

Hon. Leader of the Government said that people in going to market took only small bottles, and if they could not purchase a pint of liquor in the stores, they would be driven to the taverns. By raising the quantity from a pint to a quart much litigation would be caused, for some parties would be tempted to sell a common bottle full, and if watched would be fined.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN had no objection to allow a store to sell as much as a common bottle would contain, but would not support an increase of that quantity.

Mr. J. A. McDONALD said that by raising the quantity to a quart it would be the means of causing people to purchase more liquor than they required, and, therefore, would be productive of evil consequences.

Mr. MOAR said that it would be far better to allow a pint to be sold in the stores instead of a quart, for it would not be the cause of so great a consumption of liquor.

Mr. MUNRO said that the largest of the common black bottles did not contain a quart, and when people sent for that quantity they would either be compelled to leave the balance, or the storekeeper, rather than lose his customers would be induced to sell less than a quart and thus evade the law. He could not see that any improvement would be made by raising the quantity to a quart. On the other hand there are many restrictions placed upon tavern-keepers, which those who sell by store licenses have not to bear, for instance the former has to provide lodgings, stable, shed, beds and such things, while the latter sells goods in his shop, and has not to provide any accommodation for the public. The law is, therefore, far more favorable to the man who sells by store license than to the tavern-keeper, because the latter is put to considerable expense, and is placed under many restrictions.

Mr. McNEILL did not think any improvement would be made in the law by substituting a quart for pint license. The time might yet arrive when the sale of liquors would be prohibited altogether, but it was not fair to allow a store-keeper close by a tavern to sell either by pint or quart license.

Mr. CAMERON thought by raising the quantity sold in a store to one quart, the principle of the bill would be better carried out; a pint was too small a quantity to be allowed to be sold in stores. Some people thought no less than a gallon should be sold by store-keepers; but he thought if store-keepers were allowed to sell by the quart it would suit the requirements of the people as well as at present.

Hon. Mr. PEARY thought the pint license should be abolished, for it injured the tavern-keeper who had to provide proper accommodation for travellers, and did not particularly benefit the people generally. If quart license were substituted for pint license, there would be just as much liquor sold as at present, but would just as soon do away with both altogether. Pint license should be abolished, for there is no guarantee that the liquor sold in stores is any better than that sold in taverns.

Hon. P. SINGLAIN thought the pint license system should be abolished, for if a person wants a pint of liquor he can get it at a tavern. Those stores licensed to sell by the pint only induced young men to drink, and were an injury instead of a benefit. He did not think much improvement would be effected by raising the quantity to a quart; and, therefore, thought it better to strike out the clause altogether.

Hon. Mr. McLEAN did not agree with what was stated by the hon. member for New London, that selling liquor by the pint or quart induced young men to drink. It is a necessary evil, and store license is necessary, for there are districts where no person could keep up a house of entertainment profitably. The road from St. Peter's to the East Point, for instance, is one upon which no man could subsist by tavern-keeping alone. There are times when sickness arises, when there is a necessity for strong liquors; they should therefore be within the reach of all classes of persons, in every part of the country. He would support the licensing of stores, to sell as much as a common bottle would contain.

Mr. ABERNETHY thought the amendment proposed would not work satisfactory. Many men, in coming to town, bring a bottle with them to be filled with liquor; when it is filled they might happen to meet their friends and drink too freely. It would, therefore, do more harm than good to raise the quantity retailed in stores from a pint to a quart. He thought the measure allowed should be either a pint or a gallon.

Hon. B. DAVIES was opposed to granting store licenses for selling less than half a gallon for retailing either by the pint or quart; an injury to the tavern-keeper.

Mr. McMILLAN thought a pint license should not be allowed, for it injured respectable hotel-keepers who had proper accommodations for travellers. It has been found that people often go to the stores, where it is something cheaper, and purchase a pint of liquor, and afterwards go to the taverns and drink it. This had been done in Summerside, and was found to be a great nuisance. If this practice is allowed to go on, respectable hotels cannot be sustained, and there will then be no public accommodation for travellers. If the quantity were raised to a quart it would not be found to answer very well, for bottles do not generally contain that much. It would be pretty hard to frame a law to suit all cases and to remedy all defects.

Hon. D. DAVIES did not think the pint license fair dealing to the tavern-keepers. In Charlottetown tavern-keepers complain that the law is very stringent in reference to taverns, while stores are scarcely under any restrictions. He could not see why stores should be allowed to sell less than half a gallon of liquor.

Mr. CAMERON considered the pint license very objectionable, because it was the cause of a greater temptation to the public to drink than taverns. A pint of liquor can at present be obtained so easily that young men are easily induced, by the example of others, to purchase it, and form a habit of doing so.

Mr. MUNRO said that notwithstanding all the amendments which had been made from time to time in the liquor law, it was very little better than it was forty years ago. He believed that the testimony of the nineteenth century is that the liquor traffic is one of the greatest evils of the present age, and that if it could be got rid of altogether, mankind would be greatly benefited; but as long as it exists in the world it must be regulated, and that is all that can be done in this Colony at present. I cannot see that any improvement would be made by changing the quantity from a pint to a quart, for just as much evil would be caused by the former system as by the latter. It cannot be expected that as long as the pint system is continued we can have comfortable and commodious taverns; but to do justice to the storekeepers, they should have at least one year's notice, if a change is to be made.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN said that to raise the quantity from a pint to a gallon would be contrary to common sense, for there are many parts of the country where there is not a tavern for 10 or 12 miles, and liquor could not be obtained when required in case of emergency if it were not sold in the

stores. If this change were carried out there would be a general complaint against it throughout the country. If the sale of liquor were to be prohibited altogether, it would be quite different; but as long as its sale is allowed, people in all parts of the country should be allowed to obtain it in quantities not greater than a pint, when required.

Mr. McNEILL.—It was said that public houses are not required, but a large influx of strangers would change the aspect of affairs, and it would be found that they could not be dispensed with. There should be some protection afforded those who provided suitable accommodation for travellers, and he therefore thought the pint license should be abolished. He believed that the drinking habits of the people of this Island were considerably less than formerly; but whether they would be entirely done away with or not, was not for him to say. If the tavern-keeper was not protected by abolishing the pint license he would not be able to compete with the stores, because the latter are in a better position to sell cheaper. Men may, at present, go to the stores, purchase liquor, and go back to the taverns and drink it, thus subjecting the latter to all the inconveniences of the traffic without reaping any of the benefits.

Hon. Mr. CALLERCK said that it had been stated that although there had been much legislation in regulating the liquor traffic, no remedy for its evils had been provided. He supposed temperance men would tell us, in reply, that as long as the sale of liquors was allowed it would always be attended with the same results. This may be so, but he was not an advocate for doing away with the liquor traffic by law, because public opinion has not yet arrived at that stage.

He thought the pint license only afforded facilities for unnecessary drinking, but to adopt the two gallon system would be going too far on the other side. Public houses should have some protection, because they are placed under greater restriction than stores. He thought quart license would be an improvement, and would afford the tavern the required protection. It had been objected that a common bottle does not contain a quart, and that the quart system would only encourage drinking; but the Legislature could not make regulations that would suit all cases. He did not think the pint license should be encouraged merely because it would yield larger revenue than quart license. He believed our revenue would be equally as large as at present if neither pint nor quart license were allowed, for there is a great loss of time connected with the trade, the value of which overbalances the amount derived from it. If it were abolished our exports would be larger in proportion, and the trade of the country would be benefited; but, as our people generally have not arrived at that conclusion, all that can be done is to regulate the traffic. He thought it was just to the keepers of public houses for the accommodation of the public, that the store license should be raised to a quart.

Mr. MUNRO said that some hon. members proposed raising the quantity retailed in stores to half a gallon, but he thought such a system would only lead to dishonesty on the part of the storekeepers, and would not bring about the desired result. He thought it better to leave the license as it is at present, viz. pint license.

Hon. P. SINGLAIN said that taverns were more restricted, and could be made a much greater benefit to society than stores which sold liquor by the pint, for the latter only sell and make people drunk, while the former are compelled to provide accommodation for travellers. The tavern-keeper can easily be fined if he violates the law, but the store-keeper can do a vast amount of injury to any neighborhood without being liable to any punishment so doing. By the payment of £7 10s. those stores have power to sell as much liquor by the pint as they choose, and thus are found to be a far greater evil than taverns. If the hon. member for Georgetown insisted upon retaining the present pint license, he (hon. Mr. S.) would move that the word "pint" be struck out of the clause, and the words "half a gallon" inserted instead. It had been stated that the law would be violated if the quantity were raised to half a gallon. That might be true, but that was no reason why the pint license should be continued. If the law were broken in that way, there is a remedy provided.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN said that people had to pay dearer for liquor purchased at a public house than at a store, because the tavern-keeper is obliged to provide suitable accommodation for travellers. There is not a public house between Sturgeon and Murray Harbor, and therefore if liquor could not be obtained in reasonable quantities at the stores, people would have to travel about ten miles in order to obtain what they required. If the liquor traffic is to be abolished, the proper steps should be taken to bring about that result; but if it is only to be regulated, let it be done in a legal and proper manner, so as to place liquor within the reach of the people, that it might be obtained when required.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN said that the quantity sold in stores should not be raised to a quart, for a common bottle would not contain that quantity, and storekeepers selling a bottle full would render themselves liable to a fine. If the quantity were fixed at three half pints, it would suit the requirements of the public better than the quart system. The hon. member for Summerside (Mr. McMILLAN), stated that the hotel-keepers of Summerside were badly used because people purchased liquor at the stores and went to the hotels to drink it. In Charlottetown there is no scarcity of public houses, but there is a scarcity of good hotels. The boarding houses do not sell liquors. By raising the quantity to a quart, people would be compelled to purchase more than they require, and would have to carry two bottles instead of one, to contain it. This would be a great hardship; he, therefore, thought a license to stores to sell three half pints should be allowed. In many parts of the country tavern-keepers cannot obtain license, because the people in their neighborhood are opposed to it; unless, therefore, it could be obtained in moderate quantities in stores, people would be greatly inconvenienced.

Mr. McMILLAN thought that the store-keeper might be well allowed to sell liquor by the glass as by the pint, for the results were about the same.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL said the tavern-keeper was put to the expense of providing suitable accommodation for the public, while the storekeeper had not to go to any expense. A man might get drunk by purchasing liquor at a store, and be thrust into the street, but the tavern-keeper had to provide accommodation for those who purchased liquor from them. He (hon. Attorney General) had been one of those who had formerly advocated raising the quantity sold in stores to a quart, and he had no objection to support the motion to raise it to half a gallon, as had been proposed by his hon. colleague.

Mr. HOWARD thought it would be better to fix the quantity allowed to be sold in stores at three half pints.

Hon. D. DAVIES had been on a similar

committee some years ago, and believed that he was one who recommended the reduction from a quart to a pint at that time. The reason why the change was made was, that people had been in the habit of buying a quart and drinking that part of it which a common black bottle would not contain. This was the cause of a great deal of drunkenness, and the quantity was therefore reduced to a pint; but it is now clearly seen that the storekeepers should not be allowed to sell by the pint, as it is not justice to the tavern-keeper, while it produces much evil and is subject to few restrictions. He thought store licenses should not be allowed for less than half a gallon.

Hon. P. SINGLAIN would agree to fixing the quantity to be retailed in stores at half a gallon.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT did not see, if the liquor traffic was to be regulated at all, that any evil effects result from pint license. If a man wished to take home a bottle of brandy or whiskey, he purchased it at a store where it could be got cheaper than in the tavern. It would be unfair, therefore, to raise the quantity any higher than it is at present. It appeared to him that the intention of the present Act was merely to consolidate our liquor laws which are at present in force. If the sale in stores of any quantity less than two gallons is to be legalized, the quantity should remain as it is.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAND did not see any reason why the quantity should be raised to half a gallon, and had heard nothing during the whole of the debate which showed any necessity for it. It was not the intention of the law that liquor should be drunk in stores where it was sold; it was merely to place it where people could purchase it when it was really required. There had been no complaints to show that the pint license system did not work well; no petitions had been received from any party asking for a change in this respect; it would be better therefore to leave the law as it is. If the quantity were raised to a gallon and a half, and three or four bottles did not happen to hold that much, the purchasers, according to the ideas advanced by some hon. members, would still be obliged to drink the balance, or leave it with the store-keeper. Before passing a law that quart license should be granted, there should first be a law passed that every quart bottle should hold a quart, as proposed by a celebrated English statesman. He could not see any necessity in the world for changing the license from a pint to a quart.

The question on the different amendments was put and lost, and the clause allowing pint license was adopted.

Hon. Mr. KELLY moved that the following be added to the thirteenth clause, viz: "Provided always that it shall be no breach of this Act if such person as shall have obtained a tavern license as aforesaid (in the country) shall have or keep his shop or place for retailing of such liquors as aforesaid in a different building, not more than 400 yards from his dwelling-house wherein he shall lodge and otherwise entertain his guests or lodgers."

This would allow these tavern-keepers whose houses were some little distance from the public road, to keep a liquor saloon by the roadside, for the accommodation of travellers, while lodging and food would be provided in their own private dwellings. Both the public and respectable tavern-keepers would be benefited by such an arrangement.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN said that it was generally expected that tavern-keepers should retail their liquor in the house in which they reside; but the amendment would allow a separate building for retailing liquor. If this became law, it would be the means of inducing many to take up tavern-keeping, who at present would not retail liquor in their houses. He thought the amendment was not required.

Hon. Mr. McLEAN did not see that the sale of liquor by a tavern-keeper, in a building separate from his private dwelling should be objected to any more than when both buildings were attached.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL said that if a tavern-keeper were allowed to retail liquor in a shanty by the side of the public road, it would lead to the worst results. When liquor is retailed in a respectable dwelling-house, the matter is altogether different. He would not, therefore, support the amendment.

Mr. McLEAN said that as the law now stands, the tavern-keeper is bound to provide proper accommodation in the building in which he retails liquor. But if the amendment were adopted, the required accommodation would not be provided, and the benefits of public houses would thus be greatly lessened. The amendment would also allow the tavern-keeper to sell liquor in two places, instead of one, as at present. The proposal that had been made to allow stores to sell by the quart, instead of by the pint, was no improvement on the present system.

Hon. Mr. KELLY did not feel very uneasy about our license law, but he thought the amendment proposed by him was very fair, for people travelling by roads did not care to have to go two or three chains from the public road, as they are compelled to do in some instances at present. Travellers could go to the tavern by the road side for liquors, and to the private dwelling for food and lodging; by this arrangement they would be better entertained than at present in many instances.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN said that those tavern-keepers who resided some little distance from the public road in country places are allowed to keep a separate shop for retailing liquor, all others would take advantage of such a law, and the consequences would be injurious to the country.

Hon. P. SINGLAIN said that no tavern-keeper could have as much control over two houses as over one. A separate shop might be required in some places, but if the privilege were extended to one district, it would have to be general over the whole Island, and would, if allowed, be found to be productive of a vast amount of evil. He thought it would be far better to leave the clause as it was.

The amendment submitted by Hon. Mr. Kelly, was then put and lost, and the clause was allowed to remain as it was.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN said that it would be a great hardship if a man were to be fined because his servant being a minor, met a few of his friends at a tavern, and purchased a few glasses of liquor to treat them.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN said that a man sending a servant under age to a tavern for liquor, could not get it according to this clause. It was not always easy for tavern-keepers to tell who are minors.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL said that the Legislature had no right to set a trap to catch the tavern-keeper, and he would therefore suggest that the words "willfully or knowingly" be inserted in the clause.

The Speaker then took the Chair, progress was reported, and leave obtained to sit again. I. O. House in Committee of the whole on the

Bill to Consolidate the laws relating to Licensed Taverns.

Mr. Beer in the Chair. The section of the Act being read relating to the number of meetings to be held in a School District.

Hon. Mr. SINGLAIN had strong objections to allowing any more meetings to be held for the purpose of granting tavern licenses, than were previously provided for by the Act, and moved a resolution to the effect that the law remain as it then was.

Mr. MUNRO thought two meetings for each class of licenses would be better. The thinking portion of the community might, if aware that two meetings for each kind of license could be held, increase their vigilance. He thought it would give more general satisfaction.

Mr. HOOPER saw no necessity for defining the number of meetings to be held. That was a matter which should be left to the people, who should be left to meet as often as they thought proper.

Hon. D. DAVIES thought such a suggestion at that of the hon. member for Morell (Mr. Hooper) would not do. If parties wishing to obtain tavern licenses had the privilege of calling meetings as often as they pleased, people would become indifferent about the matter, and would not attend at all. Two meetings in each year was quite sufficient for each class of license.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL was not in the office of Attorney General more than a week when his attention was called to the matter. His predecessor understood the Act as allowing two meetings for each class of license, but on looking closely into the wording of the Statute, he could not see that that construction was borne out. From Alberton he received letters and telegrams on the subject, and as much anxiety and even misunderstanding had taken place with reference to this matter, he thought it better to place the number of meetings to be held so plain in the Bill, that no future misapprehensions could arise. He would say to the hon. member for New London that when unreasonable restrictions were placed in the way of any calling, it only excited opposition, and led to every possible evasion of the law.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT said the intention was to consolidate the law, and thereby simplify the mode of referring to it. He thought if the hon. member for New London would calmly consider the question, he would not object to the number of meetings proposed to be held. He should also recollect that the Crown Law Officers of the Government of which he (Hon. P. S.) was a member, placed the same construction upon the law which the Attorney General had placed in the Bill under consideration. He thought the Attorney General was doing a good service in placing the matter so clearly in the Bill, and believed it would be better to allow the clause to stand as it was.

Hon. Mr. SINGLAIN felt convinced that no School District in any part of the district had the honor to represent, required that four meetings a year should be held. And, however the ex-Attorney General might have understood the question, he (Hon. P. S.) could assure the hon. member that no magistrate in his part of the country understood the law as allowing any more than two meetings to be held in any one year in any school district, for any such purpose.

Mr. CAMERON thought the law required to be rendered much plainer than it had been. He was opposed to increasing the number of meetings to be held, as he could not see what could be accomplished at four, which could not be effected at two. An increased number of meetings would add to the trouble and inconvenience of the people of the district.

Hon. B. DAVIES said the Temperance people had a great deal of trouble before they succeeded in getting the law up to what it then was, and would not wish to see any more privileges given to those engaged in selling spirituous liquors than they had.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—A Committee was appointed a few days ago, for the purpose of examining and ascertaining whether it would be advisable to remove the Lunatic Asylum to Falconwood or the Stock Farm, or not. That farm was leased by the Government, for seven years, with the right to purchase it at any time during that period; and a large amount of money was expended in manuring and covering it with muck manure. The result is that it is now very valuable, and would be cheap at the price set upon it. It would therefore be unwise for the Legislature to let it go out of the possession of the Colony. The lease has now only one year to run before its expiration, and it has been considered by the Committee to be advisable to remove the Asylum to that farm, the purchase should be effected at once. It is advisable that the House should consider the matter without regard to party, because it will affect the interests of the whole Colony. Our present Asylum has become to be considered almost a disgrace to the Colony, on account of the small size of the rooms, and the lack of ventilation; the less that is said about it, therefore, the better. There is a large brick building upon the farm, which can be extended to the required dimensions for a new Asylum building; but before that building is enlarged, the farm must be purchased. I therefore move the following resolution:—

"Whereas, The lease to the Government of this Island of the property known as the Stock Farm, will expire on the first day of May, 1872; and whereas, there is contained in the said lease a covenant reserving to the Government the right of purchase at any time during the continuation of said lease of the said property, together with the brick house and the lands attached, designated as Falconwood, for the sum of £3,000 sterling; and whereas a large amount of money has been expended by the Government in fencing and improving the said farm, all of which will be lost unless the purchase be effected; and whereas a joint Committee, composed of three members of the Legislative Council and six members of this House, have recommended that certain additions be made to the said building at Falconwood, for the purpose of an Asylum, the buildings at present used as an Asylum being altogether inadequate to the requirements of the Colony. Resolved, That a Bill be introduced authorizing the purchase of the said property for the sum of £3,000 sterling, in terms of the lease; and also authorizing the issue of Government debentures, redeemable in ten years, for the payment thereof; and also a further sum of £3,000 currency, to be appropriated for the required additions and repairs to the said brick building, to be used for the purposes of an Asylum."

Hon. P. SINGLAIN.—The Stock Farm has been in the hands of the Government for six years, and as the lease will, after the lapse of another year, expire, unless the farm is secured, it will pass out of their possession. It would be found to benefit the country, if it were purchased, and well managed. The present Asylum is now found to be unfit for the purpose which it is intended, and the grounds being so limited, it would be undesirable to extend it. It is supposed that the large brick house upon the Stock Farm can be sufficiently enlarged to supply all the accommodation required, while the rooms

would be better adapted for the purpose than those of the present Asylum. I consider that improved breeds of farm stock is required in the country, and if more stock is to be imported, the farm will be necessary for its reception. If the farm were sold by private sale, it would bring a larger price than that fixed in the lease, so that no money would be lost in that respect. I was fenced in the best manner, and with the best materials, and as it would suit the present requirements of the country, I will support the resolution.

Hon. B. DAVIES.—It is a very large undertaking to expend £3,000 sterling in the purchase of the Stock Farm. I would like to know whether the results of its management during the past six years will justify the House in doing so. The Government of this Colony leased that farm for the purpose of showing the public that, under a high system of cultivation, land would produce more than under the ordinary method. Another object was to show that stock of the best description could be bred on the Island from imported stock, equal to any imported, and at far less cost. Before supporting such a resolution as that before the Committee, I should like to see some of those plans carried out. I will allow that some good stock has been bred upon the farm, but there is no statement before the Committee to show what the results of its management have been. I believe that every bushel of wheat and other grain, and all the root crops, have cost the country more than they could be purchased for in the market. If that has been the result of the working of that farm, what is the use of keeping it up? I believe that every ton of hay and oats produced from it has cost the country more than a like quantity on any of the private farms adjoining it. In fact, the farms of Judge Peters and Hon. F. Longworth are better cultivated, and are models to the Model Farm itself. Some of the stock raised by those gentlemen is of better quality than the stock raised upon the Stock Farm. Mr. Longworth has sold more stock than has been sold from the farm, and his stock is more highly valued. If, therefore, private gentlemen can raise stock cheaper and better, there can be no benefit to the country in keeping up that farm by large grants of money from the treasury. Has the farm been a benefit to the country in any respect? This question should be answered before the House should be called upon to purchase it for the large sum of £4,500 currency. If the desired results have not been realized, the Government should give good reason for their expecting that the establishment will pay better in future. I should like to see returns of the number and value of the stock imported from England; also the productions of that stock, the money it has realized, the advantages the country has reaped from it, whether it has been retained by our farmers for breeding purposes, or for being fattened up and disposed of in the market. It would also be very interesting to know what it costs to cultivate land which is in a high state of cultivation, and what sorts of manure are required to bring it into that condition. Taking all this into consideration, I doubt if it would be wise on the part of this House to advise the Government to continue the operations on that farm. I look upon it as a losing speculation. Unless those gentlemen who have the care of it can raise better stock than those of private farmers in its neighborhood, there is no use in expending public money upon it. There is some good fencing on the farm, but the horses raised upon it are no better than those seen upon ordinary farms. Thousands of acres of land can be found throughout the Island, which is in just as high a state of cultivation, although that farm has cost the country a very large sum to keep it in a fair state. With such results before us, I do not intend to support the resolution, for the House would not be justified in keeping up an institution which would be a perpetual loss to the Colony.

Hon. D. DAVIES.—It differs in opinion from the hon. member for Belfast on this matter, for this farm is not intended to be a model farm; it is a stock farm. We have plenty of model farms all over the Island, and do not require such a farm kept up by the Government. I was in the Legislature when that farm was leased, and put under the management of a keeper; and the Government had my hearty support in organizing it. Farming is now taking the place of ship-building and lumbering, and therefore should be encouraged by the Government in some way. Perhaps no better plan could be adopted than keeping up a good Stock Farm for the purpose of breeding stock to be distributed through all parts of the country, for the purpose of improving the stock kept by our farmers. Our stock has been considerably improved by this means, and farmers from the other Provinces have purchased a considerable quantity of it; but our Stock Farm has not been taken advantage of by our farmers as it might have been, and has not been managed as it should be. A large number of the stock upon it died from various causes, the principal of which was, no doubt, the want of proper care and management. I have heard stock-keepers say that sufficient care was not bestowed upon the breeding of the stock, and that the horses were overworked in cultivating the farm; as if the growing of grain was of more importance than securing a good breed of stock. A more successful farmer has recently been employed upon it, and it may perhaps be more successfully managed. It might be made a great benefit in other respects, such as a means for introducing changes of seed in potatoes, for instance. The few changes we have had, have been brought here by private individuals. I myself introduced a new variety into the country, and I am happy to know they have proved a great advantage. A better class of horses were introduced during the last few years, for the old stock was thought to be too heavy; but the country has lately been drained of that kind of stock, and it is now necessary to replace it. As we can breed excellent stock on this Island, no more attention should be paid to it here, heretofore, and some superior animals should be imported. I would even support the establishment of a Stock Farm in each of the counties, if required, to improve the stock of the country; but one farm properly maintained would be found to be quite sufficient for the wants of the Colony. I do not think we should complain on account of the expenditure of a small sum for the purchase of that farm, as it will undoubtedly prove a real benefit to the Colony, and will always be worth the sum which will be paid for it. The agricultural resources of the country are now of the first importance to its prosperity, and are of far greater consequence than ship-building and the fisheries. If the Stock Farm were now thrown into the market, it would bring a good deal more money than the sum at which it can be purchased by the Government, and its purchase will not, therefore, be any loss whatever to the country. If the old Asylum were to be sold, it would bring a considerable sum of money, which would materially assist in the enlargement of the Stock Farm building, which by the addition of a wing or two, would afford all the necessary accommodation. I would be sorry to see the raising of improv-

ed breeds of stock thrown entirely upon the private enterprise of the country, because it is a matter of the first importance that it should not be neglected. I can well remember the importation of the horse "Saladin" from England; and the stock produced by him was the best the country ever had. It is true that the stock lately imported has not been as good as could be wished for; but it is not an easy matter to get hold of the most improved stock. I have exported some hundreds of horses, and find that it is a difficult matter to select the best animals. It is not therefore surprising that our imported horses were not all first-class ones. We cannot expect that they should all be found to be of the best description. I should think that in a Parliament where farmers are so well represented, the Stock Farm would not want supporters, and that it would not be allowed to go down.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN.—Large sums of money have been spent upon the Model Farm, but what has been the result? The stock has dwindled down almost to nothing, and the Colony has not gained any benefit, which that farm should have conferred upon the country. In reference to the unfortunate inmates of the Lunatic Asylum, he wished to see their condition improved, and to see them made more comfortable in every way. The purchase of the Stock Farm for the removal of the Lunatic Asylum to it, would be better, as it is three miles from town, it would be found to be inconvenient for an institution of that kind. I suppose that if it is the intention of the Government to purchase it, it is of very little use for me to oppose it; but I cannot help expressing the opinion that the farm is too far from the city for a site for the Lunatic Asylum. The Stock Farm has never given the country satisfaction, and the reports made will show this. The stock of horses that has been imported was not suited to the wants of the country, and consequently the results have not been satisfactory. I would say that, instead of purchasing the farm, it would be better to vote, say £2,000, for improved stock, and send a competent person to England to select and bring it here. It should then be distributed among the three Counties, so that they might receive the immediate benefit of it. It would be better than sending it to the Stock Farm, for it would be better guarded, and the people would be better satisfied. I have been given to understand that the price at which the farm can be purchased is nothing beyond its real value, and that there is a very superior building upon it which cost half the money. I do not object to the Government doing a good deal of good to the country, considering the small means placed at its disposal. I am not a farmer, but I have had a good deal of conversation with practical farmers in reference to these matters, and I know that that Society gave considerable encouragement to the growing of grain by offering prizes for the best fields of it. Practical men were appointed to inspect the different fields, and the prize was given to the successful farmer. Prizes were also given for the best turnips, &c., and the great crops of that root which have lately been raised are the result of the encouragement given to the farmers by that Society. It proved a far greater benefit to the Colony than the system now pursued. They imported some improved breeds of the most profitable stock, but when it arrived here they did not keep it themselves to raise pure-bred stock—they distributed it over the country, for they were practical men. They had the stock to grow in different parts of the country, and bound them down to keep it for the purpose of breeding alone, for the benefit of the country to which it was sent. Contrast the action of that Society with that of the Stock Farm Commissioners at the present time, and the former will appear to great advantage. There are two or three horses on the farm, but they are very poor indeed for an institution of that kind; private farmers could turn out horses quite as good in every respect. A few good pigs have been imported for the farm, but the result of their breeding can be confined to a small circle around the town; the country generally has not derived advantage from them; under the old system the stock was distributed over the country, and the people received the benefit of it. We have a wretched stock of horses at present upon the Island, and it is all owing to the bad selection of stock for importation, and mismanagement after they arrived here. A really good horse is not at present to be had at any price. If a sum of money were given to a society, and they were bound to import horses, and give the country the benefit of their services, the result would be far more satisfactory than what is now done. I think the Model Farm has been a decided failure, and although some hon. gentlemen of the Government think they can conduct it better in future, it will entail a great deal of trouble and expense, without corresponding benefit to the country. The accommodation afforded by the Lunatic Asylum is not a sufficient for the present wants of the Colony, but the plan which it was built was not chosen without due deliberation, and some of the first men in the Colony made the selection. It is well situated, being in an airy place, and near good bathing grounds; the building is substantial, and although not a large enough, by the expenditure of a thousand pounds, it might be enlarged so as to meet all the requirements of the Colony. Holding these opinions, I cannot support a measure which calls for an outlay of a large sum of money which should be spent upon other branches of the public service.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—It is a matter of the first importance that it should not be neglected. I can well remember the importation of the horse "Saladin" from England; and the stock produced by him was the best the country ever had. It is true that the stock lately imported has not been as good as could be wished for; but it is not an easy matter to get hold of the most improved stock. I have exported some hundreds of horses, and find that it is a difficult matter to select the best animals. It is not therefore surprising that our imported horses were not all first-class ones. We cannot expect that they should all be found to be of the best description. I should think that in a Parliament where farmers are so well represented, the Stock Farm would not want supporters, and that it would not be allowed to go down.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN.—Large sums of money have been spent upon the Model Farm, but what has been the result? The stock has dwindled down almost to nothing, and the Colony has not gained any benefit, which that farm should have conferred upon the country. In reference to the unfortunate inmates of the Lunatic Asylum, he wished to see their condition improved, and to see them made more comfortable in every way. The purchase of the Stock Farm for the removal of the Lunatic Asylum to it, would be better, as it is three miles from town, it would be found to be inconvenient for an institution of that kind. I suppose that if it is the intention of the Government to purchase it, it is of very little use for me to oppose it; but I cannot help expressing the opinion that the farm is too far from the city for a site for the Lunatic Asylum. The Stock Farm has never given the country satisfaction, and the reports made will show this. The stock of horses that has been imported was not suited to the wants of the country, and consequently the results have not been satisfactory. I would say that, instead of purchasing the farm, it would be better to vote, say £2,000, for improved stock, and send a competent person to England to select and bring it here. It should then be distributed among the three Counties, so that they might receive the immediate benefit of it. It would be better than sending it to the Stock Farm, for it would be better guarded, and the people would be better satisfied. I have been given to understand that the price at which the farm can be purchased is nothing beyond its real value, and that there is a very superior building upon it which cost half the money. I do not object to the Government doing a good deal of good to the country, considering the small means placed at its disposal. I am not a farmer, but I have had a good deal of conversation with practical farmers in reference to these matters, and I know that that Society gave considerable encouragement to the growing of grain by offering prizes for the best fields of it. Practical men were appointed to inspect the different fields, and the prize was given to the successful farmer. Prizes were also given for the best turnips, &c., and the great crops of that root which have lately been raised are the result of the encouragement given to the farmers by that Society. It proved a far greater benefit to the Colony than the system now pursued. They imported some improved breeds of the most profitable stock, but when it arrived here they did not keep it themselves to raise pure-bred stock—they distributed it over the country, for they were practical men. They had the stock to grow in different parts of the country, and bound them down to keep it for the purpose of breeding alone, for the benefit of the country to which it was sent. Contrast the action of that Society with that of the Stock Farm Commissioners at the present time, and the former will appear to great advantage. There are two or three horses on the farm, but they are very poor indeed for an institution of that kind; private farmers could turn out horses quite as good in every respect. A few good pigs have been imported for the farm, but the result of their breeding can be confined to a small circle around the town; the country generally has not derived advantage from them; under the old system the stock was distributed over the country, and the people received the benefit of it. We have a wretched stock of horses at present upon the Island, and it is all owing to the bad selection of stock for importation, and mismanagement after they arrived here. A really good horse is not at present to be had at any price. If a sum of money were given to a society, and they were bound to import horses, and give the country the benefit of their services, the result would be far more satisfactory than what is now done. I think the Model Farm has been a decided failure, and although some hon. gentlemen of the Government think they can conduct it better in future, it will entail a great deal of trouble and expense, without corresponding benefit to the country. The accommodation afforded by the Lunatic Asylum is not a sufficient for the present wants of the Colony, but the plan which it was built was not chosen without due deliberation, and some of the first men in the Colony made the selection. It is well situated, being in an airy place, and near good bathing grounds; the building is substantial, and although not a large enough, by the expenditure of a thousand pounds, it might be enlarged so as to meet all the requirements of the Colony. Holding these opinions, I cannot support a measure which calls for an outlay of a large sum of money which should be spent upon other branches of the public service.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—It is a matter of the first importance that it should not be neglected. I can well remember the importation of the horse "Saladin" from England; and the stock produced by him was the best the country ever had. It is true that the stock lately imported has not been as good as could be wished for; but it is not an easy matter to get hold of the most improved stock. I have exported some hundreds of horses, and find that it is a difficult matter to select the best animals. It is not therefore surprising that our imported horses were not all first-class ones. We cannot expect that they should all be found to be of the best description. I should think that in a Parliament where farmers are so well represented, the Stock Farm would not want supporters, and that it would not be allowed to go down.

Hon. Mr. WRIGHTMAN.—Large sums of money have been spent upon the Model Farm, but what has been the result? The stock has dwindled down almost to nothing, and the Colony has not gained any benefit, which that farm should have conferred upon the