

previous twelve years:—1883, 6,130 miles; 1882, 9,922; 1881, 7,870; 1880, 6,139; 1879, 3,801; 1878, 2,263; 1877, 2,019; 1876, 2,278; 1875, 1,333; 1874, 1,844; 1873, 3,630; and 1872, 7,160 miles. These figures include main track only, no account being taken of second tracks or sidings."

The point which my hon. friend must have intended to make was that their business was flourishing, and that they were increasing the construction of railways. That, however, is not correct, according to this, because the mileage of railways constructed during 1884 was not much over half the mileage of 1883, and only a little over one-third of the mileage of 1882. I do not see that he can draw any conclusion in favor of his view that a highly protected country is progressing more rapidly than a free trade country. My hon. friend said that the New South Wales bonds are higher than ours. In that he is correct.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I showed the reason why.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I think he said it was because they had an agent in London.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—An agent in London, to boom them.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It is well known in England that New South Wales is one of the Australian colonies that adheres strictly to free trade, and hence they have laid the basis of a large prosperity which Victoria, Tasmania and surrounding colonies do not possess, and I can inform the House that there is a marked difference in the development of their trade. I was favored with a letter from a clergyman of the Church of England—I am sorry I have not it in my possession now—a very intelligent and well-written letter, describing the trade policies of those colonies, and the better position in which New South Wales stood in consequence of their trade policy as compared with that of the adjoining colonies, and with how much more rapid strides they were progressing and increasing their wealth and commerce, and that there was no disposition in New South Wales to recede from the English plan of free trade.

Y I

HON. MR. MACDONALD—Does the hon. gentleman know what the taxation is per head of New South Wales?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—No.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—It is \$35 or \$40 per head there.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am speaking of this letter from the clergyman. He supposed his views on political questions differed from mine, and he thought that I was wrong, but when I answered him I was able to concur in his opinion. He is a clergyman and not a politician at all.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—New South Wales is prospering although the taxation is high.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman referred to the great expansion of the coal trade in Nova Scotia, as a result of the National Policy, of course. It was in that connection that this statement was made. Now, if my hon. friend will revert back to the history of Nova Scotia, say four decades—40 years—and look at the output of coal during each decade, he will observe that the increase was greater during former decades than during the period in which this National Policy has been in operation. I have a report of the mines of Nova Scotia, according to which the output was one-third more in the decade ending 1860 than in 1850, and in 1870 it was a little more than twice as much as in 1860. In 1880 it shows only an increase of about 50 per cent. over 1870, and for the last four years it has not come up even to the same average.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend must see that during the five years that his party were in power it went down, while during the last five years it has gone up.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—But the contention of the hon. gentleman is that it has increased latterly at a greater ratio than ever before, and I think the figures which I have furnished do no bear out that conclusion. Then my hon. friend referred to the great contentment which exists in Nova Scotia. I would again