words, in their platform which they put out during the campaign. Now let us see how they turned their coat! At that time they were vying with us—they were attempting to put out a more attractive platform, just on the eve of the election. The election passed, and they were returned to power. Then they began to find out that they needed more money. Let us see what they did. Here is the statement of Premier Saunders, two years afterwards, as reported in the Patriot of April 15, 1929:

"Had the taxes remained the same as they were in 1920, I think we could have acceded to the demands of the teachers. But unfortunately through the weakness of the late Government who were playing politics in order to hold their position, the taxes were reduced, with the result that we are now in the unfortunate position that we haven't the revenue to meet essential demands."

You see there the difference between looking out and looking in! In 1927, when they were seeking the reins of power, they were prepared to reduce the taxes. In 1929, when they had tasted two years of power, they wanted more money, and the people who reduced the taxes were "weak" and committed a crime against the country in making that reduction!

"BROADENING OUT"

That was the statement repeated also by Mr. McIntyre in the legislative session of 1929. He said, on that occasion:

"When I hear the Opposition say to reduce taxes, to cut down expenditures, I say that it is time that both parties should broaden out. . . . We should get clear of this small politics and say: 'We are going to spend more money.' It would be in the interests of the farmers themselves if they would agree to pay more taxes, if we spent it on the roads and put them in good shape."

Nothing else needs any money but the roads, according to Mr. McIntyre!

We have never been given to increasing taxes, but we have reduced the taxes, and we assure you now that if we get into power we will not increase the taxes on the people of this Province. (Applause.)

Have you had any assurance of that kind from the other side, from the present Government? Have they told you they would reduce the taxes, or that they would not increase them if they got another lease of power? What has been their history in that regard? What has been the record of the present Premier with regard to taxation? He has always claimed that he was the father, the instigator of the Lea Tax Act. He was most indignant at us because we took off the Poll Tax and made other reductions in the Tax Act at that time. Has he ever suggested that he would reduce the taxes? Has not his whole record pointed in the other direction,—just like Mr. McIntyre's, who says we should "broaden out"—we should pay more taxes—so that Mr. McIntyre will have more money to spend on the roads? (Laughter.)

That, ladies and gentlemen, is a matter which you should weigh in this campaign, whether or not this Province, at this time, when the whole world is endeavoring to practice economy, when economy is necessary, when in many cases it is a matter of economize or perish—should you elect to power a government that has preached increased taxation, and for what purpose?—in order that the Government might have more money to spend. Is that the kind of a Government you want in power in these days? As I said before, we don't want parsimony; we don't want people to work for nothing in the public services; but we do feel that it is a time when expenditure should be wisely supervised, and that no money should be thrown away—whether upon the roads or otherwise. (Loud applause.)

AMAZING PERFORMANCE

I was rather amused, in the Patriot newspaper's account of the Liberal meeting at Hunter River, to read that Premier Lea had shown "very clearly" how all the planks in their platform of 1927 had been "fully implemented." In fact more than implemented! The Patriot said that the hall fairly rocked with applause. The thing that surprises me is that after a statement of that kind the hall did not fall over their ears. (Loud laughter and applause.) Let us see what that famous election platform consisted of. The first plank read as follows:

"At the Inter-provincial Conference to be assembled this fall we will, if returned to power at the ensuing election, exert our utmost endeavors in pressing our claims for subsidy for our Province. On obtaining increased subsidy a downward revision of taxation."

That was their own assurance, embodied in their election platform of 1927. Have they carried that out? What have they done about it? I want to say, with all the emphasis that I can command, that that question of subsidy is the most important matter that can engage the attention of the electors in this campaign. If there is one thing that this Province is in dire need of at the present time, it is more revenue; and, as I said before, we cannot afford to place any heavier burdens of taxation upon our people. It is a great struggle, even in this Province, to exist. There are just two avenues to further revenue: the first is increased taxation on our people; the second is obtaining the implementation of the Duncan Commission report. You know the early history of that matter, that there has always been a struggle for a subsidy settlement from Ottawa, and that practically all the increase of subsidy that has been obtained for this Province had been obtained by the Conservative party. (Applause.)

SLEEPING ON THE JOB

When I first entered the House in 1917, that matter of subsidy was pretty dead, because we were facing the War and the expenditure of the War, and it was felt that that was no time to press for additional subsidy. So the matter rested. But the War passed, and the Liberals came into power. They were in power, as you remember, for four years, from 1919 to 1923; and during those four years nothing at all was done in the way of pressing our subsidy claims. Something could have been obtained by the Bell Government, but it was not, because no effort of any kind was made to secure it. They simply slept on the job.

I remember, in one of my early years in the Legislature, listening to a full dress debate on the subject of our claims. It was taken part in, for the most part, by Liberals. They were splendid debaters on that subject; but they never got beyond debating; they never got into the sphere of action, and so the whole matter ended in that full dress debate. I do not suppose anybody outside the walls of the Legislature heard of it; certainly it never reached the ears of the Dominion Government.

And so the matter rested until the election of 1923. After we came into power, I had the honour of taking it up. My first difficulty was with the two Liberal Premiers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and I could not make very much headway because they did not give me very much encouragement. I was told by one of them that there was absolutely nothing in our claims against Canada; and before you can succeed in anything you must have faith—faith in your cause, before you can win anything. That is the first stepping stone to success; and these gentlemen, by their words and by their deeds, demonstrated that they never had any faith in the merits of our claims against the Dominion Government. (Applause.)

ACTION BY STEWART GOVT.

However, I felt that as leader of the Conservative party and Premier of this Province a responsibility had fallen upon my shoulders, and that I had a right to bestir myself and see what could be done. You know the rest. You know that in the first place we obtained \$40,000 for railway taxation, and that was only obtained because we succeeded in calling an inter-provincial conference, bringing it to the attention of the other Provinces, getting the assistance of those Provinces, who already had that money, and pressing it upon the Canadian National Railways. It was simply a matter of exerting ourselves a little!

With regard to our subsidy claims that matter, you will remember, aroused the whole Maritime Provinces. You will remember also those words of Mr. Mackenzie King: "What are Maritime Rights?" I had the pleasure of attending a great mass meeting when that campaign started in the town of Amherst, N.S. There were also present Hon. Mr. Rhodes, then Premier of Nova Scotia, and Hon. Mr. Baxter, who was then leader of the Opposition in New Brunswick. From that meeting started the campaign which resulted in the election of almost every Conservative candidate from the Maritimes to the House of Commons, and eventually in the appointment of the Duncan Commission; because Mr. King found out that it was absolutely necessary for him to hearken to the cry of the Maritime Provinces, to give some attention to this matter, if he wished to save his position and his Government. (Applause.)

So the Duncan Commission was appointed. I need not go further into that matter; you know the result, you know how the claims were presented by the Premiers of the Maritime Provinces, and how we succeeded in getting \$125,000 interim subsidy for this Province, a payment, so to speak, on account.

That payment opened wide the door, because the recommendation of the Commission was that it was only a payment on account and that a very much larger amount was due and should be paid. It was only a question, then, of accounting, to finding out just how much each Province should receive.

THE 1927 CONFERENCE

That was the situation when the Saunders Government came into power in 1927. Further than that, a conference had been arranged for and was about to be held in the month of October, 1927. Now, there was the opportunity of obtaining our rights—a splendid opportunity, an ideal opportunity, that should never have been passed up by any body of men who had any intelligence, any thought or care for the Province which they were attempting to govern.

What happened? They attended that conference, three of them; they presented a brief, showing that we were entitled to more subsidy! That, of course, was already admitted by the Duncan Commission; it did not require any argument at their hands. The only matter that remained to be settled, as I said before, was how this adjudication was to be made, how they were to decide between Canada and the three Maritime Provinces the amount that was to be paid to each of the Provinces.

You would expect that these gentlemen, having presented their claim, would have been ready to offer some suggestion to the conference as to the manner in which those claims should be met! Yet we have the minutes of that conference, and you will be amazed when I tell you that no proposition of any kind was submitted by the delegates from this Province. They were dumb as oysters, when it came to that matter.

THE LOST OPPORTUNITY

There, as I said, was their opportunity, where they had representatives from all the Provinces assembled, together with representatives of the Canadian Government;—all the parties to the contract were there, prepared and ready to do business, and only waiting for a proposal as to how it should be done. Yet these gentlemen, going up there at the expense of this Government—**at YOUR expense, with YOUR money—hadn't the sense to suggest a way out, to suggest means of making this adjudication, and so the matter ended, in "expressions of sympathy"—and not one dollar of additional subsidy from that day to this.**

What does Mr. Lea say? Of course, Mr. Lea does not know very much about this matter, because he was not let in on these conferences until the last one, to which I shall refer later. He says, however, that this Government could not do anything with our claims until the Western Provinces were dealt with. That, too, is a matter to which I shall refer in a few minutes.

DRIFTING ALONG

The provincial delegates came back from the 1927 conference without achieving any result, and so the matter stood until January, 1930. From October, 1927, until December, 1929, absolutely nothing was done by this Government; All this time they were drifting along, going further into debt, complaining because the taxes had been reduced by the Conservatives and they did not have enough revenue. They were not able to bestir themselves, apparently, not able to exert themselves sufficiently to get that money which was awaiting us at Ottawa. (Applause.)

In January, 1930, Mr. Saunders made a visit to Ottawa. His return, in the usual course of events, was followed by a glaring front page article in the Patriot newspaper, under the heading: "Claims of Prince Edward Island are being Adjusted by Audit Board Composition of Expert Accountants." "Special Memorial With Regard to Our Claim for Increased Subsidy In Lieu of Public Lands Fyld at Ottawa by Premier Saunders last Tuesday afternoon. Premier Interview:

ed by Patriot On His Return Last Night From Ottawa, Where He Had a Satisfactory Conference with Members of the Government."

Then follows the statement that "Hon. Mr. Saunders, accompanied by Senator McArthur, left for Ottawa on Wednesday the 15th last, to consult with the Federal authorities regarding matters pertaining to various Governmental activities, and, in particular, to press our provincial subsidy claims."

"Premier Saunders then stated that an Audit Board has been appointed by the King Government to make this final adjustment (under the Duncan Report). The members of the Board so appointed have been chosen with the greatest care. The Board is at present at work on our claims, making the adjustment recommended by the Duncan Commission. They are instructed by the Federal Government, Mr. Saunders stated, to review representations from any or all of the Maritime Governments."

"The Royal Commission on Maritime Claims came to the conclusion that: (a) the expenditures of the Maritime Provinces are on a reasonable basis, and (b) that the underlying principle is accepted by the Maritime Provinces that they are expected to supplement their revenue from sources of their own."

GLARING MISSTATEMENT

It turned out afterwards that the Board was not appointed for this purpose at all—that it consisted simply of men who were regularly in the employ of the Dominion Government for the purpose of doing certain auditing work which was allotted to them by the treasurer of the board. So that when Mr. Saunders stated that this was a Board appointed by the King Government to make a final adjustment of our subsidy claims, that statement was absolutely incorrect.

You would have expected from that newspaper report, that we were very near the fruition of our hopes. But time drifted on, and nothing resulted—nothing, that is to say, until the time that the King Government went out of power.

It will be recalled that during all this time, at every session of the Legislature, we asked that information be tabled with regard to how the matter was progressing, what negotiations were being carried on, and so forth. What was the answer? That it was not in the public interest that this information should be divulged. In other words, that it was not in the interests of the public that they should know their own business! (Applause.)

MR. KING'S STATEMENT

Now Mr. Lea says the reason the matter has been neglected—or "postponed"—is that the West had to be dealt with first. Is that statement correct? Is there anything to that effect in the interview with Mr. Saunders, who was dealing with this matter? Did he say that the settlement of the Western claims had any bearing on the Duncan Report one way or the other? Not a word. His statement was that the Audit Board "has begun their work" that the settlement was "now under way," and that it would be concluded shortly.

What did Mr. MacKenzie King say? The matter was brought to the Prime Minister's attention in Parliament on February, 1929 when Dr. Murray MacLaren, of St. John, introduced the matter. Here is the then Prime Minister's statement, as reported in Hansard of that date:

MR. MACKENZIE KING: May I just say to my hon. friend, in reply to his last suggestion, that that is precisely what took place the year before last. We had a conference of the Premiers with the members of the Government, and it is as a result of that conference that the Dominion has proceeded to deal more liberally with the Western Provinces than it was prepared to do theretofore.

MR. MACLAREN: Yes, but was it not at the same time suggested that an opportunity should be given to certain of the Provinces to put forward their claims for compensation?

MR. MACKENZIE KING: No one is denying that opportunity.

MR. MACLAREN: But so far only the Western Provinces are being dealt with. Why not the other Provinces?

MR. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend said a moment ago that he was not in a position to present their claims. For some reason or other the claims have not been put forward by the Provinces.

Legislature, I told the members of this Government that it was only a fake, that it was simply a matter of fobbing them off, that it would never mean anything, that the Government at Ottawa was merely taking this way of postponing the matter and getting rid of them. What has been the result? We have a gentleman at Ottawa who is a pretty strong partisan and who makes himself quite busy politically. I refer to the representative for Prince County, Mr. A. E. MacLean. Some time ago Mr. MacLean put a question on the order paper of the House of Commons, asking for the report of the Audit Board. Fortunately, I have a copy of the report which was tabled in reply. It is dated October 8, 1930, and it states:

"On January 20th last by Treasury Board minute (copy attached) the Board of Audit were directed to conduct an investigation and to advise as to the equitable reassessment of Maritime Claims."

"The Royal Commission on Maritime Claims came to the conclusion that: (a) the expenditures of the Maritime Provinces are on a reasonable basis, and (b) that the underlying principle is accepted by the Maritime Provinces that they are expected to supplement their revenue from sources of their own."

The finding is simply what the Duncan Commission found before, and of no value whatever. But to quote further:

"The Board have been somewhat handicapped in these investigations by the early impression of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that the Board of Audit were to be final arbitrators. Final and complete negotiations must be conducted directly between the Provincial Governments and the Dominion Government."

That is the very thing that I told my honorable friends on the floor of the Legislature at the time, that this Board has no authority whatever to make any finding, that it was a matter that would have to be settled by the Provinces and the Dominion Government.

Nova Scotia and New Brunswick did not recognize this Board in the matter at all. The Premiers of those Provinces knew perfectly well that it was of no value, that it was simply a stop-gap, a gesture on the part of the King Government to mark time until the federal election was over. So they did not attend the sitting of the Board. We had representatives from this Province in the person of Mr. Lea and another. Did we get anything? I will tell you what happened. It cost this Province a thousand dollars for their attendance. It is charged up in the Public Accounts, and to the taxpayers of this Province it was not worth one five-cent piece—as Mr. King might say. (Applause.)

MR. LEA BUNGLES BADLY

The Government was invited by the Audit Board to present an "ideal budget" projected on a basis of expenditures for the next ten years. Now you would expect that this "ideal budget" would be based on our claims for subsidy; in other words, that it would be made in such a way as to disclose that that subsidy was required. Here we have the amount of the "ideal budget" presented by Mr. Lea to the Audit Board, and it shows the money we required to be, roughly, \$1,261,000—practically what we are spending now. They have not asked for one cent more than they are using now! (Laughter.) They say, at the end of their statement, that the additional revenue required would be \$438,000—but their argument does not show it. That is how they prepared our claims before the Audit Board; that is what you paid \$1,000 for, to go before a Board that had no authority of any kind to adjudicate or deal with the matter. (Loud applause.)

That is not the only presentation that was made. Mr. Saunders, shortly before, presented a memorial at Ottawa. My impression is that that memorial only dealt with our claim for want of public lands, and the claim was \$408,796.94. But when Mr. Saunders went to Ottawa to present this document, he left behind him the present Premier, and it was on this occasion, as Acting Premier, that Mr. Lea made his first venture into the matter of our subsidy claims. That was the first occasion that he appeared on the horizon; and he made quite a plunge. He put forward a brief, published in the Patriot newspaper under his name, for a claim of \$3,372,166.57! (Laughter.)

Now I want to draw your attention to this, that when Mr. Lea went to Ottawa and presented a claim of \$438,000 before the Audit Board, he had already published in the

for \$3,372,166.57 in the Patriot newspaper. In other words, when he presented his claim in the Patriot to the people of this Province he claimed over three million dollars, and when he presented it to the Audit Board it had shrunk to four hundred thousand dollars. If he ever gets before the Privy Council what will he claim. (Loud laughter and applause.)

CRASS STUPIDITY

I have taken up some time with this subject, in an endeavor to show you what the people of this Province can expect to obtain from the efforts of this Government by way of implementation of our subsidy claims. In the first place, we have negligence; we have want of faith; we have lack of knowledge. That is bad enough. All these things make a pretty bad showing. But when you add to this, crass stupidity in the way of presenting them—stupidity to such a degree that it holds this Province up to the ridicule of Canada, then I think you can come to a fairly accurate conclusion as to what you may expect from this Government with regard to obtaining a subsidy settlement from the Dominion of Canada. (Loud Applause.)

Do you think there is anything more important than that? Do you think any issue transcending that issue could be presented to the electors for their decision at an election. (Applause.) There is not any question that we are entitled to a large increase in subsidy. These gentlemen agree to that. It is admitted in the Duncan Report. It is not contradicted by the House of Commons. It is a matter endorsed by all parties. Yet they have delayed. We have been deprived of our money, of our rights, for these four years now, simply because of the bungling of a stupid Provincial Government. (Loud applause.)

PUBLIC WORKS

I do not suppose that any department of the public service in this Province is so much under the eyes of the public, as the Public Works Department, more so now than ever, perhaps, because of the increase in motor vehicles in traffic on the roads, and in the number of people whom we have visiting our Province as tourists and otherwise. All these things add to the interest in this particular department, and it requires very careful and very serious consideration. There are a great many aspects and a great many things to be dealt with in connection with this department. I shall not attempt to cover this subject tonight, but will confine myself to a few observations, as I fear that I have already taken up too much of your time.

I have already mentioned the matter of highway improvement. You will remember that work was carried on by the Bell Government and by us. This present Government had no highway projects to carry through. I notice that the Premier at the Hunter River meeting the other night, referred to the funding of the automobile license fees and gasoline taxes, thereby creating a basis for the borrowing of money for highway work. That, of course, is not a new policy. It was begun by the Bell Government, carried on by our Government, and subsequently by this Government. The principle is common to the other Provinces. Perhaps there is not very much objection to it; but there may be this objection, that the wisdom of borrowing money depends entirely upon how that money is to be expended. We must remember that while we are getting the money very easily for the time being, we shall have to pay it back, or leave a legacy to our children and our children's children to pay it, some time, with interest. Don't you think it behooves the Government of this Province, when they borrow large sums of money, to consider well the purpose for which they place that burden on the shoulders of our children who are coming after us, and to whom we owe a certain duty? Don't you think it behooves the Government to see that the money is expended properly, that it shall not be thrown with a lavish hand to the four winds?

WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

We are not condemning the Government because they have funded the auto license fees and the gas taxes; but we are blaming them because in raising these large sums of money they have not supervised the expenditure as they ought; because they have wasted a large amount of it,—spent extravagantly the money that will have to be paid back, as I said before, with interest, by ourselves or those who come after us.

THAT AUDIT BOARD

When this matter of an Audit Board came up on the floor of the

THAT AUDIT BOARD

he had already published in the

THAT AUDIT BOARD

he had already published in the

THAT AUDIT BOARD

he had already published in the

THAT AUDIT BOARD

he had already published in the

THAT AUDIT BOARD

he had already published in the

THAT AUDIT BOARD

he had already published in the

THAT AUDIT BOARD

he had already published in the

Continued on page 6