

Policy, that it was devised to bring about that state of things, but it has not brought about reciprocity.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I never advocated to the contrary.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have never had the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman on the stump, and consequently I do not venture to contradict him. I simply say that the opinion to which he has given expression is different to that entertained by his party, and differs entirely from that of another distinguished gentleman, Sir Alex. Galt, and entirely from the opinions of those who have changed from free-trade to protection. All of them advocate, so far as I know, a reciprocity treaty, and therefore the opinions expressed by my hon. friend from Lunenburg are exceptional. I hope his opinions will not prevail. There is nothing visible on the surface of anything being done during the last six years to procure this boon which is foreshadowed in this resolution, but I do trust that in future some steps will be taken. We see every evidence in the case of negotiations favoring Newfoundland, which is unfettered by this Confederacy, that Mr. Bayard, one of the Cabinet Ministers at Washington, is quite in accord with that view of things, that closer trade relations should exist with bordering countries, and in fact, according to Sir Ambrose Shea, he indicated that while the Government were prepared to consider the question, they preferred considering it in its relations to the whole British dominions on this continent.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Sir Ambrose Shea was not acting for the Newfoundland Government.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have not said that he was.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—That was the impression conveyed to the House.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am giving his expression of opinion in favor of negotiating reciprocal trade relations towards which we are all so favorable.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Have not our Governments given intimations that they are ready for a reciprocity treaty?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—They may have given a great many intimations of their readiness, but I do not see many results from it. Another observation was that the West India trade was largely developed by the National Policy, and that our ships are more employed, and my hon. friend repeated it several times in order to give it more emphasis. I feel inclined to take issue with him as to the correctness of his statements. As far as I have heard from that province, I would come to the conclusion that the West India trade of Halifax is greatly impaired by the National Policy.

HON. MR. POWER—It is ruined.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg then refers to the fishermen, to which reference I have replied. He says Halifax is prosperous, and has largely increased its exports; that coal is cheaper to the consumer. That was not the argument used by the gentlemen from Nova Scotia in 1870, a number of whose speeches I did not quote from to-day; some of them unfortunately have departed from us, and others are yet in this Chamber. That is not the argument of Sir Alexander Galt. That is not the statement, as far as I know, of anyone else who discusses these trade questions. I think the hon. gentlemen who represent the city of St. John would be able to throw some light on the question, whether the duty has increased the price of coal. I think the people of New Brunswick have some reason to feel that their taxes are very considerably increased in consequence of the amount of coal they are obliged to use that is increased by the additional duty. And then my hon. friend says that no necessities of life are dearer, but meat and farm produce are cheaper. His argument is peculiar in this way; that one end of his sentence differs from the other, and therefore one end of it must always be right. Then he goes on to say, on several occasions, that bread is not dearer at all—that the duty on flour and corn meal does not tend to make any difference in the price.