

he would have known that hundreds of thousands of names are sometimes presented. He asked us also why we should not hereafter have as large a sum as hitherto for our roads and bridges. Does he expect an answer to that question when himself and others who are obstructing us, have so lately declared that there would be no means by which the annual liability for the construction of the Annapolis Railway could be met? I can answer him in his own words, but one who heard his declaration to-day, that even with Confederation, by holding on to the subvention, the whole debt connected with that extension would be paid in twenty years, and the picture presented by the future before us would be a most beautiful one to contemplate. If he makes the calculation he will find that, by putting away \$5000 a year, he will effect that object even yet. We were to give \$16,500 a year, under the former arrangement to the Company, and now we are to give \$11,000, so that by investing the balance we will have the debt paid in twenty years. The hon. member ridiculed the idea of Nova Scotia being isolated while the flag of England remained to protect us. Let me ask him if that is the language he always holds, and if he and his colleagues did not say to the people of England that a sufficient number of troops could be raised in the State of New York in a month to take these Colonies from the grasp of England? If that assertion was true, and the Colonies united would be in so bad a position, I ask him where would little Nova Scotia be with her population of 300,000 inhabitants? Her position on the sea renders her more open to attack, unless she has something more reliable than her own resources for defence.

As I said at the outset I have not been able to give much attention to the debate, but I will now refer to the action of the member for North Colchester who, a case in which a complaint was urged against a certain expenditure by the Government. He was a member of the Committee on Public Accounts, and, in connection with his duty, had laid before him certain accounts of the Board of Works concerning which he makes a variety of complaints. Now, I ask, has he done his duty to the other members of the Committee, or not? Did he do his duty to the country, if, having complaints to make, he did not bring them to the notice of the gentlemen operating with him in the Committee? Did he send for the Chairman or any member of the Board of Works to explain the alleged irregularities? As far as I can learn he took no such action, and I regret that the hon. member is not in his place to answer those questions. Why he has thus run away before his conduct was enquired into, is for him to settle with the House, but I can only say that if he desired that justice should be done and a fair investigation had, why did he say nothing in the committee or to the Government about the matters in connection with which he experienced difficulty? It is evident that the correction of the accounts and the saving of the public money were not his objects, for he waited till the committee reported, and then brought here charges against individuals without taking the trouble to ascertain whether they were correct or not. His de-

sire, without doubt, was to get something on which he could attack the Government, making his constituency believe that there was something wrong in the public departments without giving us the slightest opportunity for defence. That is not a position which will recommend itself to the House or to the country, as one that an honorable and prudent man would occupy. The hon. member avoids this by saying that on another subject he applied to the Fin. Secretary's office for information and could not obtain it; but let us see whether he was not going beyond his commission.

It is a safe rule I think that a man who sticks to his business is most likely to be successful in its accomplishment, and let us see what the hon. member's duties were. He is appointed to take up and examine the Public Accounts to 30th Sep., and he went and applied for a statement of balances due by the Collectors to 30th March. This is the information which he complained of not getting, but I hold it was not within the scope of his duty to ask for it; he was arrogating to himself duties which did not belong to him. I do not wish to say anything offensive to the hon. member, but I desire that the public should know that when he was refused that information he had departed from the duty assigned him.

Mr. LONGLEY:—I was not in the House to-day when the hon. member for East Halifax made an attack on the government, and I may not therefore be fully aware of the tenor of his remarks, but I am informed that he made an allusion to the wood contract recently entered into on the Railway Department. Being a party to the contract I am willing to bear my share of responsibility and I think I can shew that the contract was not a disadvantageous one. I will state the prices which the department has paid for wood during the three or four years preceding the commencement of Mr. Hyde's contract, and also the prices paid outside of that contract because the agreement does not include the Windsor branch. In 1863 we paid for wood \$2.31 per cord, in 1864, \$2.38, in 1865, \$2.52, in 1866, \$2.91.

Now it must be borne in mind that though the contract is dated 1st April, 1865, yet up to the year terminating 30th Sept., we had used only 2000 cords from Mr. Hyde, and yet the average price of wood for that year including Mr. Hyde's wood was, as I have said, \$2.91. It is believed that the wood furnished by Mr. Hyde will be worth ten per cent more than that furnished heretofore, because he is not only obliged to keep a large supply on hand, but he is to furnish seasoned wood for shed—assuming, however, the quality to be the same as heretofore, it will be \$2.72 per cord or 19 cents less than the regular price, and if it is to be worth ten per cent more, then its cost would only amount to \$2.00.

But there are other facts to shew that the contract will be advantageous. We paid at Shubenacadie and Stillwater, right in the woods, in 1866, \$2.89 per cord. In 1863 the consumption of wood by the department was 4,150 cords; the consumption in the nine months of 1864 was 3,400 cords; and that of 1866 was nearly 7,000 cords.