

"You ask how the bounty works? Now it works well enough for those it suits. I was always opposed to it. Where do you think the benefit is in giving a boat fisherman two dollars bounty for fishing all the season in a boat, clad in oil clothes and rubber boots, the duty on which will cost him at least five dollars for the year's work. You may say buy Canadian goods—that is where the shoe pinches. They are made and sold under Government protection, consequently poor goods sold at a profit. If they had to depend on the *quality* to sell them, better goods would be made. The sum of \$1 per ton helps very little on a bad voyage—a good trip does not need it. Government had better spend bounty in providing boat shelters, coast improvements, &c."

Now, if the fisherman of Lunenburg, about whom the hon. gentleman speaks so freely, are as intelligent as these—they will, without doubt, come to the same conclusion, and will feel surprised to find themselves so misrepresented by the Hon. Senator in this Parliament. I refer to those letters in answer to what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the fishermen being remunerated for all their taxes. Then the hon. gentleman asks what benefit has the Dominion gained by the expenditure of the present Government in the way of aiding emigration? This is a very pertinent question which he does not answer himself, and no one else does. This country, in my judgment, has gained nothing, but the United States has gained. It has to a large extent done more harm than good; It has provided for a lot of Government favorites and there has been a large expenditure, considerably over half a million of dollars, and I should like to ask the question which the hon. member from Lunenburg has asked—what possible benefit has the Dominion gained by it? The savings bank deposits have already been referred to. Then the hon. gentleman says reciprocity treaties are questionable advantages. My hon. friend knows very well that that was one of the professed objects of the Premier in inaugurating the National Policy. It was advocated chiefly on that basis. I am sure my hon. friend knows that that was one of the arguments used in favor of the National Policy.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—In what way?

HON. MR. McCLELAN.

HON. MR. PLUMB—You are mistaken in saying that the National Policy was advocated on the basis of reciprocity.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says it was not.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I know what I am talking about.

HON. MR. POWER—I doubt it.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will read a resolution which was adopted in the House of Commons, in 1877:—Moved by Sir J. A. Macdonald,—

"That the Speaker do not leave the chair, but that it be resolved that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen, now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and, moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

HON. MR. PLUMB—Through a reciprocity of tariffs.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman from Niagara must understand that, while his ability is recognized, his memory is not always above reproach. It is sometimes defective—notably so in this instance—and like other people, he has his failings, and therefore, I think he might let me proceed. But my hon. friend from Lunenburg differs from his Premier and from almost all the gentlemen in the Lower Provinces of his political stripe, that I have heard discuss this question of protection. Almost all of them have assured our people—the farmer and others who are interested in this reciprocal trade, and who are exceedingly anxious, I may say, to secure reciprocal trade relations with the United States, if possible, on reasonably fair terms—on every occasion I have heard them claim for this National