

cause the hon. member has been so *amiable* in his remarks.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. Leader of the Government has based several amusing observations upon Georgetown affairs; but I can tell the hon. Member, that, when all the contemplated improvements in that town are carried out, we shall be placed in a far better position than at present.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Many jokes have been made relative to the extent of Georgetown Common. They had a Common there once, but they did not keep it.

The third paragraph was then agreed to.

The fourth paragraph was read.

MR. SPEAKER.—I should like to hear what amount of money has been repaid by the people.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—I have great doubts whether I can give my assent to the paragraph just read, or not; for I believe that if that money had been kept in the Treasury there would have been just as much grain sown. A great deal of the money granted was received by persons who never spent a farthing of it in purchasing seed grain. The money was in many cases spent for liquor—white-eye,—and in getting up a good time or spree on the head of it. It should be only in extreme cases, where the country has been almost paralyzed by a failure of the crops, that the Government should come to the rescue to provide seed grain. I believe it would have been much better if the money had been kept in the Treasury and the parties left to their own resources. After that grant was expended a large quantity of grain was exported to Europe; and it is well known that the people were not so destitute as represented. If report speaks true, only eight hundred pounds have been returned to the Treasury, if so, I think you may cancel half the remaining sum, for it will never be repaid. I cannot help, therefore, coming to the conclusion, that the money granted was injudiciously expended.

HON. MR. HOWLAN.—Mr. Chairman: I disagree with the remarks just made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I live eighty or ninety miles from here, and from my acquaintance with the country, I can say that *there was a great deal of want in the country last spring.* It is easy for the hon. member to say that there was a large quantity of grain in the country, but not so easy for the people to supply themselves with it. There was a large sum of money deposited in the Savings Bank last year, because wealthy farmers preferred to place it there, rather than lend it to the poor man. You do not catch wealthy farmers giving away their seed grain on credit, when it is three shillings cash per bushel in the market. I know that the money granted the people last spring did a great deal of benefit. Indeed there has been a larger amount than the sum mentioned,

repaid by the people; for a large amount has been paid in since the end of the financial year. Supposing the money was all lost, it was still money well expended, for there were very few farmers who were not in want of seed. Even people who were well off, as well as those of ordinary means, required assistance; the grant was therefore really required. There was strictly speaking, no party, on this question, for it concerned the whole country, equally. No hon. Member wishes to have his constituents brought into disrespect by such remarks as those we have heard on this matter. Instead of being found fault with, for giving the grant, the government ought to be thanked.

MR. REILLY.—Mr. Chairman, I know that, as far as the district which I represent, is concerned, many persons were benefitted by the grant for seed grain. I know also, that some of the people have paid in their money up to the very moment when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition expressed his doubt whether the money was well expended or not. Many rich farmers would not give oats on credit to the poorer class; and the fact that three thousand pounds were granted, to assist the latter was an inducement to those who, held large quantities of grain to retain it for those who wanted it.

HON. MR. HENDERSON.—Mr. Chairman: I, for one, on behalf of my constituents, sympathize with that class of people who were in depressed circumstances last spring, and I by no means feel inclined to censure. On the contrary, I commend the Government for what they have done. From observation, I know that the destitution in the country was not caused by a want of spirit on the part of the people, for they made every exertion to preserve both men and stock, alive—they made exertions which they had never been obliged to make since they came to the Colony. This destitution, I am happy to say, was not general, but went to such an extent that I, for one, felt as keenly interested on that subject as I did on the question which threatened to deprive us of our constitution. The remarks I have made are founded upon what I have seen with my own eyes. Some of the causes which produced such effects among the people must be apparent to every one who takes a general survey of the history of our Colony during the last few years. I ask the question, how many of our farmers were in circumstances to let their neighbors have seed grain on credit? Those on the Cunard and other estates, had large instalments to pay for their lands, and to fulfil their engagements, they were obliged to sell most of their ordinary farm products. The high price given for grain in the market, together with this pressure upon the people, left but little or no chance to the poor man. If farmers in tolerable circumstances required assistance, how much more did hundreds of persons in poor circumstances, occupying government lands, require it? And I put the question, which was the most convenient for the