A MASTERLY EXPOSITION OF AFFAIRS

By Hon. Jas. A. Murray Was Leading Feature in Legislature Yesterday.

HIS COMPARISON OF THE RECORDS

Of the Present and Late Administrations Will Furnish Instructive Reading for Thoughtful Citizens.

(Continued from page 1)

Mr. Murray called attention to the fact that the record of progress and achievement on the Crown Land Department began when the Conservatives came into power in 1908.

In taking up matters pertaining to the Agricultural Department, the speaker emphasized the fact that his Government equipped the department, and left it in working order for the present administration, and not one new ideal or policy had been added to the department under its present administrator. The department had been made a place for friends of the Government to find employment, and the expenses of administration have increased tremendously since 1916.

Mr. Murray replied to the criticisms heaped upon his Government in connection with the Valley Railway work. Considerable fault had been found with the Murray Government for changing the course of the railway and not connecting with the C. N. R. at Rothesay. In defence of the former Government, the speaker showed by communications from the Dominion Government that the route was changed to tap the C. P. R. at Westfield at the request of the Dominion authorities. Their engineers, after surveys and thorough investigations, found it not feasible for the road to traverse the original route and so advised the Murray Government. By coming down and connecting with the C. P. R. at Westfield it meant a saving of over two million dollars to the Dominion and Provincial Governments. The expense of bridging the St. John River would have been a tremendous one, and the result problematical, and these were regarded as sufficient reasons for changing the route. The speaker pointed out the gross negligence of the Government in not providing running rights over the C. P. R. and showed their utter disregard of public interest.

Mr. Murray summarized the real achievements of the Government as follows: Reputation of being the most petty partisan administration the Province ever had. Distinction of being the most extravagant Government in history, with the largest revenue and the largest deficits. Have achieved the unenviable record of charging to capital hundreds of thousands of dollars properly chargeable to current account in order to overcome the much larger deficits than would otherwise have appeared. Record of having raised the stumpage to $4 per thousand and reducing it at the order of interested supporters. Shown its hypocrisy regarding proper representation by keeping Carleton seat vacant. Shown its contempt of the farmers and rural population by disregarding the byroads. Increased the cost of executive government by many thousands of dollars with no corresponding benefits. Failed to make ample provision for returned soldiers or to accord them recognition. Every failure the Government has made, said the speaker, is blamed on the preceding Government.

Mr. Murray's Speech

Mr. Murray (Kings) rose to continue the debate on the budget. He said the hon. member for Albert had moved the adjournment of the debate and not being ready to go on had requested him (Murray) to take his place. He had been pleased at the high tone which the debate had taken up to the present time and felt that it was creditable to honorable members and would be appreciated by the people of the province. The Hon. Premier had referred in a jocular way to a recent convention of the Conservative party. If he (Murray) felt disposed to discuss matters of that kind he might refer to another party convention in which the honorable Premier had been concerned, but he would not take up the time of the House in a discussion of the matter. He had listened with interest to the reply made by the hon. Minister of Public Works in regard to conditions in northern Gloucester, and was satisfied with the explanation which had been given. He would say that he made the enquiry on the strength of a telegram forwarded to him from Shippegan on March 23rd, and signed by Rev. D. Robichaud, Rev. A. McKinnon and Rev. T. Albert. He was glad to learn from the hon. minister's statement that the road had been opened.

The Hon. Premier had referred to an editorial in the St. John Standard which had questioned his right to greet the returned soldiers, and he had asked if the people would think that he (Murray) was qualified to act. In answer he would say that he considered himself qualified to speak for a large class of people whose sons had gone overseas and faced death, and he could speak for those who when Hell broke loose in Europe, had assumed an air of cheerfulness and confidence with the object of inspiring the boys who were to face that horror. He could also speak for that class who had been privileged to welcome home their sons, and he could speak for that class who had sons who would never return. He believed that all had been proud to welcome them on their return, but it was a matter which might now be relegated to back ground.

The Hon. Premier had referred to Hon. Mr. Carvell's elevation to the chairmanship of the Railway Commission and to New Brunswick's lack of representation in the Federal Cabinet. It was strange that holding such views he would have allowed the County of Carleton to be deprived of one of its members. As leader of the government he should of long ago seen to it that the vacancy was filled. When his hon. friends were in opposition they assailed the late government for keeping constituencies open, but now they were content to permit a vacancy to remain longer than their predecessors ever did. He heartily concurred in what had been said in regard to an increase in teachers salaries and would be glad to co-operate with other hon. members in bringing about a better state of affairs. The teachers had formed an association for the betterment of the cause of education and were surely deserving of any support that could be given by those in authority.

With regard to the Valley Railway he would deny that he charged the government with neglect in not extending to Grand Falls. What he had done was to refer to a pledge made by his hon. friends opposite in1916 that they would make the extension on coming into power. It was true the subsidy had elapsed, but his hon. friends were aware of that when they made their pledge. He declared that they had practiced hypocrisy in connection with the matter. He noticed that a bill had been introduced to grant an extension on time, and possibly an early election was in contemplation. He thought the term "collosal nerve" which the Hon. Premier had applied to him was applicable to greater force to his hon. friends opposite. It was true that he (Murray) had expressed gratification at the completion of the road to Westfield, and he felt sure that that feeling had been quite general. He would say that there had been neglect on the part of somebody in not arranging for running rights over the C. P. R. from St. John to Westfield including the bridge over the Reversing Falls. The fall of 1916 which he had the honor of introducing had made ample provision for that. It also provided in case of failure or neglect of the part of the company to secure running rights, the Dominion Government could make the application in its own right.

The fact that the agreement was not carried out in accordance with the act showed that there had been failure on the part of somebody. He concurred in the view of the Hon. Premier that payment for the running rights by the C. N. R. was what the old administration had always had in mind. The whole discussion carried on at both Ottawa and Fredericton had been on that basis. It had been understood that as the company could not benefit from the operation of the road from Westfield to St. John, the running rights were to be provided by the Federal authorities. The route had been changed to the western side of the river, because the government of that day had been impressed by the arguments advanced against the suitability of the eastern route. It had been pointed out that to erect the bridges would be a very costly undertaking and there would be no guarantee of their permanency. The speaker here read for the benefit of the House a lengthy communication which he had received in 1916 from Mr. F. P. Gutelius, then general manager of the Canadian Government railways which advanced strong arguments from the Federal Government standpoint in favor of changing the route from the eastern to the western side of the river. The letter set forth that owing to the hazardous construction, the tremendous cost, the cost of maintenance, and the interference with navigation on the St. John river, and annual fixed charges of $120,000 made up of interest and operation cost it was necessary in the public interest that some other route for the railway should be found.

Mr. Murray, continuing, said that Mr. Gutelius was a man of great vision. He had had many interesting talks with that gentleman in relation to the St. John and Quebec Railway, and if Mr. Gutelius had remained in the position of general maniger of the Canadian Government Railways it would have greatly added to the interests of New Brunswick. The following figures had been supplied by Mr. C. B. Brown, chief engineer of Government Railways:

Gagetown to Rothesay, 46.54 miles, costing $2,387,000; not including the cost of the bridge across the St. John river. Gagetown to Westfield 37.50 miles, costing $1,680,000. Distance in favor of Westfield route 4.04 miles. Cost in favor of Westfield route $707,000. Comparing the two routes to St. John Mr. Brown makes mileage, Gagetown to Union Depot via Westfield 52.20 miles, via Rothesay, 51.29 miles. Commenting on these Mr. Brown said that the mileage is practically the same as well as rise and fall and curvature, so that there would be very little difference in cost of operation, except for the heavy maintenance and operating charges on the bridge route. The feasibility of building a bridge across the St. John river had been disputed. It was a matter of ancient history ,but nevertheless might have some interest for the House. The synoptic report of 1916 quoted Mr. Monsaratt as saying that that estimate for bridging the St. John at the Mistake was $2,160,000, and time to build it at least two years. Mr. Monsaratt placed annual cost of maintenance and operation at $12,000, and said he had no position in recommending the adoption of the Westfield route. Investigations at that time had produced the fact that the bridge at Omaha had piers of a depth of 104 feet, but one at the Mistake would require piers which could not be less than 168 feet, and which engineers could not guarantee to stand after being built. Other considerations which decided the government of the time to choose the Westfield route were rafting and navigation on the St. John river. This should be an answer to those of his hon. friends who appeared to possess the belief that it was with an ulterior motive that a change had been made.

Hon. Mr. Tweeddale—"Was there a report on a bridge at Andover across the St. John river?"

Mr. Murray (Kings)—"Yes, there was, but I do not recollect the details at the present time."

Hon. Mr. Tweeddale—"No difficulties were found in the way of building such a bridge?"

Mr. Murray said that he did not remember of any, but as the cost was included in the general statement he could not give figures. Much had been said concerning the cost of construction of the St. John and Quebec Railway. It might be remembered, however, that a commission appointed to inquire into the expenditure on the national Transcontinental Railway, found that the Dominion hadlos t $40,000,000 on the Winnipeg-Moncton section. His hon. friends in criticising expenditure on the St. John and Quebec Railway made no reference to the finding of that commission. Upon taking office the hon. leader of the present government had announced that two members of the government would sit as directors of the St. John and Quebec Railway without remuneration. Who did, except the Premier himself and the hon. member for Moncton, and they only during 1917, retiring then and leaving three directors to their own devices. This was a promise that was not kept, the three directors fared very well indeed, and yet with this very efficient board and its frequent trips to Ottawa no one seemed to be able to think that an arrangement for running rights with the C. P. R. from Westfield to St. John was necessary upon completion of the line.

To come to the finances of this railway, it might be recollected that the leader of the Government had said that statements of finances would be clear and intelligible. He (Murray) had the same fault to find with the Camptroller General's report that he had found last year. Statements were difficult to understand and hard to find. The Comptroller General's report showed that interest was charged on 170 miles of railway. He held that interest could be charged only on that section of the road under construction. The classification of expenditures for road and equipment for the purpose of railway statistics as issued from Ottawa absolutely bore out his contention. In 1917 an Act was passed giving authority to borrow $1,000,000. Under the provisions of that Act certain monies were to provide a sinking fund. Much had not been done. He had no hesitation in stating that there had been evasion of this Act. The Dominion subsidy in 1918 provided $278,716.81 and in 1919 $51,261.91, making the total from this source $329,978.72. From the Prudential Trust Company in 1918 there had been received $208,177.63 and in 1919 $61,253.89, making a total of $269,431.52. The total amount received in the two years from Dominion Subsidies and the Prudential Trust Company was $599,410.24. That amount should be in the sinking fund, instead of being credited to the railway account. To his mind the Act was clear and explicit. Any money received were to be set aside as a sinking fund to meet the $1,000,000 bonds. His hon. friends opposite might say that it made no difference, that the money was received and was paid out again. If that were true they could go on indefinitely and spend millions. Although it would mean no difference in cost of the railway in the end, the Act had been most flagrantly violated by the directors of the St. John and Quebec railway, and the two members of the Government who sat as directors did nothing.

According to the synoptic report of the proceedings of the House, the hon. provincial secy-treasurer said that about $289,913.27 was required to complete the line to Westfield, less amounts to be collected totalling $207,377, leaving $88,536.27, or about $90,000. He had made a grave miscalculation, for upwards of $300,000 had been expended, and items which had been overlooked had been coming in since. The estimates of 1919 had asked for $189,000 for interest, but about $245,000 really was required. The estimate of receipts made by the hon. provincial secretary was about as far astray, for the province received only $51,261.91 in Dominion Subsidy, and $61,253.89 from the Prudential Trust Company, nothing from the C. P. R., nothing from the C. N. R., and nothing in penalties. However, other monies which apparently had been overlooked came in, such as $57,614.46 from the Department of Public Works, an old debt, $16,070.64 as part earnings of 1919, and $1,483,65 from the Canadian Government Railways. It might be interesting to inquire at this time why changes were made in the methods of accounting in the years 1918-1919. In 1918 revenue and interest were placed in Consolidated Account, but in 1919 the sum of $16,070.37, a part share of earnings was placed in the Railway Account. In 1918 the sum of $15,082.01, earnings owed to the Railway Company was placed in accounts received, but in 1919 a similar sum of $30,581.28, was charged to capital. Apparently the year 1919 was very fair as far as operation of the railway was concerned, for the total earnings amounted to $46,651.65. His hon. friends never ceased to say that the public accounts were plain and clear. An explanation of the items he had just mentioned might be in order. Up to October 31st, 1918, the cost of construction of the Gagetown-Westfield section was shown as $1,400,223.92, and not as publish on page A-41, $1,040,967.97. The latter amount was net after using sinking fund monies.

The total cost to October 31st, 1919 was $1,913,809.77, and not $1,421,973,59, as stated on page 243. Where is the authority for spending more than $1,450,000. Careful consideration of the railway accounts showed a cost of $1,913,809.77 and total receipts of $1,143,786.79, leaving an over-draft of $770,022.99.

Hon. Mr. Foster said he could inform his hon. friend that the bonds never had been issued. The authority had been obtained but the issue never had been made.

Mr. Murray said that made no difference, the legislation which had been passed had been disregarded. There had been evasion of the Act and the matter could have been carried on until millions had been spent. He did not say that the monty had been lost. The action which had been taken had been to enable the railway company to place these monies in current account. That was the point which he desired to make.

Hon. Mr. Foster asked if his hon. friend did not take the same view as he had in opposition to the attempt of the Dominion Government to make the province pay for runninng rights from Westfield into St. John.

Mr. Murray in reply said that he was delighted to be able to state that he agreed with his hon. friend, the Premier, on that particular point. His understanding always had been that the C. N. R. should take over the railway and operate it without any charge to the province.

Continuing, the speaker said he would refer to the over-expenditure by the Government. If there was one thing which present members of the Government while in Opposition used to rave about, it was over-expenditure. In 1918 the press supporting the Government had issued a statement which alleged that there was a surplus of $30,961. No one at that time said it was not a surplus, but merely a cash in hand statement. Later special auditors employed by the Government, converted this $30,000 surplus into a deficit of $134,656. In two years and seven months there had been a total deficit of $802,000. This was pretty good for a party which when in Opposition had raved about over-expenditure and extravagance. In a comparatively short time it had shown reckless and wasteful methods of expenditure never before seen in the province. In his remarks on the Address, the hon leader of the Government had given a list of what he termed the broken pledges of the party at present in Opposition. He had stated that the Farm Settlement Board had existed only for the purpose of buying farms from political friends. He (Murray) in regard to that statement could say that when head of the Farm Settlement Board he had never asked concerning the party affiliations of any man, and he knew that the Board had performed valuable service for the province of New Brunswick, and that through its efforts farms were now being filled which otherwise would be vacant. As far as the Workmen's Compensation Act concerned, his hon. friends opposite knew that the Act which they had passed in 1917 had been framed by a Commission which was appointed by the late Government, and representing both sides of politics. His hon. friends had passed that very Act and yet had the temerity to say that the former administration had failed to measure up to the standard set by labor. With regard to the Agricultural Department the charge had been that it had made no real progress, that it had sunk into the depths of incompetency and inefficiency. He would say that the Department of Agriculture stood as a monument to the late government which created and organized it, made its machinery and set it in motion.

Another charge had been that the late administration had lent itself to infringement of private rights by the introduction of the Foreshores Bill it was an unwritten law of the House that when an hon. member stood in his place and made a statement, that statement was to be accepted. As far as his hon. friend on his left (Baxter) was concerned he would say that the statement made by him and reported in the synoptic report of 1915 was accepted by the people of the province as coming from the lips of one of the most honorable men in Canada. The speaker then quoted the statement to which he had referred. When his hon. friend from the County of St. John arose and made a statement it would be believed, and if the hon. leader of the Government wished to raise the tone of the debate he would relegate such issues to the past and devote his attention to present problems of which there were certainly enough. The allegation had been made that the amendment to the Address moved by himself had been actuated by a political motive. Hon. members on the other side of the House apparently found it impossible to ascribe to an opponent any motive other than political.

They had said that the purpose of the amendment was to produce a united vote upon the Opposition side. The hon. leader of the Government need not worry about disunion in the party on the left of hon. Mr. Speaker, for he would have sufficient troubles of his own within his own party. He could inform the House that hon. members of the Opposition were at liberty to vote as their conscience and the interests of their constituents dictated. The hon. Minister of Agriculture laughed. Perhaps when some of the things the minister had up his sleeve were revealed to the public he would not laugh so heartily and perhaps these revelations were not so very far away.

Hon. Mr. Tweeddale: "I will have a better record than you did under similar circumstances."

Mr. Murray, continuing, said the amendment had been moved by him with the intention of calling public attention to the state of the Public Domain which was fast approaching a condition in which it would be a source of expense rather than revenue. Much had been said on the opposite side of the House concerning an order-in-council passed in 1914. That order had been rescinded and had no bearing on the affairs of the province. It was the problems of 1920 which were pressing for solution. The Crown Lands of the Province were being rapidly depleted, and the situation was serious. Three hundred million feet were being cut annually and in addition there were losses by fire, blow downs, and the devastation of the spruce-bud worm. He had noticed by the press that Mr. Barnjum, of Nova Scotia, a recognized authority on the subject took the same view. A stumpage rate of $7 would not be excessive. Indeed there were those in the Province who thought the rate should be higher, and he knew that all the lumbermen did not think as did those who occupied seats in the House. He had been sincere in moving the amendment, and had had no political motive. An Order-in-Council had been rescinded in 1914 and had been frequently referred to. But since that time there was another Order-in-Council which had been rescinded, and concerning it nothing was said on the other side of the House. It had been decided by the present government to make the rate of stumpage $4, he presumed by Order-in-Council. That rate was reduced, what was the reason? If rumor was correct it was done at the dictates of the supporters of the government who were connected with the lumber interests. The speaker quoted an extract from the newspaper to the effect that prior to the election of 1917 certain big lumbermen had been approached by the government with a promise that in return for support the stumpage rate would be fixed for a period of twenty years, the rate being $1.50. Prior to the election of 1917 he was leader of the government and certainly would have had some knowledge of this matter had it taken place. He did not know who approached the lumbermen and could say that no one had any authority to approach the lumbermen or make any "dicker" with them on behalf of the government. He made this denial unreservedly and was prepared to go on a witness stand and swear to it.

The present government in the platform on which it appealed to the people had a fifth plank which contained the following: "To so reduce the cost of the administration of affairs and the number of useless officials as to avoid the necessity for direct taxation now confronting us." Had there been a reduction in the number of officials? Was the plank one to get in on and not to stand on? Take the Public Works Department alone. In 1916 salaries in that Department had amounted to $12,268 and in 1918 to $46,826, an increase of $4,537. Contingencies had amounted to $1,900 in 1916 and to $5,754 in 1918, an increase of $4,254. In 1919 salaries had been about the same as in 1918, $16,743, but contingencies had amounted to $9,155, an increase of $7,255. The increase for salaries and contingencies in 1919 over 1916 totals $6,740. The platform which he had referred to had made mention of the danger of direct taxation, yet this was the first government to adopt direct taxation. In 1917 taxation for the Patriotic Fund totalled $518,000. In the year following the executive of the fund estimated that only $400,000 would be needed. The government, however, saw a chance to raise some money so it placed the total at the figure of the preceding year, thereby adding $118,000. The hon. Provincial Secretary-Treasurer in his budget address had mentioned this amount and the fact that it has been collected.

Hon. Robert Murray: "I did not say all of it had been collected."

Mr. Murray, continuing, said that as the hon. Provincial Secretary-Treasurer had proceeded to apportion the expenditure of the amount, he had concluded that it all must have been collected. In 1918 $22,033.25 was accounted for and the balance was spent according to the hon. gentleman for increased cost of material brought about by the war.

In 1919, however, the hon. Provincial Secretary recedes from his position and says that the balance is to be used to meet interest and sinking fund charges of the patriotic potato gift. That was not all in the way of direct taxation. This government had imposed amusement tax and every time he went to a theatre and saw a child or a woman paying a penny and putting a ticket in a chopping machine he realized that that was a contribution to a government which lacks the courage to increase the rate of stumpage. He could inform the government that the people took the same view.

He would refer to the Public Works Department and would say he considered the Minister of Public Works the most reckless spender in the government. He would say that to his face.

Hon. Mr Venlot: "I believe the same so do not be surprised if I have something to say."

During the session of 1917 the hon. minister had defined what he meant by permanent roads. At the same session he proceeded to take legislative authority to borrow $500,000 for that purpose which he increased to $700,000 in 1918 and to $1,050,000 in 1919. The last named amount was practically used before it was all authorized by the legislature as there is now carried in the public accounts as a capital asset of the province the Veniot permanent roads, indicated by an item placing their value at the amount spent to October 31st, 1918, $1,006,212.80. Of that $14,000 was written off through motor vechile fund leaving $992,212.80. Formerly these had permanent roads, but the hon. minister had made a slight change and they had come to be durable roads. The workings of the Public Works Department were fearful, wonderful and mysterious. In the county of Kings there were roads classed as durable which could not, without stretch of the imagination, be classed as such. The road supervisors themselves laugh at the classification. The accounts showed that an appropriation of $340,000 in 1919 had been overexpended $268,835.76, also that the first special warrant was issued in August. Could it have been possible to spend that money in the four months, April to August, with nothing being done from fall to spring? The synoptic report quotes the hon. Provincial Secretary as saying that $9,746 had been paid in cheques between November 1st and 20th, 1918. That proved that many cheques were held over until November. Hon. friends might say that many of them had been charged back but many of them must have been held back. The same report had quoted the Provincial Secretary-Treasurer as saying that he hoped that during the coming year the outlay would not be so large as so much had been done, and the report showed that the revenue was more than estimated by $104,592.21. However, this was followed up by a deficit of $327,686.22 of which the Department of Public Works was responsible for $284,000. Where is the economy and prudence of this government of reckless spending? The hon. Premier on taking office had proposed to save $900 by amalgamating the offices of railway inspecting engineer and road engineer. That was done, but the record for extravagance was kept up, three or four more engineers being appointed at a cost of about $4,600.

The report of the Comptroller General showed that $735,000 had been obtained by special warrants from June to October, 1919. Every one knew nothing was done on the roads from fall to spring and how much could be spent in April and May . It looked as though the appropriation was spent in a little more than two months. A stop should be put to such wasteful and extravagant expenditures. The report showed that from March 31, 1917 to October 31, 1919 there had been an increase of road bonds of $1,150,000 and of permanent bridge bonds of $1,261,000. The liabilities for roads had increased $672,244.99 making a total for roads of $1,822,244.99. The liabilities for permanent bridges had increased $61,071.35 making a total of $1,322,071.35. In two years and seven months under the present administration there has been a total increase of $3,144,316.34. The question was "are the people getting full return?" Speaking for his own county and many other sections he could say they were not. There had been an expenditure of over $150,000 in Kings and yet he could take the hon. Minister to roads within two miles of Sussex which had not been touched in two years. The back roads of the province in general were in the worst condition in 15 years. He also could inform the hon. minister that there had been a direct violation of the Roads Act in the county of Kings, a municipal councillor having acted as road supervisor.

Hon. Mr. Veniot: "Can you give me the name?"

Mr. Murray: "I will in private."

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Murray (Kings), on the House resuming after recess, said that his hon. friend from Albert had made a statement that bonds sold by the Government had been re-sold at a higher figured and he had suggested that somebody had made a profit. The hon. Provincial Secretary should not have been offended at that statement; the hon. Premier had made a similar criticism in 1917 in regard to a bond sale made by the previous administration. There was no occasion, therefore, for the hon. Provincial Secretary's declaration against the hon. member for Albert. He would point out that the capital liabilities of the Province in 1917 were $15,301,282, whereas in 1920 they were $20,563,763, an increase of $5,262,480 in two and seven-twelfth years. The debt of the Province on March 31, 1917, was $15,301,283.79, and on October 31st, 1919, it was $20,563,763.24, an increase of $5,262,480.45. There had been no lessening of the methods of finance complained of under the old administration, and the Government had been unable to keep the ordinary expenditure within the ordinary revenue. One of the largest items of expenditure was for interest, which last year amounted to $531,300, an increase of $180,000 over 1916. Last year his hon. friends had laid stress on the fact that they had made an arrangement with the banks for an increased allowance on daily balances. The results in 1919 did not show that anything wonderful had been accomplished from that arrangement, as $21,725.09 had been paid in interest on over-drafts, while the receipts from credit balances amounted only to $5,167.36—a difference of $16,557.37.

Hon. members boasted that under the new system of accounting a clearer view of the financial standing of the Province could be had than ever before. Possibly he (Murray) was dense, and that was probably the case with others who unsuccessfully sought information from the Comptroller's report. He found on one page of the report a statement showing stumpage revenue of $575,618, while on another page it was put down as $568,383. There might be a satisfactory explanation for the difference, but the accounts did not show it. He would like the hon. Provincial Secretary to explain the matter.

Hon. Robert Murray said that the hon. member had asked for a lot of details which he would have pleasure in supplying at a later stage in the debate.

Mr. Murray (Kings), continuing, said that was precisely the answer he had expected the hon. Minister to make. He trusted that when the information was forthcoming he would find it satisfactory. In reference to royalties he noticed that the statements which appeared in the Comptroller-General's report were at variance, which was further proof that the account were not clear to the average person. In the Public Works Department there was a difference shown in the several statements of $33,883.69. In the accounts for executive government a difference was shown of $4,274.12. The cash receipts of the Province were shown in the insert as $2,167,337.76, while in the cash statement they were shown as $2,168,822.40. He would like to know if the hon. Provincial Secretary knew the amount of the actual cash revenue in 1919. The Comptroller's statement certainly did not furnish the information. The report failed to show to what extent bills receivable had been reduced during the year. If such accounts were allowed to pile up year after year they would never know where they were at.

Some statement ought to appear which would show what accounts classed as bills receivable had been paid and included in the receipts. There was certainly no warrant for the statement that the accounts as published were clear and explicit. On the expense side the accounts seemed to be equally as conflicting as those showing the items of receipts. Why did not the Government issue a plain statement showing the amount of revenue for 1918 which had been collected, and the amount outstanding in 1919?

His hon. friends opposite in their platform of 1916 had complained of the expenditure on account of fish, forest and game protection. Last year that service had cost $137,346, an increase of $53,346 over the previous year. He had made the statement last year that game was being illegally slaughtered, and he had not changed his opinion in that respect. The conditions today were worse than those concerning which the hon. Premier had complained in 1917. The game was a valuable asset, and it was important that it should be conserved. The hon. Minister of Mines and Lands had boasted last session of a saving of $530 in the appointment of a chief game warden and a lumber scaler, but he did

(Continued on Page 4.)

"TIZ" GLADDENS SORE, TIRED FEET

No puffed-up, burning, tender, aching feet — no corns or callouses.

"Tiz" makes sore, burning, tired feet fairly dance with delight. Away go the aches and pains, the corns, callouses, blisters, bunions and chilblains.

"Tiz" draws out the acids and poisons that puff up your feet. No matter how hard you work, how long you dance, how far you walk, or how long you remain on your feet, "Tiz" brings restful foot comfort. "Tiz" is magical, grand, wonderful for tired, aching, swollen, smarting feet. Ah! how comfortable, how happy you feel. Your feet just tingle for joy; shoes never hurt or seem tight.

Get a box of "Tiz" now from any druggist or department store. End foot torture forever — wear smaller shoes, keep your feet fresh, sweet and happy. Just think! a whole year's foot comfort for a few cents.

DENT'S GLOVES

If you want the best gloves, either kid, cape, silk, or fabric:

It's good taste and good sense to

INSIST ON DENT'S.

A MESSAGE FROM "ALICE"

St. John, N. B.,
Mar. 29th, 1920.

Dear Mary:—

Since writing you last, I have secured a position with the New Brunswick Telephone Company as an Operator.

I am going to tell you about some of the things we do here.

In the first place, we employ a large number of girls. They like their work and that is a big advantage for them. They are contented and happy.

We are taking on new girls all the time and right now we are looking for a lot. We want them whether they know anything about our business or not, and we will undertake to teach them something useful, and give them a job worth while.

The work is interesting and agreeable, and is the kind that makes you feel as though you had accomplished something when the day is done.

We have a lot of things that some places are just beginning to put in. I know we are one of the first Companies here to give our employees a Life Insurance Policy. Each of us get an Anniversary Bonus at the termination of each year's employment.

Did you ever hear of the beautiful Rest Room we have here, all furnished in wicker furniture with pretty cretonne curtains in the windows. There are books to read and—of course—a Matron to look after us if we are ill.

I could write you a lot more, but come in and see the Chief Operator of the New Brunswick Telephone Company at 22 Prince Wm. Street. She can tell you more about the good chances we have. There are a lot of them, and they pay good money.

Your friend,
Alice.

P. S. Read my fourth paragraph again.