

on leave of absence. While Mr. Young was on leave of absence he was paid \$150, four months' pay, and yet this sum of \$150 did not appear anywhere in the public accounts. Had the Minister paid it himself? He hoped so, for he could not see any other way in which it could justifiably be given. The sums concerning which inquiry was made were \$375, which was paid for ten months' services, the \$169 for twelve months' rent allowance which he received, though he went on leave of absence on the last of October, 1892, and was paid for the full year 1892 and two months of 1893; the gratuity of \$330, which he received, and the \$150 which he received as payment during the four months during which he was on leave of absence. He hoped the Minister could reconcile this case with some others which had occurred. It was not a case of his being no longer needed, for Mr. Stewart was appointed at once to take his place. There seemed no set rule adopted in such cases, and impotency seemed the chief thing necessary. There was no justification for the rent allowance; there was none for the four months' salary, and it should be explained why Mr. Stewart took Mr. Young's place. There had been a recent case in which a gratuity had been granted. Wherein did the cases differ?

Hon. Mr. Gibson said there was no objection to all the information in regard to this matter being brought down. The papers would give a full explanation of the matter. He had not yet had an opportunity of seeing them, the question having been only a day or two on the order paper, but he remembered the circumstances of the case pretty well. His recollection of the case was that Mr. Clancy was quite wrong in putting the case as a dismissal. Mr. Young had resigned. The real facts were these:—While there was really nothing against Mr. Young's character, or, perhaps, against his efficiency as farm instructor, and while he was faithful to his duty, yet he was very unsuccessful in his mode of treating the boys. While he was in a position which required that they should treat him with respect, and that he should have full control over them whenever they were under his charge, he really possessed no control over them, and they were able to do pretty much as they pleased. The attention of the Government was called to the matter by the Warden and the Deputy Warden. It was at once considered how much it would be to the interest of the institution to make a change. It was not proposed at all to investigate the character of the officer. It was a case of dealing with an official who did not appear to be qualified for the position he was filling. There was no object or motive whatever for making a change other than that named.

It would be easily understood that a man in such a position should have the confidence of the boys and should be able to exercise due control over them. Mr. Young was a well-meaning man, but failed in this respect. The Inspector spoke to the former about his failure, and sought to bring about his resignation and replace him by a man better fitted for the position. Mr. Young, not unnaturally, did not want to resign. It was thought at first that possibly some other position might have been found in the public service somewhere for which he would have been fit, and to which he could have been transferred. This, however, proved not possible. He was, therefore, given leave of absence for a time, and as he had been in the employ of the Government for some years and was a thoroughly faithful officer it had been thought only proper that on leaving he should receive the small gratuity indicated. As to the question of rent allowances, he thought all the different officials at the institution in question had received such allowances for some years past. The farmer was no doubt on the same footing as the rest. There was not room in the institution for them, but there were a good many houses around in which which there was plenty of room. In Mr. Young's case the usual practice had been followed. When the papers came down the hon. gentlemen would see the facts were just as he had stated them to be.

Mr. Clancy rejoined that, at all events, Mr. Young had been seven years in the service of the Government before it was discovered that he was unfit for the place. It was a most extraordinary course which the Government had pursued, practically asserting that Mr. Young's claim for a gratuity lay in his unfitness for the place. He was charged with being useless, and yet had been paid upwards of \$500 more than he was legally entitled to. This would be an inducement to unsuccessful men. A man who could not secure a good position would simply have to fold his arms, plead his lack of success and claim a gratuity. He could not see that inefficiency was any claim for a gratuity, and could not praise the system under which the Government appeared to act. As a matter

of fact, it looked as if the gratuity was granted because there was reason to fear trouble—some revelations.

Hon. Mr. Gibson—No, no. The hon. gentleman will find that he is entirely wrong.

Mr. Clancy—We will see when the papers come down. He went on to say that he considered that what the Minister had said constituted but a lame excuse, and his explanation did not accord with the explanations offered for other cases. The order was then passed.

AGRICULTURAL HALL.

Mr. Meredith moved for an order of the House for a return giving the amount expended in the year 1882 for alterations and repairs to Agricultural Hall. Also, of the proportions of the amounts so expended which were, according to the report of Mr. Tully, Engineer of the Public Works Department, to be paid by the Agriculture and Arts Association, Mr. Philip Jamieson (the tenant), and by the Province respectively. Also, of the dates of payments and amounts still remaining unpaid. Also, a copy of the lease or agreement with Mr. Jamieson for renting to him the shop in the hall, entered into in the year 1882, or now subsisting.

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Meredith said he desired to call attention to the irregular proceedings on the part of the Government in the matter in hand, and the loose way in which transactions which did not exactly appear before the House were dealt with. Mr. Jamieson had been a tenant of Agricultural Hall since 1882. In that year the Department of Agriculture assumed to lend to the Agriculture and Arts Association the sum of \$11,396 25, to make certain repairs and enlargements to the building. It was understood that the Agricultural Department of the Province would occupy a portion of the premises after the repairs had been made. It was understood in the first place that the alterations would cost only \$5,000. There was an investigation into the matter before the Public Accounts Committee in 1884, and the most slipshod proceedings were shown in connection with it. The money was lent and the work entered upon without any arrangement at all with the various parties to the transaction, though it was understood that the association, the Government and the tenant, Mr. Jamieson, were to divide the cost of the repairs between them. The expenditure was incurred also without any vote of the Legislature. At the examination before the Public Accounts Committee Mr. Tully had stated that the proportion in which the expenditure was to be borne by the different parties was as follows:—By Mr. Jamieson, \$2,031 80; by the Agriculture and Arts Association, \$6,298 94; by the Province, \$3,149 47; making a total of \$11,480 51. Mr. Jamieson was examined before the Public Accounts Committee, and disputed his liability for that amount, but admitted his liability to pay something. The proceedings also showed that Mr. Jamieson was to pay a rent of \$1,800 annually for the ten years ending in March, 1892, and an additional \$200 for heating, etc. Now, he found no money had been paid at all on account of Mr. Jamieson's liability for the repairs. The matter had been simply allowed to drift. The Agri-

culture and Arts Association paid \$2,000 in 1884, and no more. In the public accounts of 1888 the association appeared as indebted to the Province for \$2,000, which amount did not appear in the accounts of the following year, or subsequently. Mr. Jamieson during ten years had not paid a cent on account of the liability he had admitted before the committee. The building was encumbered also by a mortgage of \$10,000, for which the association nominally, but practically the Government, was paying 7 per cent., while they were getting only 4 per cent. from the banks on money lying to their credit. Was that businesslike, he wanted to know? Another thing: When Mr. Jamieson's lease expired in 1892, it was renewed on the same terms as those on which it was made in 1882, though rents in that part of the city had greatly increased in the meantime. He did not know whether or not the fact that Mr. Jamieson was an active supporter of the Government, and at one time was spoken of as a likely candidate, had anything to do with this or not.

Hon. Mr. Dryden said Mr. Meredith appeared to argue in this matter as if the Province dealt entirely with the building in question, which was really owned by the Agriculture and Arts Association. He complained because the present tenant did not pay enough rent. Now, the Agriculture and Arts Association was an association organized by statute, and composed of delegates from agricultural societies all over the Province. In the act to consolidate and amend the agriculture and arts act the powers and duties of the council!