

deal of good. How he can possibly reason that the National Policy has been the means of making the crops grow or of inducing the farmers to sow more grain or produce more largely, is beyond my comprehension. It may be the means in this way, that the farmers, finding their resources decreasing, and in order to provide themselves with the necessaries of life, are bound to work harder and produce more; but unless he can show me that the National Policy manures the ground, he cannot prove to me that it is the means of producing more grain. Judging from such wild assertions as these from hon. gentlemen opposite, I have no doubt there are some gentlemen so blind to the operation of the National Policy, as regards the farming interest, that they would actually declare and insist upon it that the National Policy did manure the ground, for they are prepared to insist upon anything; they support the National Policy and will swear by it, you would think they are prepared even to die by it, and I hope they will, politically. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) then admitted that we could not control the market; he admitted that the foreign markets were beyond our control. This is altogether a departure from the statements made at the inauguration of the National Policy, when its advocates claimed we could control the market; they then claimed that the National Policy would bring in a large number of manufactories into operation and bring in a large number of operatives into the country who would consume everything we could produce, and that consequently our farmers and gardeners would have a market at their own doors where they could have remunerative prices for everything they had to sell; that they would, in fact, be independent of the foreign market altogether. The hon. member for Pictou now admits that the National Policy cannot do that. He admits that the predictions of its advocates at the inception of the National Policy some years ago, when they declared Canada would be independent in the matter of markets, that we would be able to adjust this question among ourselves, that our farmers would get glorious prices for what they had to sell, no matter what went on outside, no matter whether there was war or peace or whether things went up or down, these promises have not been realised. We were to have Canada for the Canadians, but all this beautiful prospect has now passed away. I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Montreal advocate the National Policy very strongly, and then admit that after all there was depression in Montreal, that things were not just as nice as they had been in the past. It was rather singular he should have gone so far as to admit that; and with regard to the deputation of which he spoke that was supposed to wait upon Sir John Macdonald in Montreal when a grand banquet was to be given him, denied that there was any such deputation. However, I notice, he could not give any very credible witnesses; and in order to back his statement that there was an abortive effort made by political friends of ours to thwart the glorious entertainment they were going to give the First Minister, he brought a man from the dead to testify that what he said was true. I have a few words to say with regard to the milling interest. I know that there is a strong feeling among Canadian millers that they should have protection, and as far as I am concerned I must say that if the millers amongst others are going to benefit by anything of that kind they are as well entitled to it as other manufactures. If in the interest of the coal producers of the Maritime Provinces, the millers are asked to pay a large amount on the coal they use in their steam mills, they have a right to get back that money in the shape of protection to their flour. I am satisfied it is impossible to do anything in the interest of millers unless a very decided increase of duty is put on flour coming from the United States. The milling interest has suffered in the past and is suffering seriously to-day, and the great diffi-

culty—a difficulty I do not attribute so much to the National Policy—under which they suffer is this. The manufacture of flour in the Western States is very extensive and the rates of freight from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Liverpool are about as cheap as they are from the city of Toronto, so that it is impossible while this state of things exists for the millers of this country to successfully compete with the American producers of flour. I know a very extensive miller in Ontario who has himself told me that if it were not for the substantial character of his plant he would, in his own interests financially, be compelled to pull up stakes and go to a point in the west where he could get his wheat cheaper and the rate of freight to the selling point as cheap as from any point in this Dominion. The only remedy to this would be, in my opinion, if once we became rich enough, to turn our canals into ship canals so that sailing vessels could load at any point on Lake Huron or Lake Superior or any of the lakes and go right through to the Liverpool market. By that means alone we might be able to reduce the rates of freight to our millers that they would be able to compete with the American millers, and until that is done I cannot see how our milling interest can be promoted further than simply to give them a command of our local markets with which they must content themselves since they cannot compete outside.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. CURRAN. I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman who has the floor made the following statement in his speech to-day:—

"I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Montreal advocate the National Policy very strongly and then admit that after all there was depression in Montreal, that things were not just as nice as they had been in the past. It was rather singular he should have gone so far as to admit that; and with regard to the deputation of which he spoke that was supposed to wait on Sir John A. Macdonald in Montreal, when a grand banquet was to be given him, he denied there was any such deputation. However, I notice he could not give any very credible witnesses, and in order to back his statement that there was any abortive effort made by political friends of ours to thwart the glorious dinner they were going to give the First Minister, he brought a man from the dead to testify that what he said was true."

I consider that this was an attack upon my veracity and honor as a gentleman and a member of this House, and it is only on that account that I take the liberty of reading an extract from a private letter which I received yesterday from one of the oldest citizens of Montreal, a friend of the late Mr. Cramp, who is alluded to here, and a friend of his family. It is dated Montreal, 20th March, 1885, and contains the following statement:—

"Mrs. Cramp requests me to offer you her very sincere thanks for the very handsome manner you alluded in your address in the House of Commons to her departed husband, and to add that the expressions quoted by you and ascribed to him she had heard him repeat in his own house."

I regret having had to read this statement, but, as my veracity was impugned, I have been obliged to do so. I also regret having had in this way to refer to Mr. Cramp, who, though not a political friend of mine, was a personal friend all his life time.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection whatever to the hon. gentleman making the allusion he has just done to the remarks I dropped in regard to what he said as to the operations of the National Policy in Montreal. He has not gone so far as to deny that the manufacturing institutions of Montreal are not in a flourishing condition and that the stringency which he stated in his former speech existed does exist. I will now proceed to make some remarks with regard to what fell from the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster)—I am sorry he is not in his place. In the introductory portion of his address he referred to some