

ter;—he was dismissed from office on the plea of insubordination. During the controversy, the then government alleged, that he held opinions, respecting the service to which he was attached, which would prevent any government from appointing him, until he gave up such views. The member for Windsor turned to a number of certificates relating to doings at the Lunatic Asylum. Those papers might be very good in themselves, but are of little use in reference to the subject for which they are produced. The certificates, relative to the person having charge of the construction of the work go for nothing, if his conduct be really what it ought not to be. The overseer was not sufficiently temperate for his duties; I do not condemn a man for taking a glass of wine, but I have nothing to do with one who, from that cause, cannot mind his business. Soon after I came to the government, I paid a visit to the works. I found the men sitting about, idle. They did not know who I was, and gave no satisfactory answer to my questions, seeming to think I had no right to enquire. It was then about 11 o'clock of the day; no overseer was present, and the men appeared watching for his arrival. Five men were employed selecting the bricks, and time thus occupied, in consequence of material not being ready for the contractors. While I was making these inspections, other members of government came on the ground, and, on understanding who they were, the men turned to their several employments. An examination of the building proved the existence of many defects. The specifications showed there was no drainage provided for the interior of the building;—and who ever before heard of putting up, even the meanest house in the land, in a gully hole, without any drainage; Yet, for this public building, there was no outside drainage, to keep the premises from flowing with water. There was a tank outside, and a drain from the cellar to the tank; but when the tank overflowed, the water went back again to the cellar. The shrinking was such, that when the building settled, some twenty-three or twenty-seven of the window-sills broke down. There were leaks in various parts of it, and the building materials were not duly prepared, nor cemented by requisite mortar. Stones could be picked from the building, and the hand and part of the arm, could be thrust between the layers, at parts of the walls. I do not blame Mr. Davis, by these remarks; an overseer was there, whose duty it was to see that the work was properly constructed. The building was improperly put up, and cost more than it ought, if proper economy were used. The overseer's accounts came more immediately under my superintendence. I found one charge of £34 for model sashes, which the contractor ought to have provided; and on enquiry from a carpenter, I found that he would make them for £4. Many items appeared mystified in the same way, and sometimes the parties did not seem to know the difference between superficial and solid contents. The account was handed back, but it was returned again, for rather a larger amount, and getting rid of the £34 charge. If a man obtained all the certificates in the city of Halifax, could you continue him under these circumstances? My charge relates to incompetency; I do not believe him dishonest. That was the way in which the late government went on dealing with a public build-

ing. It was to cost £21,000; £17,000 has been now expended, and not more than one-third of the work done, and that done badly. I wondered to hear it said, the other day, that a wall put up to support the building had injured it;—only for that, I believe, part of the building would have tumbled down.

The next part which I notice in the address of the member for Windsor, is that in reference to denominational influence. He spoke of the scenes at the last elections, and said that Catholics were driven to the hustings, to support members of government. Did he know that to be done at Annapolis? or at Pictou? or was it at Guysborough? I deny the charge, as regards the county I represent; and let members opposite make out a satisfactory case if they can. Let them keep to facts. When those charges are read, many who know them to be incorrect, and who did not vote for me before, will do so at another opportunity. The hon. member denied that he was the agitator for Railways; and said that that should be ascribed to Mr. Cogswell, and Mr. Collins, and Mr. G. R. Young. He ought to let the last name alone. That gentleman stood here, and prophetically and emphatically told the country that if the Railways were commenced as a public government work, it would be a fatal error. He said that you would feel it in your road vote, and in your school monies. He is now no more; but his words have come true. You have felt it in both particulars. When I heard the member for Windsor, I thought of the declaration made by myself about his conduct to any man that stood in his way. He had better, I think, let that name alone. The hon. member says that if the late government had made mistakes, had not mistakes occurred elsewhere also? But that is not what I charge against him. When we said that the works would cost more, and that the mode was unwise, we were denounced on the floors of the house, and denounced in the galleries, and met with no little difficulty in passing to and from the house, in consequence of that. If subsequently he had said that he believed the construction of public works in the way contemplated would be beneficial—but that the cost had been underrated, and that he was ready to give all the assistance he could to the works, and that he did not consider those into whose hands the works fall to be enemies of the same,—then the country would give him credit for good intentions and proper conduct. The country was not disinclined to judge men fairly, whether in or out of office; but it objected to the judgment of men who made such mistakes, and who sustained them as these had been. The people were not to be so dealt with—they were foreseeing and would estimate a public man as he deserved. When he forgets himself, and proves that he is not the man he was expected to be, though he may have gone up like a rocket, he may come down like a stick, as has been said on a former occasion.

The hon. member spoke of the Catholic papers abusing the Revd. Mr. Uniacke, and calling him names. When did that take place?—was it to day; or last year? Is he not aware that that was said when the Catholics sustained himself and his party; and where was his sensitiveness then about speaking lightly of Protestant ministers? Where was the Protestant Alliance? Why was that matter brought here? What is necessary