The estimated receipts of the current year are:—

From General Government—		
Subsidy on population, due 1st Jan. 1884,	$128,493 20	
Gov't and Legislative grant, due 1st Jan. 1884,	25,000 00	
Export duty indemnity, due 1st Jan. '84,	75,000 00	
	$228,493 20	
Deduct— Advanced in 1883,	225,429 69	
		$3,063 51
Amounts as above, due 1st July, 1884,		228,493 20
Territorial Revenue,		150,000 00
Fees, Supreme Court,		2,000 00
Fees, Provincial Secretary's Office,		6,000 00
Agricultural Department,		1,800 00
Fees, Lunatic Asylum,		1,250 00
Miscellaneous,		1,500 00
Sale of funded debt Debentures,		50,000 00
		$644,106 71

The expenditure is estimated as follows:—

Administration of Justice,	$14,600 00
Agriculture,	22,836 55
Auditor General,	1,600 00
Bear Bounties,	2,000 00
Blind Asylum, Halifax,	600 00
Contingencies,	14,500 00
Deaf and Dumb Institution,	1,500 00
Education,	165,464 48
Executive Government,	27,820 00
Exploration and publication of description of public lands, protection of forests and riparian rights, and Forestry Exhibition, Edinburgh,	5,000 00
Free Grants Act,	6,000 00
Interest,	65,040 51
Legislature,	26,550 00
Lunatic Asylum,	42,000 00
Marriage Certificates' registry,	1,200 00
Natural History Society,	250 00
Public Health,	3,500 00
Public Hospital, St. John,	2,000 00
Public Printing,	10,500 00
Public Works, Board,	109,000 00
Public Works, Bye Roads,	70,000 00
Rifle Association,	300 00
Surveys, Railway inspection, and Crown Land refunds,	3,000 00
Stumpage collection,	11,000 00
Unforeseen Expenses,	2,500 00
	$608,811 54
Old appropriations,	1,320 00
	$610,131 54

The following is a statement of the Provincial debt—Dominion, bonded and floating, on 27th February, 1884:—

Due Dominion Gov't in excess of debt allowed by B.N A. Act and Dominion Act 36 Vic. c 30, bal. as per Financial Statement, 13th April, 1883,	$40,098 87	
27th Sept. 1883. Paid Hon. J. Glasier on acct Disputed Terr. Fund,	856 72	
23rd Oct. 1883. Paid Hon. J. Glasier on acct Disputed Terr. Fund,	174 47	
		$41,070 06
Bonded debt as follows:—		
Chatham Br. Railway,	$56,000 00	
Saint John Suspension Bridge,	65,000 00	
Petitcodiac and Elgin Railway,	69,000 00	
Andover Br. Railway,	51,000 00	
St. Martins and Upham Railway,	131,000 00	
Grand Southern R'way	363,800 00	
Woodstock Bridge,	25,000 00	
Maduxnakeag Bridge,	10,000 00	
Kent Northern R'way,	131,000 00	
N. B. & P. E. I. R'way,	34,000 00	
Harvey Branch R'way,	9,000 00	
		944,800 00
Floating Debt—		
Temporary Loan from Bank of N. B.,	$125,000 00	
Less—balance to credit of Accounts 27th Feb. 1884,	909 13	
		124,090 88
		$1,109,900 94

At 2.30 p. m. the House went into Committee on Supply.

HON. MR. MCLELLAN, on rising, asked the indulgence of the members while making his first budget speech. It would not be such an elaborate picture as some of his predecessors had painted, but would be a plain, matter-of-fact statement of the financial condition of the country as it at presents exists. In dealing with it he would avoid, as far as he was able to do, any censure or stricture on the old Government, except to show, when need be, that much of the large expenditure which had to be made was due to them. The estimates were exceeded, but the cause is largely due to the reason that the old Government had collected and expended a large amount of the receipts of the year. He would make a comparative statement to show our relative position between Dec. 31 1883, and Dec. 31 1882; also, a comparative statement of the finances of the country at the present time. His speech, doubtless, would perhaps not be classed as a specimen of oratory, but every member would be made clearly to see how every dollar had been received, and when received, how it had been expended.

The receipts for the 14 months since the close of the fiscal year ending 31st October, 1882, were as follows: Received by the late Government on Dominion subsidies, $316,574.01; received by present Administration, $305,966.88, including the advance of $225,429.69, making the amount received on subsidies $622,540.89. There was received by the late Government from Territorial Revenue $2,213.40; by the present Administration, $181,500.50; received by the late Government as fees from the Supreme Court, $187.83; by the present Administration, $2,289.71; by the late Government from the Provincial Secretary's office, $2,245.72; by the present Administration, $4,524.25; by the late Government, from the Lunatic Asylum, $129; by the present Administration, $1,380; from the Agricultural Department, $1,890.19; from miscellaneous sources by the late Government, $244.65; by the present Administration, $1,551.90; total, $822,880.14. If the estimated receipts, as submitted to the House, are examined, the receipts will be found to be $589,439.40, being $233,449.74 less than the actual amounts received, which is made up in this way: Take the $8,020.05, which is the gain on the estimated receipts, and add the subsidy advance not estimated, $225,429.69, and it makes $233,449.77. The reason the $225,429.69 was drawn in advance, was to pay off the floating debt which they expected to have funded. Owing to increased mileage, the Territorial Revenue exceeded the estimate by $10,713.90; the fees of the Supreme Court also overran the estimate by a small amount, while the fees of the office of Provincial Secretary were slightly behind. The fees from the Lunatic Asylum fell short about $600, some amounts now due not having yet been paid in. The falling short of receipts under the head of miscellaneous is attributable to the fact that at the time the estimate was made it was thought the interest due on the St. Stephen and Havelock school loans would be received. Had their expectations been fulfilled the amount would have been $1,000 more than the shortage in this item. In the items for administration of justice the expenditure was $106.58 in excess of the estimate caused by jury fees, something which could not be controlled. In the Agricultural department there is an over expenditure of $1,489.11, which under the circumstances could not be avoided. Doubtless when the House went into supply, item by item, much discussion would take place on the Exhibition, and when the time comes the Government would be prepared to furnish every information. A few bills have not yet been adjusted, and therefore the exact amount wanted for the service could not be told to a dollar or a cent, but it would be in the vicinity of $3,000. The sum paid for bear bounties was in excess of the estimate. Whether this was due to a disposition on the part of the hunters to take all advantage of the law while it remains on the statute book or not he could not say, but it was a matter over which no government could possibly have control. The estimate for contingences was $15,000. They over expended $947.78, which was caused by having to provide for two sessions of the Legislature, costing $6,418,46, leaving $9,529.32 for departmental contingencies. Of this amount $4,228,48 was expended by the late government in about four months only $5,300,84 for about ten months service. In examining the Education accounts it would be found that the expenditure exceeded the estimate by $5,362.32, which was caused by our having to pay two years' superior allowance instead of one making the difference of $7,000, Take the $5,362.33 from the $7,000, one year's superior allowance extra, and you will find that the balance is in favor of the estimate by $1,637.68. It might be said that the cost of education for the last fourteen months ending December 31 1883, is out of proportion compared with the educational expenditure of previous years: but it must be borne in mind that in the 14 months the Government had to pay for three half years' services, ending respectively Oct. 31, 1882; and not paid until January 1st, 1883, April 30, 1883; and 31 1883. The grants for schoolhouses in poor districts was not all drawn: a balance of $182.50 still remains.

The item for elections shows an expenditure of $1,189.65 more than the estimate caused by elections in St. John, Westmorland, and Sunbury, costing $1,186.25, being within $320 of the amount over expended, Such things could not possibly be anticipated. The receipts for marriage certificates were not within $197 of the estimates. Possibly the gentlemen, in view of the fact that this present year is leap year, concluded to forego the blessedness for a little while, in order that they might receive a proposal from the ladies. The outlook for the present year is a comparatively good one in that particular. The over expenditure for the Executive Government occurred through extra travelling expenses and an amount due to the late Mr. Crawford. The travelling expenses were $4,378 for the fourteen months of which the late Government incurred $1,235 for about four months, leaving $3,143 for about ten months' service. The items for exploration of public lands and for free grants will be explained by the Surveyor General in supply. The public work shows an over expenditure of $8,476.17. The amount in the estimates is $179,366.62 out of which the late Government paid $83,426.15, besides leaving contracts, etc., to be paid for by the present administration amounting to $40,702.42. Deduct these from the estimate and only $52,238.05 will be left for the balance of the service for about ten months. Under these circumstances the Board of Works was compelled to over expend the amount shown. The Chief Commissioner will fully explain the cause of the over expenditure. The late Government over expended in 1882 $20,866.62 for this service, which is in the estimate for 1883, and for years and years previously they had ever expended. The Attorney General may be attacked for ever permitting this over expenditure and we may be faulted by the Opposition with the rememberance that he formerly found fault with others for over expending. He, (McLellan), however, could say that the Attorney General still finds fault with any department that exceeds its estimates, but the present case was one of necessity. The old Government began the year and expended largely of public money and the present administration should not be held accountable for acts not done by them and over which they have no control. The bye road grant was overdrawn to the amount of $2,075.47, caused by old claims and also by advances made to counties as is customary on each year's grants. In stumpage collection the expenses were $480.05 less than the estimate. In unforeseen expenses the same was the cause in the extent of $661.70.

It was not his intention to hide any thing from the members. The Government paid every just bill that was audited and presented up to Dec. 31, 1883, save a few that came in after the accounts had been made up. They had not, nor did they propose to keep bills hanging over with a view to delude the people and make them believe that their true state was something other than it really is. He called the attention of the House to the Receiver General's balance sheet. Taking the debit side, showing the amounts of warrants issued and classified amounting to $810,574.32. To that is added the old account of the cost of the Legislative Buildings and also the suspense accounts. There will also be found the amount of the temporary loans repaid the Bank of New Brunswick, and then the balance on hand, $25,227.60, making the debit side of the account $1,119,051.44. The credit side of the accounts shows the receipts to be $822,889.14, besides temporary loans, $241,000, and the balance of the 1882 account, $55,162.30. The floating debt of the Province on December 31, 1883, consisted of subsidies drawn against January, 1884, $235,429.69; amount borrowed from the Bank of N. B., $91,000. Which amounts, after deducting the balance on hand of $25,227.60, leaves the floating debt $291,202.09. At the same date in 1882 the floating debt of the Province was $30,142.71 more than in 1883. The floating debt on the 2nd of March, 1883, when the present Government came into power, was $165,543.50, and the floating debt on February 2nd, 1884, was $124,090.88, which is made up as follows: Borrowed from Bank of New Brunswick up to December 31, 1883, $91,000; borrowed from Bank of New Brunswick since Dec. 31, $34,000; total, $125,000; less balance to credit of account, $909,912, leaving a floating debt, on February 27, of $124,090.88.

The expenditure for the Legislature was $1,586.58 less than the estimate, but of this amount $820 has since been drawn to pay for books for the library. The saving was due to the short session.

He would not consider himself justified in taking his seat without making reference to the great loss the country had sustained by the death of Mr. Elder, a gentleman with whom he was intimately acquainted. While the House lost a valuable member and himself a great friend, it was as nothing when compared with the loss sustained by his family. He also must refer to Mr. Sterling's death, a man who would be a great loss to the country. In the removal of Mr. Landry to Ottawa the Local Legislature has lost a valuable member.

March 6.—MR. STOCKTON introduced a bill to incorporate the trustees of Owen art gallery; MR. QUINTON, a bill to amend the law relating to rates and taxes in the Municipality of St. John; also, a bill to amend Chap. 99, of Statutes relating to said Municipality.

Several notices of inquiry were answered by the Government.

MR. HUMPHREY introduced a bill to enable Moncton to borrow money to build a market.

MR. McLEOD resumed the debate on the budget. He was surprised at the admission of the Government that when they laid the estimates for last year on the table they were not fully aware of the condition of the country. For years previously, these gentlemen had been on committees of investigation, through the accounts of the late Government, and ought to have known just how it stood. They brought down the estimates and increased these by a supplementary vote of some $ 3,000, and still by their own. showing they are $20,000 worse off now than they were when they went into power. He denied the right of the Government to charge the past Administration with this state of affairs. Our revenues are nearly all fixed and could be accurately ascertained. The receipts last year were in excess of the estimates. They were estimated at $589,439.40, but they actually reached $597,895.45 an increase of $8,020.05, for which he claimed the late Government was entitled to the credit. One thing he would mention that contributed to this was that they made a regulation by which mileage was not to be returned, and the present Government got the advantage of that. The House should not have been forced into supply so soon, as some of the information could not be had until a few moments before the Secretary made his report. The only excuse the Government offered for over-expenditure was that it was beyond their control. The Executive took about $1,200 off their salaries, but that was only about enough to pay the interest on their over-expenditure. Ten months ago the Administration came in with promises of reform, which he claimed had not been fulfilled in the excuses. They shielded themselves behind the late Government. That the expenditure was uncontrollable was not a good answer to the country. In the Exhibition held at St. John the deficiency was largely due to mismanagement and a desire to favor the friends of the Government. He was not on the commission.—

HON. MR. RITCHIE—Oh, yes, you were.

MR. McLEOD denied it and said he stated at the Court House in St. John that the Government could not consent to a large committee because if so the expenses would be beyond the control of the Government. Had it not been for Sheriff Harding and Messrs. Magee, Hall and Allan, whom he himself nominated, the deficit would be greater. The estimated receipts this year were too large on territorial revenue. Lumbering is not being so extensively engaged in this year as last and there must be a falling off. When they went out of power they left the Government $597,459.45 with which to carry on the business of the country.

HON. MR. BLAIR—Where did you leave it?

MR. McLEOD said the Government had failed to carry out every reform it promised and the bill to abolish the Legislative Council was only pretense.

The House then went into committee on supply and the estimate for equity and admiralty rooms and for the deputy clerk in equity at St. John passed. When the House adjourned it was considering the item for the model dairy.

March 7.—The following bills were read a second time: To provide for the Owen Art Gallery, St. John; to amend chapter 99 of Statutes of Municipalities, relating to municipality of the City and County of St. John; a bill relating to rates and taxes in the municipality of the City and County of St. John.

MR. WETMORE gave notice of motion for Monday next, for copies of all tenders for the construction of a bridge across the river St. John, at Fredericton, and for a copy of the bond or indemnity to secure the faithful performance of the contract.

MR. HANINGTON also gave notice of motion for tenders of contracts for repairs of College Bridge over Memramcook River, and for the overseeing and inspecting thereof between April 1st last and March 5th inst., and for amounts paid on account of such work and to whom paid.

March 7.—MR. KILLAM introduced a bill relating to sewers and marsh lands.

MR. LABILLOIS presented a petition from 133 residents of Restigouche, praying that the bill to render valid the county valuation for 1883 may not become law.

The usual routine business was transacted and some notices of inquiry were given.

The item for a grant to the stock farm occupied the attention of the House all afternoon. No decided opposition seemed to be offered to the grant, but a very wide difference of opinion was expressed on the merits of the farm now used. The item passed.

The House met again in the evening and considered the grant asked to make up the deficit in the exhibition account.

MR. WETMORE contended that the administration had acted unconstitutionally in allowing a large commission to control the exhibition instead of leaving it in the hands of the Board of Agriculture, who were he contended, vested by statute with power to hold the exhibition. The new buildings that were erected cost $23,900, and other items pointed to extravagance, and with that he charged the Government. The receipts were very large, and instead of a deficit, the exhibition, if properly managed, would have presented a surplus.

HON. MR. McLELLAN believed the Exhibition had been conducted well and economically. Every cent paid out would be found in the accounts, where members might examine and scrutinize them. The last speaker found fault with the cost of the new buildings. He would ask him who it was that instituted those buildings? It was the old Government, and the contract for them had been signed before the present administration came into power. Expenses in Machinery Hall also, to the extent of $3,581, had been contracted by the same parties. It was true there was a deficit. but the country has a permanent building and considerable plant to balance that.

HON. MR. BLAIR said he would not assent to the law laid down by the leader of the Opposition that the Board of Agriculture was the body constituted by law to carry on all exhibitions in this Province. The statute conferring any powers on them had only in contemplation agricultural and not exhibitions of a general nature and magnitude as the late one. Before the administration came into power the late Government had surrendered the charge of the exhibition to the board. Serious difficulty arose between the board and the finance committee of St. John as to who should control the money and a deadlock ensued. Large liabilities had been contracted and the only thing the Government could do to save it from being a great financial disaster was to arouse the generous and manly sympathy of the people and appoint a commission. No party was considered in the selection of that body and it worked well and unselfishly. Great thanks are due to the late Dr. Elder for the interest he took in it, and in the working out of which, more than anything else, he lost his life. Such an emergency had arisen as would justify any Government in pursuing a like policy. If there was such a deficit he believed he could attribute part of it at least to the attitude of the member from St. John, Mr. McLeod, who by his action had caused such ill feeling in Portland that a proposed grant of $2,500 was not given.

The York Gleaner

Advertising Rates.

Column, 1 year	$120.00
Half Column, 1 year	60.00
Quarter Column, 1 year	30.00

Transient advertisements are charged 10 cents per line (nonpareil) for first insertion, and five cents for each subsequent insertion.

There will positively be no reduction from these prices.

Wednesday, March 12, 1884.

THE DOMINION BUDGET.

Sir Leonard's Budget of this year, a synoptic report of which we printed last week, has already been reviewed and criticized very thoroughly, more particularly by the Upper Provinces members. Few of the members of the Lower Provinces have yet spoken, but we presume they will do so in due time. We await with interest the speech of our representative from this county. We may reasonably expect that he will give an expression of his views. In 1882 he condemned our late and esteemed representative, Mr. Pickard, because, as he said, he did not raise his voice in Parliament. Mr. Pickard, it it is true, did not boast of the oratorical powers of our present representative, but at the same time he did, where the interests of his constituents were sure to suffer by iniquitous legislation, protest both by voice and vote against such legislation. Our present representative, in his card to the electors, did not endorse the financial policy of the Government,—we will not claim that he was very clear on any point so far as his card is concerned—but he insinuated (whatever his motive for so doing may have been we leave it to our readers to judge), that Sir Leonard's policy was inimical in some respects to the best interests of this county and of this Province, and he therefore declared that he would favor any modification of the tariff. Therefore on two grounds we have a right to expect our representative to express whatever views he may have. First, because he feels it is the duty of a representative to speak on important subjects, and second, because his views as to a modification of the tariff have been ignored. We repeat that we await with interest the speech of our representative. When it is made we will have much pleasure in giving it due publicity.

As to the Budget itself. It is not a true or fair financial statement, and where comparisons are instituted they are not legitimate. In other respects the budget is a wonderful production. One half of it is intended to show that trade is healthy. prosperous and the people contented; and the other half is a justification for the stringency of the times which he afterwards admits to exist, and an attempt to show that although the masses are discontented with their lot there are bright prospects in the near future. Sir Leonard's statement in vindication of his policy, however, absolutely fail to impress any reasonable person seriously with the belief that the National Policy of which he is the exponent has, to any extent, contributed to the prosperity of the past few years. He has made comparisons of trade returns to show that we did enjoy prosperity in certain years under his regime. But we all admit that within the years he has chosen to select that business throughout Canada was in a healthy state. but we deny that his policy did to any extent tend to bring about that prosperity. At the time the Tory party came into power trade in the United States which had been stagnant for years previous, and in the mother country, and in fact throughout the world where depression existed to a considerable extent, a revival in every branch of industry took place, and in the nature of things that revival extended to Canada. Following this, and as an agency that assisted in our prosperity, there came a failure in the crop in the mother country, and in consequence an unusual demand sprung up for our products which of course materially advanced in price, much to the benefit of our agricultural classes. Will any reasonable person say that the National Policy was the cause of this? But how does Sir Leonard undertake to show that his policy has been beneficial to the people of Canada? He does not deny the facts we have detailed above. This is one of his methods. He affects to show that his so-called protective policy has reduced the imports and increased the exports, and so benefited not only the manufactures, but the laboring classes, and he also affects to show, for what reasons we know not, that his policy has encouraged trade with Britain and the reverse with the United States. Now, if, as Sir Leonard contends, his policy has been to protect Canadian industry by a diminution of the imports, and if he has succeeded in this, how is it that he has been able to collect by duties some millions of dollars more than his predecessors, and millions more than were actually required to meet the expenditures of the Government, increased as those expenditures have been by the present corrupt party? The answer of course must be by increased importation. Then wherein has Canadian industry been encouraged or fostered? If our importations have been increased, as one must reasonably and naturally conclude they have been, what evidences are furnished that the Canadian workmen and manufacturer have had the slightest protection? None. The workman has no doubt had steadier employment during the last five years than the five years preceding 1878, but this is due, not to the protective policy, but to two causes, viz., the natural return of prosperity, and the rapid outlays of foreign and domestic capital in building up the North-West. These facts alone point to the fallacy of Sir Leonard's statements. Again, as to the increase of trade with Great Britain and a decrease with the United States, Sir Leonard is absurdly astray. We will not charge him with wilful misrepresention, we give the facts, and our readers can draw their own conclusions as to his motives. He compares the trade with the United States of 1876 with some other and a more favorable year, and also the trade with Great Britain, and because that comparison shows a falling off in our U. S. trade and an increase with Great Britain he draws the conclusion that his policy is the cause of it, and thus through that policy he has accomplished what to him seems the very desirable result of discouraging trade with the United States and increasing it with Great Britain, and to this point the *Maritime Farmer*, a paper about as well informed in political matters as in agricultural, gives much prominence. But Sir Leonard has deceived his friends in this. Under the present tariff the nominal imports entered for consumption from the United States almost exactly represent our true imports; whereas, in 1876, as most people should know, our nominal imports from the United States include a great many millions of dollars for goods that were entered *in transitu*, and simply passed through this country on their way to Great Britain. That fact vitiates entirely the Finance Minister's comparisons. But let us take years that can be properly and fairly compared and see the result. It is not perhaps of any great moment, at least we do not regard it so, but inasmuch as Sir Leonard has seen fit to attempt to make a point of it, let us make the comparison. Take the years 1873 and 1883. In 1873, a year which, compares properly and fairly with the year 1883, our imports from Great Britain were $68,522,000; our true imports from the United States in the same year, deducting those goods which passed *in transitu*, although they were, under the old form, entered for consumption, were $40,488,000. Our true exports to Great Britain, or our own products of the same year, were $31,486,000; our true exports to the United States of our own produce, deducting short returns in each case, were $37,262,000. What were the facts last year—facts well worth knowing? Our imports from Great Britain were $52,000,000; our exports to Great Britain, of our own produce, were $39,672 000. Our imports from the U. S. in these goods, which really and actually entered into consumption, were $56,000,000; our sales to the United States were $35,963,000, as before, striking out short returns. Now, what is the result? Between the years 1873 and 1883, we purchased from Great Britain $16,500,000 less in 1883 than in 1873, and we purchased from the United $15,500,000 more than we did in 1873. We sell to Great Britain. of articles of our own production, very nearly $8,000,000 more, and we sell to the United States $1,250,000 less; so that, if it does matter particularly to the Finance Minister that trade between ourselves and Great Britain and ourselves and the United States is worse at the expiration of the decade of ten years to the extent of $40,000,000, it is under the policy of the Finance Minister.

In further attempting to illustrate the benefits of his policy to Canadians, Sir Leonard is equally as unfortunate. He compares the bankruptcies of 1875 with those of 1883, and inasmuch as they were not so numerous in the latter year as in the former, he concludes that that is one instance of the good results of his policy. The Finance Minister however, seemingly forgot at that moment that in 1875 an Insolvent Law existed—a law which encouraged, as we all know, business men to go into bankruptcy to make money, and we know that from that year until the present time so great was the encouragement held out to business men to go into bankruptcy, that such a strong prejudice was created against Insolvent Laws that it is almost impossible to get Parliament or the country to consider any bill bearing the name. While we admit that the bankruptcies of '83 were not so numerous as those of '75, still, when we compare the slight difference with the effect of the law referred to, the comparison is decidedly damaging to the policy of the Minister. By other instances, equally as futile, Sir Leonard attempts to justify his N. P., but the more he seeks to justify it, the more indefensible does his policy appear to be. We have referred in the above to but a few of Sir Leonard's Budget statements. We will take up some others in our next issue. Sir Leonard has labored early and late and long to convince the people of Canada that his National Policy, under the guise of a Protective Policy, was one in the working out of which they would find everlasting prosperity. That policy has now been in force long enough to fulfil, if it ever could, the prophecies of the Finance Minister, and we leave it to our readers to judge if those prophecies have, in even a single instance, been fulfilled. Instead of the hum and bustle, our factories, or at least the majority of them, are either closed or working half time, or working with half their complement of hands; thousands of workmen have been thrown out of employment, and they and their families are suffering from the evils and distress incident to idleness; and in Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal, and other centres of trade, dire want has inflicted itself. We will give some instances of this next week. In the meantime, let our readers muse over the facts we have presented to them in this issue.

Since the above has been put in type, Mr. Temple has addressed the House, endorsing *in toto* the tax on bread stuffs and other necessaries of life, and assert ing York County to be largely in favor of the iniquitous system of taxation. When *Hansard* comes to hand we will give our readers the benefit of his utterances.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT OF 1883.

There appears to be considerable doubt amongst leading constitutional lawyers as to the constitutionality of the new License Act, and in some of the counties in different Provinces, it has been decided to ignore the law altogether and contest the right of the Federal Parliament to legislate on the subject. In this city, Chief Inspector Belyea has commenced a vigorous campaign towards the enforcement of the Act, although many staunch temperance men doubt the propriety of proceeding under the new law, they contending that the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act are amply sufficient for the suppression of illegal liquor selling, and that as the latter Act has been declared constitutional, its machinery well understood and the penalties severe enough for all practical purposes, a mistake has been made in flying to the new law in preference to the old.

The first case arising under the new Act, was tried before Police Magistrate Marsh on Tuesday last, the defendant James Hanlon, being summoned for violation of the 84th section of the Act; the 83rd and 84th sections were as follows:—

83. "No person shall sell by wholesale or by retail any liquors without having first obtained a license under this Act authorizing him to do so."

II. "No person, unless duly licensed, shall by any sign or notice give the public cause to belive that he is so licensed, and the use of any sign or notice for such purpose is hereby prohibited."

84. "No person shall keep or have in any house, building, shop, eat-house, saloon or house of public entertainment, or in any room or place whatsoever, any liquors for the purpose of selling, bartering or trading therein, unless duly licensed thereto under the provisions of this Act."

The proof was adduced under the 129th section, which says:—

129. "Any house, shop, room or other place in which it is proved that there exists a bar, counter, beer-pumps, kegs, jars, decanters, tumblers, glasses or any other appliances or preparations similar to those usually found in taverns and shops where liquors are accustomed to be sold or trafficked in, shall be deemed to be a place where liquors are kept or had for the purpose of being sold, bartered or traded in, in contravention of the *eighty third* section of this Act, unless the contrary is proved by the defendant in any prosecution; and the occupant of such house, shop, room or other place shall be taken conclusively to be person who has, or keeps therein, such liquors for sale, barter or traffic therein."

Mr. J. D. Hazen, who appeared for the defence, objected to the proceedings on the ground that the Act was *ultra vires*, and cited the opinion of the Privy Council in the case of *Queen vs. Hodge* in support of his objections, which however was overruled by the P. M. and the defendant fined $20 and costs.

The second case was that of Mr. Wilmot Guiou. Mr. George F. Gregory appearing for the defence. This prosecution was also based on the 84th section of the Act, and Mr. Gregory raised the points: 1st, that the Act was *ultra vires*; 2nd, admitting its constitutionality, it was not applicable to Canada Temperance Act districts—and York was one; 3rd, no proof that defendant was the occupier of the premises in question; 4th, no proof that the liquors found on the premises were had for the purposes of sale; and 5th, that the 129th section referred in express terms to the 83rd and not the 84th section, and therefore the two sections taken together were meaningless and of no effect. The P. M. overruled all these objections and fined the defendant $20 and costs.

Mr. J. Alfred Russel was before the court for obstructing the Chief Inspector, the section relied on being the 81st, sub-section II. (see below). The prosecution failing to prove a demand of entrance, and Mr. J. A. Vanwart asking for a dismissal on that ground, the case was accordingly dismissed.

There were several other cases before the Police Magistrate, but as no new points were taken by Counsel, we pass them by. In the cases of Hanlon and Guiou copies of the proceedings have been asked for and the constitutionality of the Act will be fully tested.

In order that our readers may see the large powers given to the Chief Inspectors we quote two of the most important sections bearing on that point, in full:—

81. Any officer, policeman or constable, or Inspector of Licenses may, for the purpose of preventing or defeating the violation of any of the provisions of this Act which it is his duty to enforce, at any time enter into any and every part of any hotel, tavern, or other house or place of public entertainment, shop, warehouse or other place wherein refreshments or liquors are sold, or reputed to be sold, whether under license or not, and may make searches in every part thereof, and of the premises connected therewith, as he may think necessary for the purpose aforesaid:

II. Every person being therein, or having charge thereof, who refuses or fails to admit such officer, policeman, or constable or Inspector demanding to enter in pursuance of this section in the execution of his duty, or who obstructs or attempts to obstruct the entry of such officer, policeman, constable or Inspector, or any such searches as aforesaid, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars.

82. Any magistrate, if satisfied by information on the oath of any such officer, policeman, constable or Inspector, that there is reasonable ground for belief that any spirituous or fermented liquor is being kept for sale or disposed contrary to the provisions of this act in any unlicensed house or place within the jurisdiction of the magistrate, may, in his discretion, grant a warrant under his hand by virtue whereof it shall be lawful for the person named in such warrant, at any time or times within ten days from the date thereof to enter, and, if need be, by force, the place named in the warrant, and every part thereof, or of the premises connected therewith, and to examine the same, and search for liquor therein; and for such purpose such person may, with such assistance as he deems expedient, break open any door, lock or fastenings of such premises, or any part thereof, or of any closet, cupboard, box or other article likely to contain any such liquor; and in the event of any liquor being so found unlawfully kept on the said premises, the occupant thereof shall, until the contrary is proved, be deemed to have kept such liquor for the purpose of sale contrary to the provisions of section 83 of this Act.

II. When any Inspector, policeman, constable or officer, in making or attempting to make any search under or in puranance of the authority conferred by section 81 of this Act or under the warrant mentioned in this section, finds in any unlicensed house or place any liquor which in his opinion is unlawfully kept for sale or disposal contrary to this Act, he may forthwith seize and remove the same, and the vessels in which the same is kept, and upon the conviction of the occupant of such house or place or of any other person, for keeping liquor for sale in such house or place without license, the magistrate making such conviction, may in and by the said conviction, or by a separate or subsequent order, declare the said liquor and vessels, or any part thereof, to be forfeited to Her Majesty, and may order and direct that the said Inspector, policemen, constable or officer shall destroy the same or any part thereof, and the Inspector or other person as aforesaid shall thereupon forthwith destroy the same or part thereof, as directed by such conviction or order."

One charming provision of this Act is the third section, which after stating the exceptions in favor of the makers of native wines and auctioneers enacts, "Nothing in this Act shall apply—(3) To any person selling liquor in any refreshment room of the Senate or House of Commons, or the Legislative Council or House of Assembly of any of the Provinces, by the permission and under the control of the Senate, House of Commons, Legislative Council or House of Assembly respectively."

THE PROVINCIAL BUDGET, Etc.

Provincial Secretary McLellan delivered his budget speech last Wednesday afternoon. It was his first effort of the kind, and consequently more than usual interest centred in it. He was not disappointing. The speech was a plain matter-of-fact financial statement of the condition of the Province; it was such as all could follow and understand; it was just such as the country wants. We are not sure that it pleased the Opposition, but this we will say, it was highly pleasing to all who were desirous of an honest statement of our Finances. We congragulate Mr. McLellan on the ability and fairness which characterized his first budget speech.

As will be seen from the Financial Statement which we publish in another column, there has been during the past year an expenditure in excess of estimate of $16,970.49. The expenditure was $807,574.32, and the estimate $790,603.83. This is not as satisfactory a state of affairs as the new reform Government expected to be able to present to the country. They had aimed to bring about a better state of affairs. They have during their regime been prudent in their expenditures, and economical in their administration, but for all that it has been found utterly impossible to meet the Legislature with a balance of estimate over expenditure. And the blame lies at the door of the late Government. And we will show why. That Government had, of the past fourteen months, control of affairs for the first four months, and during that time they had incurred enormous expenditures—such expenditures as the means of the Province did not warrant. Yea, more. Liabilities which they had contracted during preceding years remained unsettled, and even bills that they contracted during the visit of the Marquis of Lorne and Princess Louise to this Province some half dozen years ago had not been paid, but were held back, awaiting some favorable opportunity to pay them under some guise or other. So extravagant had been their administration that they were ashamed to pay their own bills, except by piece meal, and that under cover. We will give one of the many instances in this connection. First, however, we may state that the Opposition, or at least Mr. Hanington, who is the quasi leader, when this state of affairs was brought to the notice of the House, claimed that these bills were not paid on account of the excessive charges; but we give the facts and our readers can see for themselves how little there is in Mr. Hanington's excuse. Mr. Blackall, of St. John, presented to the Government his bill for coach hire. The Government put Mr. Blackall off time after time, promising to effect a settlement as soon as possible: but before they could get an opportunity to pay the bill they had been ousted from power. When the present Government came into power. Mr. B. again presented his bill, with the certificate of Mr. P. A. Landry (who at the time the bill was contracted was Chief Commissioner) attached that the bill was correct, and the charges fair and legitimate. This needs no comment. Then, in this way the present Government have been forced to shoulder enormous liabilities incurred by their extravagant and reckless predecessors, and hence this year they have been compelled to meet the Legislature, contrary to first expectations (for they could not possibly have anticipated such a state of affairs as existed when they came into power) with a deficit. However, we have had ample evidence during the past year that our present Government are alive to the absolute necessity of an economical and prudent administration of affairs, and that they will at their next showing be in a position to make just such a statement as the country expects of them. The estimated receipts for next year are $644,106.71; the estimated expenditure, $610,131.54.

The discussion on the budget was not lengthy. So far as the Opposition speakers were concerned they spoke altogether from a purely personal standpoint, and even in that not in a very edifying manner. Mr. Wetmore waxed warm on some points, and the warmer he waxed the more vehement he became, and the more metaphorical was his speech. His associates in Opposition were more clear, more discreet, and received at least a respectful hearing. The House went into Supply without division. The principal items of discussion last week were those under the head of Agriculture, in which interests the Government propose to spend this year $22,836.55. Mr. Wetmore took exception to all of these items, urging in some cases that the Government were not warranted in making such expenditures. However, the feeling of the House was strongly in favor of making the reasonable grant that the Government asked in aid of Agriculture, and it was voted, notwithstanding Mr. Wetmore's opposition. Mr. Wetmore might himself have seen that he was not carrying the House with him, for the more he sought to press his views the more his auditors withdrew, and when the walls echoed back his eloquence he remembered that "silence is golden," and sat down. The grants for the Forestry Exhibition, the University, and to aid poor school districts were passed yesterday after some discussion.

The action of the Opposition to obstruct the business of the country, and to put the country to useless expense is being unfavorably commented upon. One instance of this useless expense: Mr. Hanington has moved a resolution for information that is contained in the public accounts. He insists however that the information he asks for should be copied and laid on the table of the House in writing. To have this done would entail the expense of 15 or 20 additional clerks. Still he insists upon the information in the form asked. An instance of obstruction: Mr. Hanington on Saturday night last endeavored to have the consideration of an item for Agriculture postponed, and without reason. "I had almost made up my mind," he said, "when the House took recess at six o'clock to come here after tea, and talk against time for the remainder of this night's session." It is to be regretted that the business of the country should be obstructed in this way by the Opposition, and for no valid reason. It simply means waste of time and waste of money.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Some of Mr. Temple's supporters are securing signatures to a petition asking His Worship the Mayor to call a public meeting in the City Hall, to take some action to secure a subsidy from the Dominion Government for the construction of the Miramichi Valley Railway. We are a little surprised that Mr. Temple's friends themselves have felt compelled to take hold of this matter. We were told during the campaign that it was Mr. Temple alone that could secure the subsidy. What is the trouble now? Is it that Mr. Temple has no influence with the Government?

[Scottish American.]

THE CANADA PACIFIC.

The members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate need not be surprised that their urgent demand for a loan of $30,000,000 and other privileges from the Dominion Government is leading many Canadians to scrutinize rather narrowly the actions of the former. When the Syndicate was formed in 1881 its members were all represented as being immensely rich, but it must be confessed that any signs of that wealth have only become apparent since then, and that the palatial one million dollar mansion of Messrs. Stephen, Angus, and others, have only lately sprung up like mushrooms. The Canadians are further wondering why Mr. Stephen is not becoming the banker of his Canadian Pacific Railway, and lending it the needed $30,000,000, instead of asking them—the Canadian people—to do it.

We do not say that it gives any clue to where the money received by this Syndicate has gone, but it is curious to note the munificent and princely benefactions of some of its members at a time when as a body they were loudly appealing for public help. It will suffice, however, simply to allude to the $50,000 recently given by Mr. Stephen to McGill University; to the $50,000 given by him to the Montreal General Hospital; to the annuity of £7000 sterling ($35,000 a year) settled by him upon his daughter; and the $10,000 upon so distant and disinterested a subject as his private secretary's first-born.

All things considered it is not surprising that the Canadians are noting these things rather particularly at present, and are inclining to the opinion that the members of the Syndicate have adopted the Gladstonian motto of *jam satis*, and instead of the harassing trouble of trying to make both ends meet in the Canadian Pacific Railway wish to peacefully enjoy life in ease and affluence