

man's authority to-night. James Thomson, when he wrote this article was against the hon. gentleman; he has turned no doubt to his side, and having turned and made a somersault on unrestricted reciprocity the hon. gentleman takes him up and quotes his statistics. On that occasion the hon. gentleman—and it would a help to our side of the discussion if he had repeated his argument—was also reported to have said:

"He went into the question thoroughly showing that the benefits of protection would be for the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec."

Does the hon. gentleman repudiate that argument now? Does he say that protection is not a benefit for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec? As to Mr. Thomson, here is one extract from the *Chronicle*:

"Mr. James Thomson was dealt with in a manner that would have stirred the people to indignation against him, if they had not been overcome by the ludicrous aspect of the case."

They ridiculed him as a candidate for a judgeship; they ridiculed him for the manner in which he handled figures and called him "Baron Statistics"; and yet the hon. gentleman asks the House to take his statements as to assessments. My hon. friend knows well, that in reference to that statement of Mr. Thomson's, two things can be said. If it be true, according to the assessment rolls of Nova Scotia, that property happens to have had a lower value in 1884 than it had in 1868, the hon. gentleman knows that the burning question in local politics in that Province is, how to get a fair and rational and sensible assessment, how to get the property assessed at its proper and true value; and he knows that that argument is puerile and weak, whether it came from "Baron Statistics" or any other baron. He knows that property in Nova Scotia reached a boom value immediately after Confederation. He knows that the promises which he held up to ridicule as deluding the people as to the

wonderful prosperity that was going to come to them, raised the value of property to an abnormal value in 1868, and the value has no doubt since gone down to its proper and normal level. But the hon. gentleman knows that the statistics I read to-night from the authorised publications of the repeal Government give a full and complete answer as to whether the province is poorer or richer than it was before. Now, I have taken up considerable time, Mr. Speaker. I have carried my remarks further than I intended; but young as I am, and mindful of the rebuke I received in this house a session ago that when a member, authorised by the people of Nova Scotia, should speak, and when he should not, should be gauged by the years of that member, and yet remembering the liberal sentiment which pervades this house, I felt justified in taking up some time in quoting from the mouths of these hon. gentlemen and their friends throughout the country, to show that this movement, first of commercial union, now of unrestricted reciprocity, vague, indefinite, meaningless, about which hon. gentlemen on the other side are now squabbling and disagreeing among themselves, was nothing more nor less than a small and petty dodge of a very desperate and hopelessly beaten political party in the Dominion of Canada. These hon. gentlemen have made specious promises before; but I will tell them in all these political wiles, as someone has said: "You can fool some of the people all the time, you can fool all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool a majority of the people all the time."

Mr. RINFRET moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.