

Herald Extra.

STAND BY THE TICKET

THE CHARGE OF OVER-EXPENDITURE

Notwithstanding the full explanations given by Messrs. Blair and Wilson in their speeches, the Gleaner repeats its charge of over-expenditure. The charge has been thoroughly exploded. The fullest proof has been given that not only has there been no over-expenditure, but on the contrary the government has during every year but two kept the expenditure well within the income, showing surpluses of \$83,000 against deficits of \$27,000, making a net surplus of \$56,000 in the years they have been in power. Most of the apparent over-expenditure is due to the payment of the large floating indebtedness left by the Fraser government, and the Gleaner knows this perfectly well. For various reasons, which were fully explained at the time, some of them being satisfactory and some not, the government proffered the present one had carried a floating indebtedness from year to year. The first act of the present government was to pay this off. At the time the Gleaner claimed credit for the government for doing this, now it charges them with it as an over-expenditure. But not to repeat explanations that have been given already, let the electors of York stop to think what make up these alleged over-expenditures. There is the Parliament Building, the Fredericton Bridge, the Normal School, the Horse Importation, the Government Stables, and the new Departmental Buildings. Some of these were the work of the preceding government, but were paid for by the present one; that is to say the money which paid for them in the first place was repaid to the banks by the present government. The others are the work of the present government. Which of them does Mr. Gregory condemn? Which of them would the electors of York prefer not to have been made? These great works have been completed to the advantage of York and the whole province and the other public services have been fully provided for. No interest has been neglected. The revenues for the present year are all at the disposal of the government to meet the expenses of the year. Nothing has been borrowed in advance on the strength of them. In all the years the government has administered affairs it has not run the province one dollar in debt for ordinary expenditure. The year's business has been kept within the year's income, except on the occasions mentioned; and because in those years exceptional calls upon the Public Works Department by the destruction of bridges and the new Departmental Buildings, the expenditure exceeded the estimate, will the people complain? If a heavy freight carries away a bridge is it not better that the bridge should be replaced, than that for the sake of showing a surplus the people should be inconvenienced?

But the extraordinary thing about all this is that Mr. Gregory and the Gleaner not only tacitly, but openly, approved of every dollar of the expenditure they now condemn, except that of 1888, and they have never until now pretended to criticize that, and now only do so in most general terms. When were Mr. Gregory and the Gleaner right—when they approved or when they condemned? They cannot have been right on both occasions. What earthly value can be attached to criticisms that are animated by hatred and jealousy, that are favorable one day and hostile the next? Mr. Gregory and the Gleaner in every word they say concerning the government, condemn themselves, or they approved of everything which they now say is wrong.

York Wants Four to Pull Together.

The statesmanship that sets itself out to figure how many letters a certain number of postage stamps will pay is not of a very high order. When one hundred, two hundred or three hundred dollars worth of postage is used in an office during a year the inference is that there must be great deal of correspondence. Mr. Gregory affects to be amazed that the Secretary for Agriculture requires for his office nearly \$150 a year in postage, and as much more for telegrams. He knows absolutely nothing about the correspondence of the office. If he wants the facts let him go to the Post Office and Telegraph Office and enquire. So far as the Secretary for Agriculture is concerned the gentlemen in charge of those offices may tell all they know about his postal and telegraphic correspondence. A little incident may be here related. When the present Secretary for Agriculture was appointed, he spoke to Postmaster McPeake about a P. O. box, and said that "I would like a box of my own." Mr. Peake answered him: "You want one of the largest boxes in the office." Since then the horses have been purchased, the system of crop reports instituted and other changes entailing large correspondence have been made. The department to-day has over two hundred regular correspondents throughout the province with whom it is in communication at short intervals all through the year. This is the regular correspondence with whom the Secretary communicates when he desires information or wishes to impart it. Besides which there is the ordinary correspondence of the office. In regard to telegraphing, there is one way in which the bill can be reduced more than half—that is by persons preparing their telegrams; but they don't do it and you cannot make them do it, and you cannot refuse to take their unpaid messages as they might be of importance and such as ought to be paid out of the public chest.

The postage and telegraphic bill of a department cannot be controlled. It will vary as the business of the office varies. If any body says he can run one of the departments for less postage and telegraphic charges than they now expend, he is simply talking about something he knows nothing about. Departmental officers do not write any more letters than they have to.

What Does York Want of an Opposition?

A HOLLOW CRY.

No greater fallacy can be imagined than that which underlies the canvases that "we want an opposition." Who wants an opposition? Does the City of Fredericton? And if so, why? Does the County of York? And if so, why? These are practical questions, and if they admit of an affirmative answer the reasons for the answer ought to be given. Does this constituency need an opposition in order to secure its share of public money? We had opposition representatives from 1883 to 1886. Did they serve the county any good purpose? Estimable men both were Messrs. Wetmore and Colby, one of them had been a member of the government, the other was leader of the opposition. What service did they render the county by being in opposition? What service could they render the county, and did not the county decline to re-elect them because they could no longer be of service? They had taken an attitude hostile to the government, and the county felt it could do better without them. This was the view the Gleaner took in 1886. It was a sound view. It is the view the electors of York will take next Monday.

"An opposition is wanted" they say. Opposition to what? To oppose what measure, what line of policy? The so-called opposition are silent in this county on this point. In Northumberland the opposition have something to talk about. They are opposed to the stampage policy of the government. Does York want any opposition to the government on this point? In St. John the opposition is on account of Mr. Ritchie's appointment to the Police Magistracy. Is there a man in the County of York who cares a straw about that? The opposition in the other counties is avowedly personal. It is not opposition to the government, but to the individual members from those counties. Take Kent for example. Mr. Thibney who leads the opposition there is not opposed to the government particularly, but to Mr. LeBlanc who is a member of the government. Take Carleton, Dr. Atkinson is opposed to Mr. Ketchum on personal grounds and hence picked a quarrel with the government over a railway subsidy. So in York, if Mr. Blair would give up his position to Mr. Gregory the latter would jump at the chance of joining the very government he now opposes. His opposition is personal opposition to Mr. Blair. Mr. Allen is in opposition because his brother-in-law did not get an office.

Farmers of York Stand by the Country Candidates.

These facts are unquestioned: The Renous and Dungarvon were offered for sale for several years in succession. Messrs. Tennant, Wiley and others, without consulting the Attorney General, applied for permission to lease the streams for less than the usual price, and were informed they could have them only at the usual price.

THE DUNGARVON MATTER.

The lease was made out to them and the rental paid. Up to that time the Attorney General had no connection with the fishing club and did not contemplate having connection with it, and since he joined it the only transaction the club has had with the government was to pay the rent as it fell due.

ABOUT POSTAGE.

Then where does the wrong come in? "Oh," says Mr. Gregory, "the club set out one of the streams for a larger rental than they pay for both."

MR. ALLEN.

THE HERALD has not said much about Mr. Allen. It has nothing against Mr. Allen. He has a right to get annoyed because a friend is not appointed to office, and to run an election as an opponent of the government, if he wants to. This is a free country. At the same time in what respect is Mr. Allen better fitted to represent the county than either of the gentlemen on the government ticket. He is without business or political experience, and has never disclosed an aptitude for public life. True as the Gleaner alleges, he is the son of the Chief Justice, but he is not responsible for that and can hardly receive any credit for the fact. The Chief Justice has three other sons. They are going to vote against their brother, if they vote at all. They will not vote for him. They think he has made a grave error in becoming a candidate. So the family cry does not have much effect in the family itself. No other qualification has been alleged on Mr. Allen's behalf except that he is a good fellow; but the woods are full of good fellows.

GOOD ENOUGH FOR ONE DAY.

THE BRIDGE.

To reply to all the calumnies which a conscienceless opponent may make would be a wearisome task. It is sufficient to expose some of them. It is to be placed in any of them. We take the Fredericton Bridge which the Gleaner alleges cost \$128,000 and insinuates that Mr. Blair corruptly misappropriated a third of the amount. What are the actual facts of the case? The following are the official figures and show every dollar paid on account of the bridge:

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Cost of Bridge | \$73,662.46 |
| Guard Piers | 7,180.00 |
| Repairs in 1886 | 1,879.93 |
| Sidewalk | 3,000.00 |
| Repairs in 1887 | 1,240.00 |
| Total | \$86,962.39 |

This is absolutely every dollar paid by the department of public works on account of this bridge, or directly or indirectly chargeable to it. Not a dollar is covered up in any other expenditure. There are no figures or amounts published anywhere, or not published; no statement of cost official or non-official, no papers, books, memoranda or anything of the kind, warrant as much as a suspicion that one dollar above \$86,962.39 was spent by the province directly or indirectly on account of the bridge. Mr. Blair in his references to this matter not having the figures by him has to be on, the safe side put the cost as little above this; but these figures are official.

THE STOCK FARM WARRANTS.

Mr. Gregory and the Gleaner insist that no particulars are given of the expenditure of the warrants charged to Mr. Lagrin on account of the Stock Farm. This statement is either wilfully or ignorantly untrue. Every year full details are published both in the Auditor General's Report and the Report on Agriculture. Take last year for example; the details are on page 261 of the Auditor General's Report and on page 147 of the Agricultural report. They show how the warrants were applied and from the statement it appears that of the \$9,042.98 the total amount charged against the Stock Farm, \$105 only were for the expenses of the Secretary of the Board and the two members who constituted the Farm Committee. The remainder of the amount was for rent, manager's salary, expenses incurred by the manager, and for advertising, the several services and the amount for each being published after being audited and found correct. Now either the Auditor General has published a false report or the statements of the Gleaner and Mr. Gregory are unfounded. Do they make these statements wilfully, knowing them to be untrue or ignorantly? In either case they show how untrustworthy are the charges they make against the administration.

LET YORK STAND BY HER GUNS.

The opposition endeavor to score a point against the Attorney General by pointing out that his traveling expenses are larger than some of his predecessors. Granting this is true, it proves nothing. It does not follow that the travel was not necessary in the public interests. Indeed it is known that no attorney general ever traveled as much on public business as Mr. Blair has done. But objects the Gleaner, Mr. Blair is not properly chargeable to the Attorney General. He may have and he may not have; but whether he has or not what proof is there that he ever charged railway fares in his traveling expenses? Mr. Blair's course probably is to charge for traveling expenses what those expenses are, and if he does not pay railway fares not to charge for them. In six years the Gleaner says the traveling expenses of the Attorney General have been over \$4,154. This is not true, for in the annual included the expenses of several delegations to Ottawa and elsewhere, and are not properly chargeable to the Attorney General but to other members of the government with him. There is no pretence that he ought not to have gone on the delegations, no pretence that his other travel was not all perfectly right and for the public service. It is not alleged that any body else could have done the same amount of traveling for less money. Only the unfounded allegation is made and harped upon that the Attorney General charges as expenses sums that he does not pay out. This charge is absolutely without foundation.

Vote Blair a Big Fear.

CHARLOTTE SENDS THE SURVEYOR General back with three colleagues; King's, the Solicitor General and two colleagues; Gloucester, the Chief Commissioner and one colleague. These counties vote confidence in the government by sending a full contingent in its support. Is it good policy for York to divide its support—to send enemies of the government to represent it? Is Mr. Blair too strong in the government for the interests of York? Charlotte, King's and Gloucester have made themselves solid with the government. Will York publish to the province that she has too much influence with the administration? It would be bad policy; the worst of policy in the light of what these counties have done, counties represented in the government, for York to refuse to return a full ticket. For the government will be sustained throughout the province. Make no mistake about that; it will be handsomely sustained. Therefore it is the interest of York to strengthen the hands of her representative in the government, so that other counties may not be able to say: "We have given the government a better support than York and have stronger claims upon it."

Vote the Ticket.

ELECTORS OF YORK whom will you sacrifice on the altar of Mr. Gregory's morbid jealousy? Will it be John Anderson—a successful farmer and business man—a practical working man, who knows his county and what its necessities are? Will it be Richard Bellamy who has five years been an honored and valuable representative? Is the only return the county can make him to vote want of confidence in him? Will it be William Wilson who has served the county as well and faithfully, and shown himself to be always active for its best interests? William Wilson is a son of York, if ever a man was—one who from humble beginnings has made himself known and respected all over the province. Will it be Andrew G. Blair, the best representative York ever had, the successful leader of the government, the astute and able public man? Which will you sacrifice? Your answer will be neither. There is nothing to gain by the sacrifice. You can gain nothing by weakening your influence with a government which will come back from the people with its strength in other parts of the province undiminished.

Two from the City and Two from the Country is a Fair Deal.

THE TICKET REPRESENTS THE WHOLE COUNTY.

THE Gleaner pretends to have had a discussion with THE HERALD on the finances of the province and that the latter has withdrawn from it. There has been no such discussion. Mr. Wilson's masterly presentation of the financial record of the province as published in THE HERALD extra last week gave the fullest possible refutation to the Gleaner's charges. He showed that instead of over-expenditure, the government in the five years it has been in power has kept the expenditure \$56,000 within the income, and yet has gained by saving a man to than any of its predecessors. It could do this because it had a greater income than any of its predecessors, and surely the county expects the income to be expended. Briefly the position is this. The present government from the province in debt on open account \$330,000. It paid off \$250,000 by issuing bonds and undertook to pay off the remaining \$80,000 out of revenue. It has done this. It has increased many important lines of new expenditure. It has had to pay interest on new railway subsidies. It has enlarged the Lunatic Asylum, bought and built upon the Asylum Annex Farm, built the Fredericton bridge, bought the government horses, built the government stables, built the new Departmental buildings and had public services up to the standard and has to-day cash in hand in the bank. The showing is a splendid one, and the facts cannot be controverted.

THE TICKET REPRESENTS THE WHOLE COUNTY.

IN ST. JOHN and elsewhere a constant canvass against the government is that it is "too much for York." The opposition proclaim it whenever they go that Blair gets too much for his county. Is it true, electors of York? Have you had more than your just rights? Will you play the game of the opponents of York by weakening the hands of the Attorney General? That is to be gained by sending a man to the House, who day and night, in season and out of season, will plot and plan to injure your representative in the government? Mr. Gregory represents no principle. He promises no reform. He advocates no new measures. He simply seeks to get what he can by any means. He is the government. Defeat him he cannot; but has York no better return for the conduct of its representatives during the last four years than to send their most bitter opponent to the assembly? The election of George E. Gregory would be a calamity for York. He can do the county no good. He seeks only to do Mr. Blair harm.

Farmers of York Stand by the Country Candidates.

FOR TWO YEARS the county has been deluged with falsehoods concerning the Attorney General and his friends. The slanders which ingenuity can devise have been spread far and near, and the man, in whom the whole province has confidence, who has gone through session after session of the legislature without the slightest imputation upon his integrity, is held up to the county of York as unworthy to every trust, as corrupt and dishonest. Does the county of York believe these things of Mr. Blair? Can they point to an act of his which will not stand scrutiny? Who are the men who assail him? Under what obligation have they ever laid this county? What guarantee have they ever given of honor and political wisdom? Compare the records of Mr. Blair and Mr. Gregory and judge for yourselves, electors of York, which of them will be your fittest representative.

Vote for York.

THE ST. JOHN Sun and the opposition candidates are persistent in their attacks on the government expenditures in York. They contend the length and breadth of the City and County of St. John the cry is being raised that York gets too much. Every dollar that has been spent here is being used as a reason why six men should be sent from St. John in opposition. They call on the electors to oppose the government because it built the Fredericton bridge. They cry out that the government should be defeated because the stables were erected here. They attack the Provincial Secretary for consenting to the erection of the new Departmental buildings here. Vote down the York government in the cry of the opposition in St. John. Electors of York stand together. There is only one answer to make these men who assail you, and those who have stood by you, and that is to vote the full government ticket.

Give Blair a Big Fear.

THE Gleaner says: "Unless all signs fail five counties alone, Northumberland, Kent, Westmorland, Albert and St. John, will give their support to the ticket. It is not true but suppose it is) does not the Gleaner's main argument fall to the ground? That paper wants Mr. Gregory elected to form the nucleus of a good opposition and this is his own principal argument. Now if what the Gleaner professes to believe is true, there will be opposition enough without Mr. Gregory and York will do well to stand by the ticket.

Vote the Ticket.

MR. ALLEN might have corroborated what Mr. Blair said as to land owners speculating in riparian rights. Mr. Allen knows that his own brother-in-law made a handsome thing by selling certain riparian rights of his. It is reported that \$1000 was his share of the price. Mr. Beckwith had a perfect right to sell his riparian rights and every one was pleased that he got a good price for them. Reference is made to the transaction only to show that land owners will sell their rights and do not consider them valuable except to speculate upon.

LOOK AT THE EXPENDITURES IN YORK.

LOOK AT THE EXPENDITURES IN YORK! "and vote for the government if you can." Electors of York will do well to note this appeal. The sole bond of harmony between the several factions of the opposition is the expenditures in York. Electors of York will give no comfort to such an opposition. THE Gleaner falsely alleges that Mr. Theriault is in opposition. He is a pronounced government supporter. It alleges that Messrs. LaBilloy and Murray are independents. They are pronounced government supporters.

ON THE HUSTINGS.

A Cyclone of Enthusiasm for the Government Ticket.

THE OPPOSITION PARALYZED BY THE PROCEEDINGS ON NOMINATION DAY.

THE OPPOSITION CLACQUERS OVERSHADOWED BY A SOLID PHALANX OF GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS. PITY GRIEVANCES, AND PERSONAL CANVASSES EXPOSED. MR. BLAIR'S TELLING SPEECH. MR. WILSON RIDDLES MR. GREGORY. ANDERSON AND BELLAMY MAKE A GRAND IMPRESSION. GREGORY AND ALLEN STUFFY THEMSELVES BEFORE THE ELECTORS.

THE SHERIFF'S COURT for the nomination of candidates to contest the local elections opened in the Court House about eleven o'clock Monday morning, Sheriff Sterling presiding. There was a large number of electors present. The only thing done in the Court House was the nomination of the six candidates who are in the field. The speeches were delivered in the City Hall in the afternoon. Messrs. Blair, Wilson, Bellamy and Anderson were nominated by the following:

- Alfred Rowley, Maryville,
- Loran C. McNutt, Fredericton,
- Wm. Richards, Nashwaak,
- John Owens, Fredericton,
- Wm. Lemont,
- Walter McFarlane, St. Marys,
- Elisha Vanwart,
- Rainford Staples,
- Frederic Thompson, Fredericton,
- Richard A. Esty,
- John A. Morrison,
- David Pugh, Maryville,
- Robert L. Young, Nashwaak,
- Thomas Murray, Douglas,
- John A. Edwards, Fredericton,
- C. L. Estabrook, St. Marys,
- Fred. B. Edgecombe, Fredericton,
- Jas. S. McMurray,
- Wm. E. Seawright,
- Geo. L. Gunter,
- M. McDade,
- Matthew Tennant,
- Robert Davies,
- Wm. T. Jesty,
- Elias W. Henry,
- Benj. A. Everett,
- Benj. A. Thoms,
- Andrew G. Haslin,
- W. T. Whitehead,
- Henry Chestnut, Fredericton,
- Joe. C. Risten,
- M. S. Hall,
- James Dever,
- Luther Goodspeed, Peniac,
- Frank I. Morrison, Fredericton,
- Jones Rowan, Doaktown,
- Timothy Lynch, Fredericton,
- Ludlow Ferras,
- Alfred Haines, St. Marys,
- J. W. Wetmore, Fredericton,
- A. G. Edgecombe,
- John A. Canty, Fredericton,
- John A. Campbell, Kingsclear,
- H. C. Mackay,
- George Blaney, Lower St. Marys,
- B. M. Mullins, St. Marys,
- Jas. E. Simmons,
- Geo. N. Bookout, Fredericton,
- E. A. Barry, St. Marys,
- Wm. Bearisto, Fredericton,
- M. A. Brewer, Keswick,
- John F. Miles, St. Marys,
- W. A. Barker,
- H. O'Brien, Fredericton,
- Wm. A. Quinn,
- Oliver Barton,
- R. Boone, Douglas,
- John Edney,
- Geo. Y. Dibble, Fredericton,
- Frank Bird, Bright,
- Tennant Christie, Bright,
- Benj. Burt, Douglas,
- Henry Burt, Bright,
- J. E. Casey, Dumfries,
- H. W. Vevey, North Lake, and hundreds of others.

Mr. Gregory was nominated as an Independent by the Alderman Moore, Z. R. Everett, Jas. H. Crockett, Wm. Crockett, M. D. Osele Crockett, Charlie Crockett, J. G. Gill, Lewis H. Bliss, J. B. Gunter, Chas. E. Duffy, Jas. T. Sharkey and about twenty others.

Mr. W. K. Allen was also nominated as an opposition candidate by the same gentlemen. Shortly after one o'clock the City Hall was packed to its utmost capacity, by a large and representative gathering of the electors of the city and county.

THE RISING OF HON. MR. BLAIR.

TO address the audience was the signal for long-continued applause. After a few preliminary remarks he proceeded to deal with the juvenile canvasses which had formed the stock-in-trade of Mr. Gregory in this campaign. It was not a difficult thing, he said, for an astute lawyer as Mr. Gregory was, to frame an indictment against the government by picking up little things here and there, and spreading these things among the people where there would be little opportunity of meeting them. It was impossible that he could

reach the mind of every elector and touch upon just the points that had influenced him in his particular case. He would rely upon the justice of his cause, upon the record of the government and upon its claims upon this county, and, doing that, he had no doubt whatever about the result of the contest now being waged in this constituency. (Applause.) "I am confident that the people of this province, if of no other county in this province, will have no disposition to condemn the government and allow the impression to be created abroad, and among its enemies, that it has had any portion of the confidence of the people of York withdrawn from it."

He was now appealing to the electors of York for the eighth time, and

THE EIGHTH SILENT TIME.

It had never been his privilege to be elected by acclamation in this County. Other counties which considered that they had not received the same attention at the hands of the government as York had received were returning the supporters of the government without opposition. In Restigouche, Gloucester, Kings, Queens, Charlotte and Madawaska the government supporters had to-day been elected by acclamation. In all these counties, where the people had just as fair an opportunity of judging of the merits of the government as those of York had possessed, no fault was found with the government, and the government representatives were being sent back with renewed expressions of confidence. This contest was not a question of men, but a question of policy, a question of the conduct of the administration during the past three years. The ballots of the people on the 20th inst would be either for or against the administration, and therefore he proposed to deal with the acts of the administration as far as the limited time would allow in order that the people might be able to judge of its merits or demerits.

When the party which he had led for so many years was in opposition their position was not a mere negation; they placed their platform before the country and he was willing that that platform should be critically examined in the light of the subsequent acts of the present government. He was satisfied that any candid man examining the record of the administration could not but conclude that while they had not accomplished everything they had intended, yet in large measure they had achieved the results aimed at and promised to the people of this Province.

He showed how the Government had grappled with

THE QUESTION OF THE CROWN LANDS.

There had been a practice on the part of the old Government of giving the public lands to railway companies and private individuals at the most nominal figures. It was the policy of this Government—a policy that they had steadily adhered to, that it was better for the people that the Crown Lands, the timber lands of the country especially, should be held by the people for the people for all time to come. The Government decided to hold possession of these lands in order that the best possible results could be realized from this very valuable property. They had pursued the policy previously pursued, as a result of which, since this government had come in, not a single acre of timber lands had been sold, but were held to augment the revenues of the Province. At that time the stumpage was raised first to \$1 per thousand and afterwards to \$1.25. They had done that because there was no reason why private owners of forest lands should be deriving from those lands a rate of stumpage largely in excess of what the lands of the Crown had realized. That position they had maintained as a Government against strong opposition and persistent local pressure. Against the constant pressure of the North Shore Counties the Government had firmly held its ground. That was the secret today of the opposition to the Government in Kent and Northumberland.

Mr. Blair then took up the question of the fisheries and explained the course of the Government. There was not a man in that audience who had been in the Government, after a careful examination of the question, would not have pronounced precisely the same course which the Government had adopted with reference to this subject.

The speaker then proceeded to show what the government had done for

THE AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF THE COUNTRY.

The government had grappled with that subject boldly and taken a most active interest in the farming interests of the province even though a large outlay of money was involved in so doing. A large importation of horses and sheep had been made. The government had not swayed the criticisms from all quarters on that subject, but the great body of the people had clearly and distinctly commended the policy pursued in this regard. Since the government had adopted this policy of promoting the interests of the farmers of the country, they had had communications from several of the other provinces of Canada, anxious to know what system had been adopted in order that they might inaugurate a similar policy, and the year after this system was adopted he was pleased to see it declared that it was the intention of the Imperial Government to adopt a system which in all substantial details resembled ours. The Agricultural Act as it had stood for the last eighteen or twenty years had been taken hold of by the government and remodelled in very many respects which had been of substantial service to the people of this country. Under the old law the Agricultural Societies were so distributed in the province that no matter how large or small a county was it received the same proportion of the agricultural grant. The government had concluded that it was unjust that a county like Sunbury should receive the same grant as the County of York. The whole province had therefore been divided into the result that while the number of societies had not been increased in York and other large counties the number of societies had been doubled and therefore were now receiving

DOUBLE THE AMOUNT OF AGRICULTURAL GRANTS.

They formerly received. The government had dealt as generously and liberally as it