

THE LEGISLATURE.

It Was Prorogued on the 13th, After Rushing Through Important Business.

St. John's Seventy-five Liquor Licenses Can Be Distributed Over the Whole City.

Minister of Agriculture Created—Government Would Not Consent to Appointing a Practical Farmer.

Fredericton, March 15.—The house met at ten o'clock this morning. Mr. Dibblee committed a bill authorizing the Woodstock town council to make a further issue of debentures for sewerage purposes, Mr. Pinder chairman—Agreed to with amendments.

Mr. Mott committed a bill removing doubts as to the legality of the proceedings of certain boards of school trustees, Mr. Pinder chairman—Agreed to.

Mr. White committed a bill amending the law amending the succession act, Mr. Pinder chairman—Agreed to.

Mr. Beveridge committed the bill authorizing the Victoria county council to effect temporary loans, Mr. Pinder chairman—Agreed to with amendments.

Mr. Venable committed the bill relating to the election of county councillors, Mr. Pitts chairman.

An amendment moved by Mr. Sivewright that persons doing business in a parish would be eligible as candidates for such parishes as well as those living in the parish was adopted. The bill was agreed to as amended.

Mr. Fowler recommitted the bill in addition to and in amendment of the Liquor License act of 1897, Mr. Richardson chairman. Agreed to with amendments. One of the amendments provides that in order that there may be a proper police supervision over places where beer and other soft drinks are sold in the city and county of St. John the license commissioners may issue to the proprietors of such places a nominal license at a fee of \$1 each. It was provided that all these places should be closed up at 11 o'clock p. m. so far as the sale of such drinks is concerned.

Mr. Shaw thought the bill might require to affect many respectable oyster saloons.

Mr. Lockhart thought the bill a good one. Much harm was done at the moment by the existence of the so-called beer shops.

Mr. Shaw thought the idea of making the law apply to drug stores.

Mr. Alward said the bill was a move in the right direction. It was well to have beer shops under police supervision. The bill however, should not apply to such respectable places as Turner's oyster saloon on King square.

Mr. Tweedie said more harm resulted from some of the so-called beer shops than from any of the liquor saloons. He doubted, however, the advisability of closing up all places selling only temperance drinks as early as 11 o'clock.

Mr. Fowler took the same view as Mr. Alward, and said Turner's oyster saloon was and always had been a respectable place.

Mr. Stockton is willing to support the bill as it stood, making its provisions apply to all places selling light drinks.

At the suggestion of Mr. Dunn the hour of closing was fixed at 12 o'clock.

Another amendment proposes a wholesale importation liquor license at \$100 each. It applies to the representatives of foreign houses selling in this province to wholesalers only. Such representatives must be men who are carrying no stock of goods in this province.

Mr. Shaw—in other words this is a commercial traveller act so far as the liquor trade is concerned.

Mr. White—You might call it such.

Mr. Lockhart—These men will come in competition with the wholesale liquor dealers of the province.

Mr. White—They are in competition with them now and pay no license.

Mr. Lockhart—The license fee should be divided with the city or municipal council in which the man resides, instead of going to the government.

contained in the law of last year and let every one take chances of getting a license or not under the proposed reduction in the number. He would strongly oppose the present amendment if it meant that Carleton, St. John, was likely to have any licensed saloons under it.

Mr. Dunn—No licenses can be granted in Carleton under the proposed amendment. The section proposed would have the effect of largely confining the liquor traffic to those sections of the city more closely, or more thoroughly, under the supervision of the police and taking it away to a large extent from the residential parts of the city. As he had said, it would give the commissioners more discretionary power to grant licenses to those who had adhered to the law in the past.

Mr. Lockhart said his principal aim was to see that Carleton was exempt from licenses. He supposed he should welcome any measure that reduced the number of licenses in the whole city.

The bill as amended was agreed to. Mr. Dunn committed a bill to protect timber lands of the crown from fire, Mr. Wells chairman.

Mr. Dunn explained that owing to increase of forest fires it was very necessary to appoint wardens in certain cases. It was provided that expenditures upon this service would not exceed \$10,000.

Recess till half past two o'clock.

After recess consideration of the bill to protect timber lands from fire and stimulate cutting of lumber on timber lands in certain cases, was resumed.

Considerable discussion arose over section 4 of the bill, which reads as follows:

Whenever, in the opinion of the lieutenant governor in council, it may be possible, by the building of a branch line from any existing line of railway, or by making an extension to such line, to stimulate the cutting of timber upon lands of the crown, the lieutenant governor in council is hereby authorized to agree with any company or person that upon such branch or extension being built and operated, a rebate shall be allowed upon lumber cut upon crown lands in the vicinity of such branch or extension, to an amount not exceeding at the rate of \$2,500 for each mile of road so constructed, and provided that no such branch or extension shall exceed four miles in length, and such rebate shall not be allowed for a longer period than ten years from the making of such agreement, and not to exceed in the whole in respect to any one such branch or extension the sum of eight thousand dollars.

The bill was opposed by Messrs. Lockhart, Pinder and other members of the opposition and by Mr. Hill.

Mr. Tweedie, from the special committee appointed to prepare an address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, reported, and read the draft of the address, as follows:

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty: Most Gracious Sovereign: We, Your Majesty's loyal and devoted subjects, the legislative assembly of the province of New Brunswick, dominion of Canada, in parliament assembled, desire, in our own names and on behalf of the people we represent, to approach Your Majesty with assurances of our attachment and loyalty to your throne and person.

We extend to Your Majesty our warm and hearty congratulations on the near completion of sixty years of your reign, the longest in the history of the nation.

In all those progressive movements and reforms which advance moral, social and material improvements, Your Majesty's reign surpasses every other in English history. It has been pre-eminently conspicuous for social progress, material development, scientific advancement, the expansion of industrial and commercial pursuits so conducive to human happiness, the spread of education among all classes, the enlargement of people's rights, the full adoption of colonial self-government throughout the empire, and the introduction of the beneficent principle of friendly arbitration in adjusting international disputes; and in the benefits and friendships arising therefrom have abundantly shared.

We earnestly pray that a kind Providence may grant Your Majesty many years of health and happiness to rule over a united, prosperous and contented people.

When the provincial secretary had finished the reading the address all the members arose and joined in singing God Save the Queen.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Tweedie, seconded by Dr. Stockton, it was ordered that the address be engrossed and presented to the lieutenant governor, with the request that it be transmitted to the governor general to be laid before Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker appointed Hon. Mr. Tweedie, Dr. Stockton and Hon. Mr. Emmerston as the committee to present the address to the lieutenant governor.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie moved that Mr. Speaker leave the chair and that the house go into committee on the bill amending the law relating to agriculture.

vote upon this bill, especially in view of the present state of the finances of the province. He had taken some trouble to look into the various financial returns laid on the table by the government this session. This government called itself a fighting government, but its fighting consisted in telling their supporters that the statements of the opposition proposed to show by reference to the returns brought down that when the deficit and the amount expended since the opening of the fiscal year were taken into consideration, the government had not done so well as the opposition.

Mr. Black said that in 1883 the house had passed a bill placing the department of agriculture under the control of a member of the executive. What circumstances had arisen making the change now proposed necessary? Why should the province have to bear the expense of a department? It was idle to say that the measure was brought forward in the interests of the province. Hon. members should consider the matter carefully as to how they would be able to justify to their constituents their

entitled to have spent in that period one quarter of the total appropriation, or \$128,000. The hon. member was deeply ignorant as to the financial affairs of the province.

Dr. Stockton said he would not have troubled the house but for the personal allusion made to himself by the last speaker. Whether his career had in no sense and in no way not, he thought it would compare favorably with that of the hon. member who had just spoken. The little Vesuvius had made a spasmodic effort to revive itself. The house had passed the other day a bill to give the hon. member, who had charge of the lunatic asylum, the power to lift water by a windmill, but he thought that expenditure was unnecessary as long as that hon. gentleman was in charge of the institution. The irrelevant remarks of the hon. member had in no sense and in no way not been paid out upon various services left a deficiency of \$150,000 or \$200,000 facing the government for the present fiscal year. If the government met the deficiency then there would be no money to spend on public works.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie said he did not believe any previous provincial secretary ever had the hard time that he did. That was not because of inefficiency on his part, but because of the gross ignorance of figures exhibited by the opposition. He would like to call attention to the figures which the heaven-born financier of the opposition had dealt out to the house in patriotic language. He said that the government had spent more than \$500,000 in building permanent bridges, and that the government had not yet started in the treasury a single dollar for public works, in fact, that the government had a deficit of \$173,889.88 paid out since Oct. 31, 1896, chargeable to ordinary account. In addition to that there had been paid out since the close of the fiscal year on board of works ordinary account \$1,406.84. Add to these figures \$100,000 in various departments on warrant cheques, \$12,500, and there was the large sum of \$280,386.72 to be deducted from the ordinary revenues of 1897, leaving a balance to meet the whole year's expenditure of \$584,386.84.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Why don't you figure it out instead of dealing in general assertions?

Mr. Black said he would do so. He estimated the various figures for the current fiscal year, and the amounts which had been already expended under them, which he said made up the total figures he had given. The unpaid balance was \$41,892.98, leaving not a single dollar to be spent on any public work, migration and other public works. He challenged the opposition to successfully contradict a single statement he had made. In 1895 the cost of the executive government was \$28,376.40; in 1897 the government's estimated cost was \$29,000,000, which was increased by at least \$2,000 by the creation of a departmental head for the office of agriculture. The farmers of this country did not want an additional departmental office created. They recognized the fact that the province had no money to spend on any public work, migration and other public works. He challenged the opposition to successfully contradict a single statement he had made.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Yes, and the mouse is here. The hon. member should have been ashamed at the statement he made. He had charged against the revenue of the current year the amount of \$173,889.88, but that had not belonged to this year at all. To that he had added \$32,890 of over-expenditure on board of works ordinary account. Of course that was a part of the \$76,435, but he charged it against the government all the same. He had charged it against the year's spending \$80,198 since Oct. 31st, 1896, and not satisfied with that he charged them with the warrant account of \$79,000 that that expenditure was made upon, and thus made a total of \$159,000 he charged them not only with what he spent but with the very warrants upon which it was spent, and thus doubled the whole thing up.

Mr. Pitts said he felt as though he were being transported to the opening of the winter session of the Legislature. Hon. Mr. Tweedie's remarks had been transported long ago.

Mr. Black said this bill was supposed to be in the interests of the farmers, but he failed to see where the benefit to them was to come in. The expenditure of the executive government was now \$2,000, and this bill would add \$2,000 to it or more. Travelling expenses and perquisites would bring the amount up to \$3,000, and from that would be deducted the cost of the country would get no benefit out of it. The people were already dissatisfied with the very large travelling and other incidental expenses of the government, and he predicted that hon. members who voted for this bill would have difficulty in justifying the same to their constituents. He protested against the passage of the bill, and predicted that those who now passed it in a light-hearted manner would live to mourn that they had done so.

Mr. Lockhart said the hon. member for Gloucester (Sivewright) had agreed to vote against the bill provided it could be shown that the new department would cost \$2,000. (Laughter.) Mr. Black said the average travelling expenses of the departmental heads of the government were \$996.69, and if this average was maintained with the new department it would raise the total cost up to \$3,396.68. There would also be additional clerks no doubt. The province was paying an exorbitant amount for a departmental administration. With three less ministers than the more populous province of Nova Scotia, we were spending \$14,155.30, while that province spent only \$11,000.00.

Mr. Alward asked whether there had been any demand in the province for the appointment of another minister? Had the farmers asked for it? He ventured to say that the government would not appoint a practical farmer as minister of agriculture. It probably would be a lawyer who did not know the first rudiments of farming. The new office was created by the exigencies of the present situation. He appealed to the hon. members to reduce the number of the hon. member for York was characteristic, but he had not expected such a display in the gasping hours of the session. When the hon. member for York pointed to the speaker he said that he had been a member of the current revenue account from the first day of November to the fourth of February he had omitted from his consideration entirely the fact that the period named comprised one fourth of the expenditure of \$89,000 being excessive the government were

entitled to have spent in that period one quarter of the total appropriation, or \$128,000. The hon. member was deeply ignorant as to the financial affairs of the province.

Dr. Stockton said he would not have troubled the house but for the personal allusion made to himself by the last speaker. Whether his career had in no sense and in no way not, he thought it would compare favorably with that of the hon. member who had just spoken. The little Vesuvius had made a spasmodic effort to revive itself. The house had passed the other day a bill to give the hon. member, who had charge of the lunatic asylum, the power to lift water by a windmill, but he thought that expenditure was unnecessary as long as that hon. gentleman was in charge of the institution. The irrelevant remarks of the hon. member had in no sense and in no way not been paid out upon various services left a deficiency of \$150,000 or \$200,000 facing the government for the present fiscal year. If the government met the deficiency then there would be no money to spend on public works.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie said he did not believe any previous provincial secretary ever had the hard time that he did. That was not because of inefficiency on his part, but because of the gross ignorance of figures exhibited by the opposition. He would like to call attention to the figures which the heaven-born financier of the opposition had dealt out to the house in patriotic language. He said that the government had spent more than \$500,000 in building permanent bridges, and that the government had not yet started in the treasury a single dollar for public works, in fact, that the government had a deficit of \$173,889.88 paid out since Oct. 31, 1896, chargeable to ordinary account. In addition to that there had been paid out since the close of the fiscal year on board of works ordinary account \$1,406.84. Add to these figures \$100,000 in various departments on warrant cheques, \$12,500, and there was the large sum of \$280,386.72 to be deducted from the ordinary revenues of 1897, leaving a balance to meet the whole year's expenditure of \$584,386.84.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Why don't you figure it out instead of dealing in general assertions?

Mr. Black said he would do so. He estimated the various figures for the current fiscal year, and the amounts which had been already expended under them, which he said made up the total figures he had given. The unpaid balance was \$41,892.98, leaving not a single dollar to be spent on any public work, migration and other public works. He challenged the opposition to successfully contradict a single statement he had made. In 1895 the cost of the executive government was \$28,376.40; in 1897 the government's estimated cost was \$29,000,000, which was increased by at least \$2,000 by the creation of a departmental head for the office of agriculture. The farmers of this country did not want an additional departmental office created. They recognized the fact that the province had no money to spend on any public work, migration and other public works. He challenged the opposition to successfully contradict a single statement he had made.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Yes, and the mouse is here. The hon. member should have been ashamed at the statement he made. He had charged against the revenue of the current year the amount of \$173,889.88, but that had not belonged to this year at all. To that he had added \$32,890 of over-expenditure on board of works ordinary account. Of course that was a part of the \$76,435, but he charged it against the government all the same. He had charged it against the year's spending \$80,198 since Oct. 31st, 1896, and not satisfied with that he charged them with the warrant account of \$79,000 that that expenditure was made upon, and thus made a total of \$159,000 he charged them not only with what he spent but with the very warrants upon which it was spent, and thus doubled the whole thing up.

Mr. Pitts said he felt as though he were being transported to the opening of the winter session of the Legislature. Hon. Mr. Tweedie's remarks had been transported long ago.

Mr. Black said this bill was supposed to be in the interests of the farmers, but he failed to see where the benefit to them was to come in. The expenditure of the executive government was now \$2,000, and this bill would add \$2,000 to it or more. Travelling expenses and perquisites would bring the amount up to \$3,000, and from that would be deducted the cost of the country would get no benefit out of it. The people were already dissatisfied with the very large travelling and other incidental expenses of the government, and he predicted that hon. members who voted for this bill would have difficulty in justifying the same to their constituents. He protested against the passage of the bill, and predicted that those who now passed it in a light-hearted manner would live to mourn that they had done so.

Mr. Lockhart said the hon. member for Gloucester (Sivewright) had agreed to vote against the bill provided it could be shown that the new department would cost \$2,000. (Laughter.) Mr. Black said the average travelling expenses of the departmental heads of the government were \$996.69, and if this average was maintained with the new department it would raise the total cost up to \$3,396.68. There would also be additional clerks no doubt. The province was paying an exorbitant amount for a departmental administration. With three less ministers than the more populous province of Nova Scotia, we were spending \$14,155.30, while that province spent only \$11,000.00.

Mr. Alward asked whether there had been any demand in the province for the appointment of another minister? Had the farmers asked for it? He ventured to say that the government would not appoint a practical farmer as minister of agriculture. It probably would be a lawyer who did not know the first rudiments of farming. The new office was created by the exigencies of the present situation. He appealed to the hon. members to reduce the number of the hon. member for York was characteristic, but he had not expected such a display in the gasping hours of the session. When the hon. member for York pointed to the speaker he said that he had been a member of the current revenue account from the first day of November to the fourth of February he had omitted from his consideration entirely the fact that the period named comprised one fourth of the expenditure of \$89,000 being excessive the government were

entitled to have spent in that period one quarter of the total appropriation, or \$128,000. The hon. member was deeply ignorant as to the financial affairs of the province.

Dr. Stockton said he would not have troubled the house but for the personal allusion made to himself by the last speaker. Whether his career had in no sense and in no way not, he thought it would compare favorably with that of the hon. member who had just spoken. The little Vesuvius had made a spasmodic effort to revive itself. The house had passed the other day a bill to give the hon. member, who had charge of the lunatic asylum, the power to lift water by a windmill, but he thought that expenditure was unnecessary as long as that hon. gentleman was in charge of the institution. The irrelevant remarks of the hon. member had in no sense and in no way not been paid out upon various services left a deficiency of \$150,000 or \$200,000 facing the government for the present fiscal year. If the government met the deficiency then there would be no money to spend on public works.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie said he did not believe any previous provincial secretary ever had the hard time that he did. That was not because of inefficiency on his part, but because of the gross ignorance of figures exhibited by the opposition. He would like to call attention to the figures which the heaven-born financier of the opposition had dealt out to the house in patriotic language. He said that the government had spent more than \$500,000 in building permanent bridges, and that the government had not yet started in the treasury a single dollar for public works, in fact, that the government had a deficit of \$173,889.88 paid out since Oct. 31, 1896, chargeable to ordinary account. In addition to that there had been paid out since the close of the fiscal year on board of works ordinary account \$1,406.84. Add to these figures \$100,000 in various departments on warrant cheques, \$12,500, and there was the large sum of \$280,386.72 to be deducted from the ordinary revenues of 1897, leaving a balance to meet the whole year's expenditure of \$584,386.84.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Why don't you figure it out instead of dealing in general assertions?

Mr. Black said he would do so. He estimated the various figures for the current fiscal year, and the amounts which had been already expended under them, which he said made up the total figures he had given. The unpaid balance was \$41,892.98, leaving not a single dollar to be spent on any public work, migration and other public works. He challenged the opposition to successfully contradict a single statement he had made. In 1895 the cost of the executive government was \$28,376.40; in 1897 the government's estimated cost was \$29,000,000, which was increased by at least \$2,000 by the creation of a departmental head for the office of agriculture. The farmers of this country did not want an additional departmental office created. They recognized the fact that the province had no money to spend on any public work, migration and other public works. He challenged the opposition to successfully contradict a single statement he had made.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Yes, and the mouse is here. The hon. member should have been ashamed at the statement he made. He had charged against the revenue of the current year the amount of \$173,889.88, but that had not belonged to this year at all. To that he had added \$32,890 of over-expenditure on board of works ordinary account. Of course that was a part of the \$76,435, but he charged it against the government all the same. He had charged it against the year's spending \$80,198 since Oct. 31st, 1896, and not satisfied with that he charged them with the warrant account of \$79,000 that that expenditure was made upon, and thus made a total of \$159,000 he charged them not only with what he spent but with the very warrants upon which it was spent, and thus doubled the whole thing up.

Mr. Pitts said he felt as though he were being transported to the opening of the winter session of the Legislature. Hon. Mr. Tweedie's remarks had been transported long ago.

Mr. Black said this bill was supposed to be in the interests of the farmers, but he failed to see where the benefit to them was to come in. The expenditure of the executive government was now \$2,000, and this bill would add \$2,000 to it or more. Travelling expenses and perquisites would bring the amount up to \$3,000, and from that would be deducted the cost of the country would get no benefit out of it. The people were already dissatisfied with the very large travelling and other incidental expenses of the government, and he predicted that hon. members who voted for this bill would have difficulty in justifying the same to their constituents. He protested against the passage of the bill, and predicted that those who now passed it in a light-hearted manner would live to mourn that they had done so.

Departmental Association met in annual session, the general expression of opinion was that they did not want the change. All they wanted was a good live man in the office, familiar with the needs of the farmers. The department had been well administered by the provincial secretary, and there was no need of a change. The object of the bill was to create another office to keep the troublesome supporters of the government in line. A lot of them were kicking, and the government were at their wits' end to know what to do with them. It was time the government put their shoulders to the wheel and devoted themselves seriously to the wants of the country and to an economical administration of public affairs. Last year the government in the last days of the session introduced a bill providing for the enormous expenditure of \$400,000 upon permanent bridges, yet the returns brought down showed that seven bridges, amounting to \$18,819, which were paid for out of that appropriation, were under contract in the fall of 1895, and bridges done by day's work, amounting to \$3,014.25, were charged as permanent bridges in like manner. He for one would vote against this bill, which had its origin solely in the necessities of the government.

The motion was then carried that the speaker leave the chair.

The house then went into committee of the whole on the bill amending the law relating to agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie said the whole point of the bill was that it was proposed to have a member of the government at the head of the department of agriculture. It was true that in a small province like ours every effort should be made to cut down expenditures, and the government should not allow any useless expenditures to be made, but it is oftentimes the case, and this was one of them, that necessities arise for expenditures by reason of progress that is being made. We all know that agriculture is the foundation of all industries, and that without it no industry could exist, and it is the right and duty of every government, as far as the revenues will permit, to assist in every way this great and basic industry. This idea of having a minister of agriculture on the floors of the house was not a new thing. It had been thought of and talked of long before the government came into power. Hon. members of the opposition say that the creation of this office would mean an additional burden upon the country of nearly \$30,000. (The speaker) wished to state, as provincial secretary of the province, that in his opinion the cost of executive government in this province would not be increased next year more than \$400 or \$500 by the creation of this office.

Dr. Stockton said that the necessity which had arisen and made it necessary that a responsible minister of the crown should be placed at the head of the department of agriculture were political, not agricultural, because the farmers of the country were the subscribers who might be supposed to know what the needs of the agricultural interests were, had only a few weeks ago, after careful deliberation, decided that it was not in the interests of the farmers of the country to establish the department of agriculture. The hon. provincial secretary stated that the additional cost of this department would not exceed \$400 or \$500 per year, but in 1892, when the legislative assembly was abolished, we were told that it was for the purpose of cutting down legislation, and yet these expenses are almost as large as they were prior to that time, and he (Stockton) would venture to say that when this new office was created the travelling expenses of the government as large as they had prior to the abolition of the legislative council. In Nova Scotia they pay for salaries and travelling expenses of the government \$1,198, while in New Brunswick they pay for salaries and travelling expenses the sum of \$13,800, and if we put the additional cost of the department of agriculture down at \$2,000, we would be paying \$15,800 a year for salaries and travelling expenses, as against \$1,198 in the province of Nova Scotia, with a population of 100,000 more than our own. He would vote against the resolution to read the bill.

Mr. Black said he wished to say a word with reference to some statements made by the provincial secretary in an attempt to dispute the statement which he (Black) had made. The hon. provincial secretary had stated that the \$32,890 over-expenditure on board of works account was included in the \$76,435 balance account. This was certainly not the case, as would be seen by reference to page 3 of the auditor general's report. The statement that he (Black) had put down the \$79,000 warrant expenditures, was equally untrue. The motion to read the bill section by section was carried, the vote being: Yeas—Mitchell, Tweedie, Emmerston, White, Dunn, LaBrosse, Farris, Moray, Russell, Carpenter, Oesman, MacKay, Russell, Bertrand, Paullin, Levesque, Mott, Sivewright, Richard, O'Brien (Northumberland), Powell, Wells, Dibblee, Hill, O'Brien (Charlotte), Barnes, Davidson, Young.

Nays—Stockton, Pitts, Sumner, Shaw, Lockhart, Howe, Pinder, Black.

Dr. Stockton moved, seconded by Mr. Sumner, that the word "who shall be a practical farmer," should be inserted after the word "council" in the fifth line of the first section.

Mr. Hill said he agreed with the view advanced by the provincial secretary that the person who had charge of the agricultural department should be more in touch with the people and with the legislature, and should be more accessible to the members of the legislature than he is under the present system. He had long felt that the money paid to agricultural societies had not been well spent, and he believed that the money should be expended towards exhibitions—some \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year—was to a large extent wasted. It was possible that the establishment of a department of agriculture might be of great benefit to the province, and it was possible that it might be of no use whatever. It was had at the head of this department a gentleman who, whether he

be a practical farmer or no, has a love of agriculture and an interest in it—who will avail himself of the information to be derived from different sources in other provinces and countries, and who will instruct the farmers of the country as to the best and most profitable methods of carrying on the farming industry—he had no doubt it would be of a very great benefit. On the face of the bill he seemed to add largely to the expenditure, but as he had been informed that large savings would be made in other directions, which would make the additional cost of the new office very small, he had concluded to cast his vote in favor of the measure.

Hon. Mr. Emmerston said that in his advocacy of the bill he was not governed by the mere question of expediency. He had felt for a long time that in the interest of the agriculture industry of the province, there should have a representative head of the department of agriculture on the floors of the house. By reason of our present system there had been a lack of interest—a lack of energy—in connection with that department; there had not been any concentration of mind and without concentrated effort no man could accomplish much. As to the proposition that the head of the department should be a practical farmer, he did not think there was any more necessity for a practical farmer at the head of the department of agriculture than there was for a bridge builder at the head of the department of public works or a lumberman at the head of the crown land department.

Mr. Shaw said he was opposed to the bill not because it was a government measure, but because he thought it was not in the best interests of agriculture. He believed that if the government really had an eye to the interests of the agriculturists they would appoint a practical farmer as the head of the department of agriculture. He did not think there was a man on the floors of the house any more fitted for the position than the gentleman who holds it now, and the government of the day, instead of making a place for one of their supporters, should have selected a man who has been a farmer and who understands the wants of the farmers without being influenced in any way by political party feeling.

Mr. Sivewright said that he had previously stated that if the opposition could show that there would be an increase of expenditure of \$2,000 as a result of the establishment of the department of agriculture, he would vote against the bill, but as they had failed to show that the increase would be more than \$1,900, he held he was \$100 to the good, plus the advantage of having a head of the department on the floors of the house, who would have the necessary attention to the management of that department.

Mr. Carpenter said he had noticed during the short time he had been a member of the house that the opposition always posed as the champions of the agriculturist of the country, but he was almost certain that the duties assigned to the committee would be of no use whatever.

Mr. Pinder said that he had noticed during the short time he had been a member of the house that the opposition always posed as the champions of the agriculturist of the country, but he was almost certain that the duties assigned to the committee would be of no use whatever.

Mr. Black said he wished to say a word with reference to some statements made by the provincial secretary in an attempt to dispute the statement which he (Black) had made. The hon. provincial secretary had stated that the \$32,890 over-expenditure on board of works account was included in the \$76,435 balance account. This was certainly not the case, as would be seen by reference to page 3 of the auditor general's report. The statement that he (Black) had put down the \$79,000 warrant expenditures, was equally untrue. The motion to read the bill section by section was carried, the vote being: Yeas—Mitchell, Tweedie, Emmerston, White, Dunn, LaBrosse, Farris, Moray, Russell, Carpenter, Oesman, MacKay, Russell, Bertrand, Paullin, Levesque, Mott, Sivewright, Richard, O'Brien (Northumberland), Powell, Wells, Dibblee, Hill, O'Brien (Charlotte), Barnes, Davidson, Young.

Nays—Stockton, Pitts, Sumner, Shaw, Lockhart, Howe, Pinder, Black.

Dr. Stockton moved, seconded by Mr. Sumner, that the word "who shall be a practical farmer," should be inserted after the word "council" in the fifth line of the first section.

Mr. Hill said he agreed with the view advanced by the provincial secretary that the person who had charge of the agricultural department should be more in touch with the people and with the legislature, and should be more accessible to the members of the legislature than he is under the present system. He had long felt that the money paid to agricultural societies had not been well spent, and he believed that the money should be expended towards exhibitions—some \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year—was to a large extent wasted. It was possible that the establishment of a department of agriculture might be of great benefit to the province, and it was possible that it might be of no use whatever. It was had at the head of this department a gentleman who, whether he

be a practical farmer or no, has a love of agriculture and an interest in it—who will avail himself of the information to be derived from different sources in other provinces and countries, and who will instruct the farmers of the country as to the best and most profitable methods of carrying on the farming industry—he had no doubt it would be of a very great benefit. On the face of the bill he seemed to add largely to the expenditure, but as he had been informed that large savings would be made in other directions, which would make the additional cost of the new office very small, he had concluded to cast his vote in favor of the measure.

Hon. Mr. Emmerston said that in his advocacy of the bill he was not governed by the mere question of expediency. He had felt for a long time that in the interest of the agriculture industry of the province, there should have a representative head of the department of agriculture on the floors of the house. By reason of our present system there had been a lack of interest—a lack of energy—in connection with that department; there had not been any concentration of mind and without concentrated effort no man could accomplish much. As to the proposition that the head of the department should be a practical farmer, he did not think there was any more necessity for a practical farmer at the head of the department of agriculture than there was for a bridge