

millions a year on public works, but during the time the present Government"—

Those hon. gentlemen who preached retrenchment and reform from 1867 down to 1874—

"they have spent on an average of six millions a year. That is the best evidence of the way the money is being expended by this Administration."

They gloried in the expenditure then, and of course my hon. friend would not go back upon the policy of aiding railways and local subsidies, because he knows that having regard to this question of bribery, he knows that he claimed the Government ought to do more than it has done in that province of Nova Scotia. He knows that he and his party have wrung the changes from one end of Nova Scotia to the other, to the effect that we have been neglected since Confederation in regard to railway expenditure, and that the Government ought to have built those railways long ago which they promised to build, and I say they are carrying out their promise in this respect as they have in all others. I thought the question of bribery was settled last year, when the late leader of the Opposition discussed the matter with the present Minister of Finance, and when the present Minister of Finance was able to read the language of that gentleman and that party's lieutenant in Nova Scotia, when he came down to a public meeting and promised there a far larger expenditure on railways to the province of Nova Scotia if they would only support the Liberal party. I thought that matter was threshed out then. It does seem extraordinary that this hon. gentleman's allies down in the province should have blamed us at public meetings for not spending enough money, and then formulate an indictment against us in the house for having spent so much. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion will not be fruitful; that it will not aid us, at least with the United States, to obtain unrestricted reciprocity by washing this dirty linen of Nova Scotia, which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House of Commons of Canada, and which will bring neither credit to him nor to the people who sent him here. Now we have the record of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He took up a large portion of the time of this house by telling us the other night about the effect this duty had upon our barley, and about our dependence upon the American market and that we had to pay a duty on all

the products which we send into that market. When the late Government was in power, that Government which spent their money with such a lavish hand—when they occupied the treasury benches, when also the late George Brown had failed to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, the hon. gentleman's opinion was of another kind. At Simcoe in February, 1878, he made a speech, and I ask the attention of the house to this, for the argument answers the very weak and disingenuous argument he addressed on the other side of the question during this debate. The hon. gentleman said:—

"It may be claimed that the agricultural interest has been interested by the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty. With one single exception the average prices we have received since the abrogation of that treaty have been higher than they were when the treaty was in force. In 1875 we exported 5,400,000 bushels of barley, and imported less than 5,000 bushels. Our business in the exportation of barley; it may be that the American duty reduced the amount exported somewhat, but, of course, we cannot help that as we do not make that treaty and cannot reduce it, but that state of things will not continue longer. We have opened up a great export trade of barley with England, and England will take our whole crop. We can say to the United States: If you pay us the same price for this barley less the cost of transportation which England pays, you may have it."

He continued to point out that in reference to peas, beans, and other articles, it was the American that paid the duty, and not the Canadian. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, coming again to that speech that was addressed to us to-night by the hon. member for Halifax, (Mr. Jones), I would like to call the attention to the authority he has brought before the house on the question of the assessment of property in Nova Scotia. I think the hon. gentleman is bold. I think the hon. gentleman proved his boldness by quoting, in support of his argument on the coal trade, a letter quoted by the hon. the late member for Digby, which was answered by that gentleman's own letter; but he is a far bolder man when he quotes this statement of James Thomson, of the city of Halifax, in reference to statistics. Mr. Thomson is the man that came, in 1878, under the lash of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). That hon. gentleman held this same James Thomson up to ridicule in the city of Halifax; that hon. gentleman amused his audience by picturing this man as a comical statistician and that hon. gentleman christened him "Baron Statistics." Now "Baron Statistics" is the hon. gentle-