

resolved that the new Government House be sold at the earliest practicable date for the best price obtainable therefor and from the proceeds thereof a suitable site be purchased and thereon erected a Government House in keeping with the democratic sentiment of the people of this province."

The Liberals pointed out that an Act had been passed by the Legislature expressly stating that a sufficient portion of the proceeds from the sale of the old Government House property should be set aside to constitute a fund the interest on which should provide for the maintenance, furnishing and repair of the new Government House and that "no other sums shall be appropriated by the Legislature annually for the maintenance or support of Government House." But it turned out that in the dying hours of the session, without notice to or knowledge of even the Leader of the Opposition, the Government had repealed this Act. It will be seen, however, that before the Act was repealed, in defiance of the law, the Government had proceeded with an enterprise that had wiped out entirely the amount received from the sale of the old property. It had to quietly repeal the Act to save its face.

Investigation showed that \$800,000 had been derived from the sale of the old Government House and \$60,000 more as a profit from the sale of the site first purchased for Government House, a total of \$860,000. Yet the Government spent \$1,100,000 over-drawing on capital account for its main expenditure and for the whole cost of maintenance, in reckless and extravagant disregard of all principles of decent and economic government.

Again in 1916 and 1917 the Liberals moved amendments recording their disapproval of this excessive and wasteful expenditure and the heavy charge made upon the revenues of the Province for maintenance, but the Government in every instance forced the estimates through the House by its partisan majority.

Expenditures Investigated.

The expenditures were investigated by the Opposition in the Public Accounts Committee during the session of 1917. There was not even the excuse for the tremendous increase in expenditure that there had been any material alteration in the plans. In answer to a question the Deputy Minister of Public Works stated "There were no material changes in construction." The grossness of the deception which was practised upon the House and upon the country is only too apparent.

Another point that developed was the fact that although enormous sums were expended, for example, \$58,857.61 for tile