

tra grant for the road and bridge service. Our financial position, when the expenses of our great public works are assumed by the General Government, would be far better than it would be if we remained without uniting ourselves with the other Provinces. Then we have made a large saving in the public expenditure by the measures we have passed this Session in reference to the local constitution. The hon. member says we have increased the public debt by \$200,000; suppose we had, although I deny the accuracy of his statements, have we got nothing to show for it? How long will it take us to make up that amount? If he looks at the Provincial Building being constructed opposite, at the extension of the Hospital for the Insane, the St. Peter's Canal, and other works of Provincial importance, he will soon find where \$200,000 has gone to. But before I conclude, let me allude to another matter which was a disputed point between us. He questioned the accuracy of my memory as to the amount expended in connection with laying the corner stone of the Asylum. I gave the amount at £300, but he stated it was only £320. Now I must admit that I was wrong, and I cheerfully make the correction required. But how was I mistaken? Why, I understated the amount. I find on referring to a speech of Mr. Howe, that that gentleman gives it at £313 7s. 10. I hope, therefore, the hon. member will acknowledge that my version is at least as reliable as his own.

MR. ANNAND—I feel it due to acknowledge an inaccuracy in stating the amount expended by the late Government in the entertainment to which the Provincial Secretary has referred. I spoke, not from memory, but from information given by a friend who sat beside me. But I cannot allow the Provincial Secretary to sit down without replying to the remark in which he accused me of being an obstructionist. I tell him that in all the valuable services which the Government have rendered I was with him. I never voted against the grant for education, nor for roads and bridges, nor navigation securities; I never opposed the extension of the railway to Picton. It is true that I differed from the Government on some points of policy, and I have felt it my duty to bring them to book and to ask them why they have not redeemed the pledges which they gave to the country. The Provincial Secretary has referred again and again to the action of the People's delegates on the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. My remark that the road would not pay grease for the wheels was the remark of an eminent engineer who had given the subject his attention,—and I must say that my faith in that road, as a means of through traffic, was very much shaken by the report of Mr. Fleming. After a very thorough examination, that gentleman demonstrated that the railway would not be a paying concern, and he led us to believe that the terminus would be at St. John. But, as Mr. McLelan proved the other day, our revenues would have enabled us to build the road ourselves, and would have enabled us to go on extending our roads East and West to the extreme boundaries of our Province. When I am told that that work is to be a great boon, I ask what are we to pay for it? On four articles alone we are to pay \$300,000 a year; that, with the in-

crease of the ad valorem duties, would give half a million of dollars, and the entire cost of the road, £3,000,000 at 4 per cent., would only be \$600,000. And, let me ask, what is to become of our railway extension hereafter? Who supposes that we will get it from Canada, with their grand projected fortifications and their expensive canal extension? But even if the railroad were a great boon, it would be no compensation for the loss of our government and our revenues. We were told the other day by the Attorney General that the People's delegates continued to oppose the guarantee for the railway even after the Confederation bill had passed. I tell him he is entirely wrong, and I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Howe stating that the moment he and his friends found Confederation was sure to pass, they withdrew their opposition to the railway. I make that explanation in justice to Mr. Howe; and as for myself, I could not offer opposition when I was on this side of the water.

The Attorney General also taunted us with not having presented the petitions from the people. Let me tell him that that taunt does not become him or his colleagues, for I have good reason to believe that they did their best to prevent our being recognized at the Colonial Office, but in that step they did not succeed—we were heard; and they then used every exertion to prevent the voice of the people from being heard. But the Attorney General should have known better than to charge us with not presenting those petitions, for the records of the Imperial Parliament show that those petitions were presented by Admiral Erskine, on the 5th of March, while the bill was in committee. It is stated to have been the largest petition presented to the Commons of England.

I have been told that the press under my control represented the country as in a bankrupt condition before Confederation; at that time I was not here, and I do not know that I ever read the articles referred to, but is it not a fact that money could not be procured to meet the checks drawn on the treasury of this Province.

HON. FIN. SEC.—It is not true, and never was.

MR. ANNAND continued:—I am not able to state the facts from my own knowledge, but the general impression in the community to this day is that the assertions were true, and that being the case, it was the duty of the press to represent the facts. The Provincial Secretary has said that we cannot expect to get so large a sum hereafter for our roads and bridges, but let me ask why not? We have seen the revenue increase in one year by \$185,000, being \$35,000 more than the interest on the Picton railway, and if our customs revenue had not been taken away, and handed over to another country, we could have covered the country from end to end with roads. I would like to see the face of the Province covered with railways; and as to the Annapolis road, I may say that I think that line should have been carried on by paying a company a subsidy for twenty years, and then we would be done with the liability, and could have gone on with our extensions. The subsidy would then have been returned to the treasury, to be re-employed in the construction of other railways and public works. Thus the country would have gone on and prospered, and blossomed as the rose. But