General Business.

UNPRECEDENTED ATTRACTION!
OVER A MILLION DISTRIBUTED.

L. S. L.

"Louisiana State Lottery Company.

Incorporated by the Legislature in 1868 for Educational and Charitable purposes, and its franchise made a part of the present State constitution, in 1879, by an overwhelming popular vote.

Its MAMMOTH DRAWINGS take place Semi-Annually, (June and December), and its GRAND SINGLE NUMBER DRAWINGS take place on each of the other ten months of the year, and are all drawn in public at the Academy of Music, New Orleans, La.

Famed for Twenty Years,
For Integrity of its Drawings, and Promptly Payment of Prizes.

Attested as follows:

"We do hereby certify that we supervise the arrangements for all the Monthly and Semi-Annual Drawings of The Louisiana State Lottery Company, and in person manage and control the Drawings themselves, and that the same are conducted with honesty, fairness, and in good faith toward all parties, and we authorize the company to use this certificate, with facsimiles of our signatures attached, in its advertisements."

G. T. Beauregard
J. A. Early
Commissioners.

We the undersigned Banks and Bankers will pay all Prizes drawn in The Louisiana State Lotteries which may be presented at our counters.

R. M. WALMSLEY,
Pres. Louisiana National Bank.
PIERRE LANAUX,
Pres. State National Bank
A. BALDWIN,
Pres. New Orleans National Bank.
CARL KOHN,
Pres. Union National Bank.

Grand Monthly Drawing

at the Academy of Music, New Orleans, Tuesday, May 14, 1889.

Capital Prize, $300,000.

100,000 Tickets at Twenty Dollars each. Halves $10; Quarters $5 Tenths $2; Twentieths $1.

LIST OF PRIZES

1 PRIZE OF	$300,000 is	$300,000
1 PRIZE OF	100,000 is	100,000
1 PRIZE OF	50,000 is	50,000
1 PRIZE OF	25,000 is	25,000
2 PRIZES OF	10,000 are	20,000
5 PRIZES OF	5,000 are	25,000
25 PRIZES OF	1,000 are	25,000
100 PRIZES OF	500 are	50,000
200 PRIZES OF	300 are	60,000
500 PRIZES OF	200 are	100,000
APPROXIMATION PRIZES.		
100 Prizes of $500 are		50,000
100 do	300 are	30,000
200 do	200 are	40,000
TERMINAL PRIZES.		
999 do	100 are	99,900
999 do	100 are	99,900
3,134 Prizes amounting to		$1,054,800

NOTE.—Tickets drawing Capital Prizes are not entitled to terminal Prizes.

For Club Rates, or any further information desired, write legibly to the undersigned, clearly stating your residence, with State, County, Street and number. More rapid return mail delivery will be assured by your enclosing an Envelope bearing your full address.

IMPORTANT.

Address M. A. DAUPHIN, New Orleans, La.,
or M. A. DAUPHIN, Washington, D. C.

By ordinary letter, containing Money Order issued by all Express Companies, New York Exchange, Draft or Postal Note. We pay Charges on Currency sent to us by Express in sums of $5 or over.

Address Registered Letters containing Currency to NEW ORLEANS NATIONAL BANK, New Orleans, La.

REMEMBER that the payment of Prizes is GUARANTEED BY FOUR NATIONAL BANKS of New Orleans, and The Tickets are Signed by the President of an Institution whose chartered rights are recognized in the highest Courts; therefore, beware of all imitations or anonymous schemes.

ONE DOLLAR is the price of the small est part of a Ticket ISSUED BY US in any Drawing. Anything in our name offered for less than a Dollar is a swindle.

Herring For Sale.

Good Spring Herring, will be sold very cheap for money or oats.

T H FLEIGER, Escuminac

Gillespie & Sadler

AUCTIONEERS
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
SHIP BROKERS AND
WAREHOUSEMEN!

Merchandise Stored at a Small Cost, and Insurance effected on same.

Consignments :- Solicited
AND
Returns Made Promptly.

Thomas F. Gillespie, John Sadler,
Water Street, Chatham.

COFFINS & CASKETS

The Subscriber has on hand at his shop superior assortment of

ROSEWOOD & WALNUT COFFINS,

COFFIN FINDINGS
AND ROBES

which he will supply at reasonable rates. BADGES FOR PALL BEARERS also supplie

WM. McLEAN, - Undertaker

McALPINE'S
Province of New Brunswick Directory

D. McALPINE & SON are now preparing to publish a Complete Directory of this Province, which will include all persons (Male) from the age of 20 years old and upward, and all Females in Mercantile Business; also an Historical Sketch of the Province up to 1883, with other general information. It will be well bound and printed on good paper. The publishers have been requested several times, by leading business men and others, to publish the above work and promised their support. They therefore feel confident that the work is needed, and that business men of all classes will consider that it is necessary to Advertise in it to make it a success, otherwise the publishers will not be able to publish it. We are now behind nearly all the other Provinces in the Dominion, and of the States in America, in not having a Directory of the Province since 1870-71. There will not likely be a similar work published for the next ten years, therefore the special inducement to those who do advertise in it now. Any persons who wish their Advertisements inserted, by applying early will obtain better positions. Except the seven paid pages opposite covers, the prices will be general, viz: $20.00 per page; $12 00 per half; $10.00 per third; $8.00 per fourth—with Directory included.

D. McALPINE & SON,
43 Carleton Street, St. John, N B

BEST COUGH MEDICINE,
PISO'S CURE FOR CONSUMPTION.

It has permanently cured THOUSANDS of cases pronounced by doctors hopeless. If you have premonitory symptoms, such as Cough, Difficulty of Breathing, &c., don't delay, but use PISO'S CURE FOR CONSUMPTION immediately. By Druggists. 25 cents.

Miramichi Advance,

CHATHAM, N. B. - APRIL 18, 1889.

HOW MR. EDWARD JACK HAS PROTECTED THE TRACADIE.

Mr. Edward Jack published one of his characteristic letters in the Fredericton *Gleaner*, in reply to the ADVANCE's recent exposure of his abuse of the Tracadie River, which he holds under lease from the provincial government. He, no doubt, considered it a very clever production and had it reproduced in a second-hand way on the Miramichi, even the *Advocate* gladly seizing the portion relating to the mephitis mephitica as the particular tid-bit exactly suited to its taste. The following letter which we take from the *Gleaner* of the 9th inst., will show the position in which Mr. Jack stands in the controversy.

The Tracadie and its Lessee.

To the Editor of THE GLEANER,

SIR,—The Advance of the 28th ult. referred to the fact that Mr. Edward Jack, lessee of Tracadie River, had, year after year, neglected the duty of guarding it, as required by the terms under which it was leased. In your paper of the 2nd inst. I find a letter under Mr. Jack's signature, which is somewhat incoherent and characterised by the writer's usual display of classical misfits, but purporting to convey the idea that he has not been guilty of the neglect with which the Advance charged him. He makes his letter in THE GLEANER as personal as possible in its references to me, and seems to think that by thus assailing one of the principal witnesses against him in his abuse of a portion of the public domain, he will succeed in diverting attention from his wrongdoing. In the discussion of matters such as the preservation of our forests and fisheries, and especially such of the latter as are under control of the province, I am not concerned about what such defaulting lessees as Mr. Jack may say of me personally, in their anger over my exposure of their neglect of duty. I can afford to leave that kind of warfare to Mr. Jack and his imitators, while I address myself to the work of making him and his kind sensible of the fact that personal abuse and inuendo, bluster and pretension are light in the balance against the facts of their offences. The circumstances under which Mr Jack's default was publicly emphasized, are as follows:

On the 12th ult., according to the official legislative report,—

"Mr. Burchill gave notice of inquiry: Have the leases of the Tabusintac and Tracadie rivers been required by the Surveyor general to place guardians on those rivers, if not, why not? If so, how many guardians have been on duty on said rivers and what are their names?"

On the 14th ult., according to the same authority:

"In answer to Mr. Burchill, the surveyor general said he had reason to believe there were two guardians on the Tabusinac river last season, with regard to the Tracadie he believed there were no guardians on it last year and he would say that unless the lessee attended to the law in reference to guardians this year, the license would be cancelled and the river again placed for sale."

Turning to the regulations under which Tracadie was sold, it will be found that the following was amongst the requirements:

"The lessee shall covenant to keep and maintain, at his own cost and expense, one or more guardians, etc.

It is also stated in a foot-note appended to the regulations:

"The surveyor-general in fixing the upset prices which he has placed upon the fishing privileges, has had in view the importance of securing an efficient system of protection, etc."

The surveyor general himself says: Mr. Jack has been notified that if he neglects putting guardians on the Tracadie next season, his license will be cancelled.

I wish to add that I have been on the Tracadie a good deal. In the summer of 1887 and 1888—both years in the month of July—I covered it from North Branch to tide water, which includes all its best pools, save those of the Lord and Foy Brook, which is its main tributary. I have met men on it who were carrying on summer lumber operations, and also canoemen and teamsters familiar with every rod of it. I have met and talked with men whose names Mr. Jack is said to have given as those of his guardians, but neither these latter, nor any of the others ever heard of or saw a guardian in Mr. Jack's employ on the river. Gentlemen who were with me, as well as I, saw the remains of poachers' spears and torches on the bars, and we were informed that the river was poached upon by spearers and netters with impunity. And yet, Mr. Jack, who hints at other people being liars, says:

"I now publicly declare that I have complied with all the conditions contained in my lease of Tracadie, and this statement I am prepared to verify and prove by the evidence of the fishery commissioner for New Brunswick, to whom I direct all my enquiring friends."

I say that Mr. Jack has absolutely ignored, from the first, his duty to place guardians on the river. Neither he nor the fishery commissioner can truthfully deny the fact, and if it were anyone else but Mr. Jack who had so neglected his duty, his lease would doubtless have been forfeited. Knowing, however, that even in the face of his default Mr. Jack is coddled by the department, our anglers, who would willingly pay double the price he does for the Tracadie and protect it also, are forced to conclude that the guardianship provisions of our river leases are only a device to keep *bona fide* sportsmen from competing for fishing privileges against semi official speculators of Mr. Jack's stamp.

Respectfully yours,
D. G. SMITH.

It should be borne in mind that the important object, from a public stand point, to be attained by closing our provincial trout streams to the public and placing them in private hands, is their protection from the illegal and destructive methods of fishing resorted to by poachers. The Surveyor-General plainly intimated this in the *Royal Gazette*, in connection with his advertisement announcing the sale of the Tracadie and other trout, as well as salmon rivers. Sportsmen who contemplated securing the Tracadie, understood that the Surveyor-General would require that at least two guardians should be maintained on it. It was not bidden in at the general sale, and negotiations were pending in reference to it, when it was learned that Mr. Edward Jack, who is a deputy Crown Land Surveyor, or something of that kind, which gives him special advantages in such matters, had quietly become the lessee. Now, Mr. Jack is not only an apparent favorite and privileged person in Crown Land official circles, but he is a prolific, if not very interesting contributor to the press, his subject oftentimes being the splendid fishing to be had on certain of our rivers, which, on further enquiry, sportsmen learn that they can enjoy by paying so much to Mr. Edward Jack. In this way he secures cheap advertising for the river properties which he holds on speculation, and, as he pays nothing for protection—on the Tracadie, at least—he is enabled to pocket all he receives from anglers as clear profit, after paying fifty dollars apiece for his two rivers. Mr. Jack is, therefore, clearly a defaulter in his duty to the public. He refers to the provincial fishery commissioner, Mr. Phair, and it would be better for that officer, as well as for the Department that employs him, if he were in a position to say that Mr. Jack had ever had a guardian on the Tracadie. While, however, Mr. Jack has been making money out of his neglect of the duty he was bound to perform for the protection of the public domain, he has been lecturing the public and crown land department in a very ostentatious manner on the duty of conserving the forests, which are leased to other people. In view of his own methods however—of his lining his pockets with fancy fees secured from anglers who are unaware of his neglect of his guardianship duties, of his letting the Tracadie remain open to any kind of poaching, its uncared for condition may invite—honest people will only laugh when they hereafter read the usual periodic diatribes on the preservation of the public domain which are so ostentatiously paraded in the provincial press under the name of Edward Jack. There is a suggestion of imposture about the whole business that is not calculated to inspire confidence in those who might lay hands upon it in behalf of the people, but, for some reason, not only do not do so, but resent being reminded of their neglect of duty.

Net Fishing in Non-Tidal Waters.

The Ottawa telegraphers and newspapers in the Maritime Provinces, generally, made a singular mistake last week in representing the Government bill prohibiting net-fishing for salmon in non-tidal waters, as applying to, *tidal* waters instead. The object of the bill in question is really to prevent the netting of salmon on or near the spawning beds, and if it is as represented by the Minister of Fisheries it ought not to meet with very serious objection. It is well known that the commercial salmon fisheries of the country are in tidal waters. For instance, they extend, on the S. W. Miramichi, from the sea up as far as Indiantown and, on the Northwest, to the Redbank bridge, if not above it, and under the new bill, will continue to do so. In special cases, and where the spawning beds are not involved, fishing may—as stated in the debate by the Minister—be permitted even above the influence of the tide. Any fishing in the upper waters is chiefly for home consumption and we presume that will be still permitted where it will not be injurious to the preservation of the fishery itself. There can be no doubt that some restriction of net-fishing in our rivers on the bars and in salmon pools is necessary to prevent the destruction of the fishery, and a reasonable effort in that direction ought to meet with general approval. The next move ought to be an amendment to the Fisheries Act prohibiting anglers from killing more than a certain number of salmon each per season.

BONES! We observe that Dr. Berryman has been asking the Government at Fredericton whether it intended to assist the Lancaster Bone Mill Company by a grant of public money and that Hon. Mr. McLellan feared that in view of the different services that had been provided for the Government would not be able to give the assistance referred to. If the Doctor will send his spare bones to our saw-mills we will cut them up cheaply for him, and he and other St. John representatives might, in return, be induced to favor the Government decreasing the burdens it maintains on that class of mills at the north.

The Prohibition Question.

OPINIONS OF FOUR UNITED STATES BISHOPS.

[Boston Herald.]

On Fast day Rev. Edward Abbott, pastor of St. James' Episcopal Church, North Cambridge, concluded an address on constitutional prohibition by reading letters on the subject from Bishop Neely, of Maine, Bishop Clark, of Rhode Island, Bishop Vail, of Kansas and Bishop Perry of Iowa. The tenor of the letters was in substance as follows:—Bishop Neely declared that the amendment had not been of the least value in checking the sale of liquor in Maine. Bishop Clark expressed the opinion that in Rhode Island the passage of the prohibitory law has been disastrous to the cause of temperance. Bishop Vail of Kansas, on the other hand, expressed the belief that the working of the anti-saloon law in that state, framed to enforce constitutional prohibition, is as perfect as possible in restraining such vice as intemperance. Bishop Perry gave at considerable length the result of his experience and observation in regard to the working of prohibition in Iowa, and the view presented by him was wholly unfavorable. He contradicted some of the statements which have been published favorable to prohibition, notably that of the governor, and spoke of the effect which the prohibitory enactment is having in checking emigration. He declared that the increase of bank deposits is alone noticeable in those parts of the state where the prohibitory law is a dead letter, and that in Davenport and its vicinity the number of open saloons is greater than ever before. The law, he claimed, has not abolished the saloon.

THE CHURCH IS NOT READY.

Mr. Sydney B. Paterson, of St. John, who is a well known prohibitionist says in the *Temperance Journal*: "I do not believe that entire prohibition could be more easily enforced at present than local option. *The Church is not ready for the prohibition of the liquor traffic.*"

Mothers!

Castoria is recommended by physicians of children teething. It is a purely vegetable preparation, its ingredients are published around each bottle. It is pleasant to the taste and absolutely harmless. It relieves constipation, regulates the bowels quiets pain, cures diarrhœa and wind colic allays feverishness, destroys worms, and prevents convulsions, soothes the child and gives it refreshing and natural sleep. Castoria is the children's panacea—the mothers' friend, 35 doses, 35 cents.

The Legislature.

APRIL 4TH.—Mr. Mitchell committed the bill further amending the law for the protection of birds and animals. The bill was agreed to with slight amendments.

Mr. Phinney from the select committee, to whom was referred the Lien bill, recommended same to the favorable consideration of the house.

Hon. Mr. Blair recommitted the franchise bill. Agreed to with amendments.

Hon Mr. Blair recommitted the bill amending the law providing for registration of births, deaths and marriages. Hon. Mr. Blair said that at present the division registrars are paid ten cents for each birth, death and marriage registered. Considering that that officer had to make two copies of the registration in each case and that formerly the clerk of the peace received 50 cents for each marriage certificate registered, he (Blair) thought the amount now paid registrars was not enough to stimulate them to make this law as perfect as possible. He was not wedded to the idea of increasing the amount to 15 cents, but in order to test the feelings of the committee, he moved the blank in sub-section 24 of section 4 be filled with the words "fifteen cents."

Mr. Hanington opposed the increasing the registration fee from 10 to 15 cents.—Progress were reported with leave to sit again.

At the evening session, Dr. Stockton moved his resolution of which he had given notice, qualifying all widows and spinsters holding real estate to the value of $100 or personal or personal and real property to the value of $400, or who should be assessed upon income to the amount of $400 the right to vote for members of the assembly. He opened by reminding the house that in deference to the view of the attorney general, that the passage of the resolution which he had moved the other day when the franchise bill came before the house, would imperil the bill, he had withdrawn it, with the distinct understanding that the house would have an early opportunity of pronouncing upon it. It had been represented by some that he should have pressed that resolution at that time, quite irrespective of the consequences, but he (Stockton) had felt that great credit was due to the government for the wise, liberal and comprehensive measure they had introduced, and he had felt that it would be unfair to the government to hamper their action. He quite agreed with the proposition heretofore laid down by the attorney general, that the legislation of the country should be behind rather than in advance of public opinion. If he thought that the principles embodied in the resolution he had just moved were in advance of public sentiment, he would hesitate to advocate its adoption. He believed, however, that so far from being in advance of public sentiment the resolution was rather behind it. Dr. Stockton pointed out that property should have the right to vote whether held by male or female. To say that, for instance teachers in our public schools had not the intelligence to vote was paying a very questionable compliment to the common schools of the province. The principle underlying the right to vote was that we might select fit and proper persons for the administration of the country's affairs. Should not the voter be able to discriminate as to whether such person was a fit and proper person or not? Why then should licensed teachers, having a certificate of intelligence from the government, be adjudged devoid of the capacity to so discriminate? He referred to the number of ladies present in the gallery and to the petitions from them from Westmorland and other counties in support of woman suffrage, to show that there was an interest in the question and that it was asked for. Women in politics would have an elevating rather than a demoralizing effect and the opinion of Lord John Russell was quoted to prove this assertion.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Killam in a speech arguing strongly in favor of its adoption.

Mr. Wilson, while in accord with the resolution, believed the right to vote should be extended to married women as well as widows and spinsters, speaking at some length in favor of his contention. In concluding, amid loud applause, he moved an amendment to the resolution, to the effect that every woman of the age of 21 years, being a British subject, etc., have the right to vote at elections to the assembly.

Mr. Morrissey seconded the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Blair, while recognizing the ability and intelligence of the gentlemen in the house who favored the resolutions before the house, felt they had fallen into a grievous error and were misled by a want of careful and calm consideration of this serious question. He declined to follow Dr Stockton into the states of Kansas and Wyoming, and preferred taking his one from such representative British statesmen as Gladstone and the late John Bright. Mr. Blair argued strongly against the resolution, urged the house to be careful and not put themselves on record on a question which would, if passed, prove one of the most disastrous acts ever committed by the legislature.

Messrs. Emmerson, Alward and Moore, spoke in support of the resolution, and the debate was adjourned at nearly midnight until to-morrow.

APRIL 5.—Mr. Wilson's bill creating a lien on logs and lumber was committed and progress reported after it had been discussed to some extent.

The Woman's Suffrage resolutions were then discussed by Messrs. Baird, Wilson, Atkinson, Hanington, Ritchie, Hubbard, Tweedie and Stockton.

The following is a brief report of Mr. Tweedie's remarks upon the subject. He said he desired to make a remark or two before a vote was taken. This seemed to be the legislative equinoxial period, judging by the quantity of wind we have heard lately. There has been a great deal of talk much of which has had little or no bearing on the matters under consideration, he did not intend to occupy the attention of the committee at any great length nor did he feel called upon to express any opinion whatever on the resolution moved by Mr. Stockton. There was good reason to believe that the resolution had been moved without sincerity. If Stockton and Emmerson had been sincere in their pretended desire to give women the right to vote why had they withdrawn their amendment to the franchise bill. It was when that bill was under the consideration of the committee that a resolution or amendment giving the franchise to women should have been pressed by those who now seem anxious to carry this resolution, which means, in plain terms, simply nothing. In this discussion we have heard a great deal about the apostle Paul and that other apostle, Sir John A. Macdonald, as to what their views were on woman suffrage, but when Stockton and Emmerson had an opportunity of having their own opinions become law on this question they fled, fled on the promise of the attorney general that they should have a field day to discuss the question, they accepted the promise of Blair and they have had their field day and accomplished what? Nothing. As he had said they were afraid to press their amendment when they might have accomplished something and Hon. members should not now be called upon to express an opinion on a resolution which even if it were carried would be productive of no results. But we are told that the amendment to the franchise bill was withdrawn because it had been moved by friends of the government and because its passage might affect the government. If the resolution should pass might not the legislative council amend the government franchise bill in accordance with the spirit of the said resolution, and supposing that were so, would not the government be in a very embarassing position when the council's amendment came back to this house conferring the franchise upon women. The friends of woman suffrage wanted a toy with which to play, let them be careful if they are friends of the government or else they may find their toy a most dangerous one. The member for Kings had pointed out that all great reforms were gradual in their growth, and it might be argued that we have gone far enough at present in conferring manhood suffrage. Stockton and Emmerson seemed to have formed a partnership in this matter, their talk about woman was all mamby pamby, and he took no stock in it; he thought as much of his wife as did any other man of his own wife, but he was not going to applaud her to the skies. The hon. member for Albert loves to talk. He has taken up a good deal of time of this house. He (Tweedie) felt like saying to him young man you should not be so fresh. You should not start out by having so much to say the first year you are in the assembly. (Laughter.) If the honorable member would follow his advice, he, Emmerson, would be thankful to him in the future. He would not have so many of his present views coming against him at some distant day. There was no general demand for woman suffrage in the country or through the press. This question of woman suffrage would never be accomplished by a resolution such as the one before the house. It would only be brought about when there is a strong public sentiment throughout the country in favor of such a measure, and when the majority of the house come here pledged to vote for woman suffrage. He admired the position of Blair on this question which was not one to be settled in the immediate present but which might be safely left to the future. He did not feel called upon to support the resolution which could accomplish no more than had Stockton's winter port resolution which was discussed here a couple of years ago, nor did he, as he had said, feel called upon to state now what was his own opinion on the question of female suffrage.

When a division was taken on Mr. Emmerson's amendment the vote was as follows:

Yeas—Alward, Morrissey, Russell, Taylor, Stockton, Emmerson, Baird, Ketchum, Atkinson, Bellamy, Moore—11.

Nays—Blair, McLellan, Ryan, Mitchell, Ritchie, Turner, Hanington, Black, Young, Tweedie, LeBlanc, Killam, Glasier, Harrison, Phinney, Theriault, Labillois, White, Palmer, Hutchison, Quinton, Hibbard, Hetherington, Douglas, Humphrey, Burchill—26.

Dr. Stockton's resolution was also lost the vote being:—

Yeas—Alward, Young, Killam, Glasier, Taylor, White, Stockton, Emmerson, Hibbard, Baird, Ketchum, Atkinson, Bellamy, Moore—14.

Nays—Blair, McLellan, Ryan, Mitchell Ritchie, Turner, Hanington, Black, Tweedie, Morrissey, LeBlanc, Russell, Harrison, Phinney, Theriault, Labillois, Hutchison, Quinton, Murray, Palmer, Hetherington, Douglas, Humphrey, Burchill—24.

Mr. Russell introduced a bill incorporating the town of St. Andrews.

Adjourned.

APRIL 6.—Mr. Young committed the bill authorizing the trustees of school district No. 4, Beresford, Gloucester Co., to issue debentures. Agreed to with amendments.

Hon. Mr. Blair committed the bill further amending the public health act, Mr. Young in the chair. Mr. Blair said the bill was intended to confer greater power upon boards of health in order to enable them to more efficiently deal with epidemic. Agreed to with amendments.

Hon. Mr. Ritchie introduced a bill to prevent the advertising of foreign lotteries.

Mr. Wilson recommitted the lien bill, Mr. Emmerson in the chair. Mr. Wilson said the bill required little explanation. It was intended to establish liens on logs and lumber only. The other provisions in last year's bill were eliminated from this act because they had been objected to by many members of the house. The principle of liens on log and lumber having been agreed to last year, this bill should pass without much opposition. The expensive machinery of the equity court had been dispensed with in the bill, and it was provided that suits could be brought for sums between $20 and $400, which suits could be tried in the county courts. Another feature of this bill was that a laborer could not attach logs or lumber until he had completed his contract. There was also another provision in this bill, which required an affidavit from the laborer that the amount was really due. These safeguards prevented an injury being done capital.

Mr. Phinney supported the bill, urging that it was a measure calculated to greatly benefit the laboring classes, while under it capital would be protected. A lien bill in Maine had been in operation at least since 1857, and it worked well there. The bill now before the house was far more liberal in its provisions than the Maine law, so far as safeguarding the interests of capital. He cited numerous cases where poor men in this province had been fleeced out of their wages, which could not have occurred if we had had a lien bill here years ago.

Mr. Moore strongly favored the bill. Some such a law was needed in the interests of the laboring classes. This bill he thought would do justice to employer as well as employe.

Hon. Mr. McLellan said he was in favor of liens when the matter was agreed to between the parties. If the principle of liens be admitted, the promoter of this bill should have gone further and made his bill apply to every class of labor and thus do equal justice to all the working people. This bill, as it was proposed to amend it, would give a lien for 20 days after the logs or lumber had arrived at the rafting ground or place where the same is enclosed by booms. That would work a great hardship. Small operators from Queen's and parts of King's who are able to get high prices in St. John for their logs and lumber in the early spring, before the drive comes from up river, would greatly suffer under this bill. Of late years there have been few if any cases where any considerable number of lumber laborers have been cheated out of their wares. If the bill passed it would be productive of more harm than good, but if the principle of liens was a good one it should, as he had said, be extended to all classes of laboring men.

Mr. Hetherington moved an amendment to include workers in quarries, on buildings and on railway construction among those entitled to liens. The poor men of the country had been swindled because of dishonest railway contractors, and this bill, if correct in principle, should apply to all classes of laborers.

Mr. Black said the fact that a lien bill had been rejected by this house so frequently was evidence of a strong feeling in the country against the measure. The discussion on this question in the house had gone to the country through the press and yet we have no petitions here in favor of the bill. The supporters of the bill should be required to give some good reason not yet given to show why this act should pass. He feared that this bill would hamper the trade of the country, which would greately injure rather than benefit the laboring classes. Labor, capital and enterprise should go hand in hand and no bill should pass likely to hamper either of them. At present labor is king in this country and capital is the servant, and new conditions should not be imposed upon capital unless it could be shown that the laboring classes were really suffering. He instanced several cases of hardship to capital likely to arise under this bill and thought on the whole it was a most undesirable measure.

Mr. Baird said he had always supported this measure and would do so now. He paid his men and had to compete against other lumbermen, some of whom did not in all cases pay theirs. He cited cases of hardship which he declared would not have occured if this bill had been in force long ago.

Mr. Hibbard would support the bill as a first step towards doing justice to the working classes. If the bill works well it could be amended so as to make it apply to all laborers.

Dr. Alward opposed the principle of the bill on the ground that it was calculated to crush out small operators and greately hamper capital which should be left as free as possible both in the interest of employer and employe. Progress reported.

Mr. Young moved for copies of all tenders, contracts, petitions and all correspondence and papers relating to the construction of the Bathurst station bridge. He condemned the construction of the bridge as an injudicious expenditure of public money. Other services of the country were neglected, while a second bridge was given to Bathurst. The new bridge was not only not required, but it had been petitioned against by the people of the district. It would cost about $8,000 while the big Tracadie bridge was left in a dangerous condition.

Hon. Mr. Ryan said the papers would be brought down. He said many of those who had petitioned against the construction of the bridge referred to had done so because of a misrepresentation of the facts to them, and afterwards signed a petition in favor of the bridge being built. There were three or four petitions asking that the bridge be constructed. The reference of the hon. member (Young) to the big Tracadie bridge was rather unfortunate. The hon. member, although not the contractor of that bridge was the builder of it.

Mr. Young—That was 12 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Ryan—No, about seven or eight years ago. Since then because of the poor workmanship on the bridge in the first place and the poor material in its construction, the bridge has frequently needed repairs. It was only a matter of opinion between the hon. member and himself as to how judiciously or otherwise the public money was spent in Gloucester county. While he had control, he would exercise his best judgement in that matter, regardless of the opinion of the hon. member. The latter had made some extravagant promises during the last election, and if he had failed to carry them out that was not his (Ryan's) fault.

Mr. Phinney committed the bill relating to collecting judges, Mr. Hibbard in the chair. Agreed to with amendments.

APRIL 8.—Hon. Mr. Blair committed the bill amending the highway act of 1886, Mr. Morrissey in the chair. Mr. Blair said this bill had been introduced by Mr. Emmerson and there were several amendments suggested by the municipalities committee, which amendments he will read.

Mr. Palmer explained why amendments had been made by the municipalities committee and spoke of the necessity of some changes in the present law.

Mr. Black pointed out that there were great doubts as to the power of highway commissioners under the existing law. He also thought some steps should be taken to more clearly establish and maintain the boundaries of highway roads.

Mr. Hanington did not think it possible to carry out the second suggestion of the hon. member (Black.)

Mr. Black believed that if official plans were made of new roads, giving proper boundaries, etc., much of the present difficulty would be overcome.

Mr. Palmer favored the making of plans of new roads, such plans to be kept on record by the different municipalities.

Dr. Atkinson agreed with Mr. Black's views. He thought there should be some change in the expenditure of the bye-road money; $70,000 were expended on bye-roads and the results were not satisfactory.

After further discussion, progress was reported with leave to sit again.

On motion of Mr. McLellan the house resumed supply. Deputy Speaker Palmer, who was in the chair, named Mr. Murray as chairman of supply. The item of $1,000 additional to the St. John hospital passed.

When the St. John public hospital item was under discussion, Mr. Tweedie said there should be some understanding that the commissioners would be required to admit patients from outside counties.

Hon. Mr. McLellan said the grant was given with that understanding. If the hon. member (Tweedie) should give a letter to some patient in Northumberland and the commissioners did not admit the patient, he (Tweedie) would have just grounds for calling attention to the matter and asking the government to withdraw the grant.

Mr. Black—The commissioners wanted a grant of $5,000.

Hon. Mr. McLellan—Yes, this additional $1,000 makes the grant $3,000. If in the future the government could see its way clear to further increase the grant they would ask the house. The item passed for the necessary power.

Regarding the item of $27,500 for public buildings, Hon. Mr. McLellan explained that $25,000 were voted last year for the construction of the new departmental buildings. Of that sum $4,344 had not been used and it was proposed to revote that amount. In addition to that $23,156 were asked for expenditure in connexion with public buildings. A large portion of the latter sum would be used in the construction of additional accommodation at the lunatic asylum annex. He spoke of the great increase in the number of patients at the asylum. The increase was fully 100 since 1883. At present there are too many patients in the different wards of the main buildings, and it was desirable to increase the accommodation there and in the annex.

Mr. Tweedie—What will be the cost of the addition to the annex?

Hon. Mr. McLellan—Of course, we have not yet got the exact figures on the matter, but from the best information the medical superintendent can get, the cost will be between $12,000 and $15,000.

Mr. Tweedie—How much of the amount do you intend spending on the departmental buildings?

Hon. Mr. McLellan—The cost of heating, lighting and furnishing has yet to be provided for. It is impossible to give a correct idea of the cost, especially as regards the furnishing, but the chief commissioner would no doubt, in this matter, have proper regard for the public interests. The government hoped the amount asked for would cover all expenditures in connexion with the annex and the departmental buildings.

Mr. Tweedie said the house was entitled to more information than the provincial secretary had given. The latter was a business man, but his statement to-day was not a business statement. In brief, that statement was that part of the $27,000 was to be spent on the annex and part on the departmental buildings. We are told that Dr. Steeves thought the annex addition would cost $12,000 or $15,000. He had yet to hear that Dr. Steeves was a practical man, so far as the cost of buildings was concerned. We are also told that what is not spent on the departmental building would be spent on the annex. That was no proper statement. We were informed by the provincial secretary last year that the departmental buildings would cost only $25,000 in all, and that the money would come from the eastern extension claim.

Hon. Mr. McLellan—I made no such statement and there's nothing in the reports to show that I did.

Mr. Tweedie—It may not be in the reports, but I have a distinct recollection of your having made that statement in answer to a question by myself. We were told that the departmental buildings would cost $25,000 and in addition to that amount $27,500 is now asked. We cannot tell from the information before us whether $20,000 more will be used on the departmental buildings and $7,000 on the annex or vice versa. The statement of the provincial secretary was a weak and absurd one, and he for one wished to enter his protest against voting so much money without fuller information.

Hon. Mr. McLellan said Mr. Tweedie was inconsistent in this matter. He (Tweedie) had voted for the expenditure of $12,500 in connexion with the government house, legislative building and normal school without having before him all the figures as to what would be spent on each building. At least the hon. gentleman did not vote against such expenditure.

Mr. Tweedie—I voted against the expenditure of $25,000 for departmental buildings.

Hon. Mr. McLellan—The hon. gentleman has a right to object, but he should be fair in his criticism. What I said about Dr. Steeves was that from the best information he could obtain the addition to the annex would cost between $12,000 and $15,000. We will, of course, get plans and specifications prepared and no unnecessary money will be expended. Hon. members know that he (McLellan) did not say the departmental buildings would cost only $25,000 in all. He had said that would be about the cost of construction. The lowest tender for construction was between $26,000 and $27,000. He (McLellan) had not attempted to create the idea that about $25,000 would cover all expenses in connexion with the building, including heating, gas fixtures, furniture, etc., and Mr. Tweedie's remarks were unfair.

Mr. Tweedie—Will you now say what the total cost of the building will be?

Hon. Mr. McLellan—I have already told the hon. gentleman that it would be impossible just now to say. He had no doubt when the building was completed the chief commissioner would be able to satisfy the house of the correctness of all expenditures.

Mr. Tweedie said he had been perfectly consistent in this matter and was prepared to leave that question to his constituents. He had opposed the erection of the departmental buildings and he was now opposed to this grant, there being no proper information as to how it was to be expended on the departmental buildings in addition to the grant of last year. He was not prepared to accept the off hand statement of the provincial secretary that part of $27,500 was to be expended on the annex and part on the buildings here. (Tweedie) might be considered cranky by some, but he was not prepared to go it blind in this matter.

After speeches by Hon. Mr. Ritchie and Dr. Atkinson, the item passed.

Mr. Murray gave notice of a motion for papers in connexion with the sale of the stretch of water for fishing privileges from Metapedia to Toad Brook on the Restiguouche river.

The lien bill being further considered Mr. Burchill said if the principle of liens was correct, this bill should apply to all classes of laborers. He agreed with Mr. Hetherington that the laborers of the country had lost much money through dishonest railway contractors. The lumber business was in many respects an unfortunate business. It had to contend against the wind, water, snow and rain—against all the elements in fact. It had also to contend against the excessive stumpage imposed by the present government. Now after having made he further burden that industry by the imposition of a lien upon logs and lumber. It was not proposed to provide a lien for farmers, for those who worked upon ships or in manufactories. It was not even intended to impose a lien upon hemlock bark. This lien bill might work well enough so far as York and Carleton counties were concerned, but it would cause great hardships in Northumberland. In his county there was quite a trade done in sleepers, posts, telegraph poles, etc., and these never went near the booms, but were taken away by the railway. How would such cases as these be affected by this bill? The bill provided that the lien should attach for 20 days after logs reached the boom; in 20 days that would mean 20,000 000 of logs to be held by the S. W. Miramichi boom. As a matter of fact the boom would not hold half that quantity.

Mr. Hanington said he had always opposed this bill and saw no reason to change his views now. There was no necessity for this measure. He challenged the advocates of this measure to point to one case in 100 where lumber workers were cheated out of their wages; yes, one case in 1,000 where a winter's work has been lost. He had some doubts as to whether certain members would be so earnest in their advocacy of this measure if they did not feel that it would be strangled in the upper house. The bill would be most injurious to trade. It would kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Some hon. members found the advocacy of such a bill as this a popular thing. He, however, had always opposed such a bill and his constituents had approved of his course. Who are the N. B. operators who do not pay their men? He knew of none. He instanced several cases of fraud and extortion likely to result from the passage of this measure.

Mr. Tweedie said this bill did not reflect upon honest operators. If all operators are honest then this bill will do none of them any harm. The question was: Does the law at present sufficiently protect the poor man? Has the labourer who gets out the logs, who practically creates the log and gives it value, a sufficient protection for his labor? He thought not. As the law is at present a man may go into the woods in September, and, after working all winter, may come out in the spring and find that the operator is not worth a cent. In such cases, and there were too many of them, the laborers got nothing. Mr. Burchill's position was most peculiar on this question. Last year he voted that the bill be read section by section, and then voted against every section. The talk of Mr. Burchill and other opponents of this bill, to-day, was all clap-trap. It was unfair to the laboring man to say that under this bill he would harass capital with unjust law suits. The experience of the lawyers in this house was that it was not the poor man who goes to law as a general thing and he (Tweedie) would just as soon take the oath of the laboring man as he would the oath of the man in broadcloth. (Applause.) The passage of this bill would not affect capital, but would be a terror to evil doers and a praise to those who do well. (Hear,