the present Secretary of State. Where was the Grand Master of that organization? In that hour of trial for his friends and for the association of which he was the presiding officer, where was he? Was he on the field of battle to counsel and guide and advise those gentlemen who had given him an office of high trust, and made him for the time being their commander-in-chief? No, Sir, he tells us himself, that of all places on this earth, he was away down at Washington. I do not know whether he made that trip in the Government car "Jamaica," that is said now to be gone to California with another ex-member of the Cabinet, or not; but at all events the Controller of Customs tells us, that he was down in Washington. If a Grit goes down there, there is trouble at once: he is declared to be plotting for the ruin of his country, but it appears that when the Controller of Customs goes there he is not open to that charge. Well, Sir, I want to draw attention to the statement made by the Minister of Finance respecting the United States loan. After telling us that he had placed his Canadian loan on the market at such favourable terms, that after deducting all the costs and expenses, and all the other charges in connection with the loan over in London, he placed it at 3⅙ per cent. Then he goes on to say:

> A short time after that the United States put an issue of bonds upon the market, and the rate of interest which those bear and which the United States have to pay, is within a fraction, in fact I think it is absolutely, 3¾ per cent, while the Canadian loan went on the British market at 3⅙ per cent.

Subsequent to that we had a little discussion with the Controller of Customs over the same question, and he confirmed the statement that our loan was made at the net value of 3⅙, the loan made by the United States bearing 4 per cent interest on the 30 years coin bonds for which $65,000,000 was obtained. Now, whatever the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) went down to Washington for, he certainly did not secure much information about that loan. Sir, what were the facts? Twice in 1894 the Secretary of the Treasury issued bonds, but in November, at that particular period referred to by both the Finance Minister and the Controller of Customs, those 30-year old 4 per cent bonds were issued. The bonds that were placed on the market then, were bonds that ran for only a little over nine years, that bore 5 per cent interest on the face, and were sold for gold at a rate that netted a little under 3 per cent to the banks that purchased them, and the loan of February was selling then on the market currently, paying 2¾ per cent to purchasers. What led to the difficulties? It was simply this: That in the United States Congress there was a section of members who were determined to make the payments of the United States silver equivalent to gold, at the rate of 15½ to 1, when that coin on the market was only worth 33 to 1. The gold was flowing out of the United States treasury as rapidly as it came in until on the 28th of January, when the President sent his message to Congress, there was not enough of gold in the treasury available for three days' draft at the rate at which it had been going out of the treasury for the ten days previous. It was becoming a crisis in the United States. A contract was then made, after a great deal of negotiation, with not only the New York bankers, but also the Rothschilds of London, for the delivery of 3,500,000 ounces of standard gold coin of the United States, at the cost of the parties tendering, to the United States Treasury. It is true, those bonds were thirty years 4 per cent bonds, and they were sold to the bankers to yield 3¾ per cent, because the bankers took the risk of not being able to prevent the draft on the treasury, and they were bound to import half the gold required. Here is an important factor in that transaction which both hon. gentlemen omitted to mention. Why did they not tell us that the proposition stood upen for ten days, which was made to Congress by these very same bankers, that instead of leaving the word "coin" in the contract, as it was gold they were supplying, they would take a 3 per cent gold bond at par in place of those very bonds? What did the New York "Tribune" of the 10th of February say about the refusal of Congress to endorse that proposition when it was laid before them by President Cleveland? It said this:

> The President has made the necessary proposals to banks, but most judiciously has left ten days' time in which Congress, if it has the needful wisdom, can save the country $14,000,000 by passing a proper Bond Bill. Pass some Bill with the proviso that the Secretary of the Treasury shall contract to pay the same kind of money that the Government asks from lenders. If it wants to borrow silver, let it pay silver. If it wants to borrow gold, let it be honourable enough, and also shrewd enough, to pay gold. Why not authorize the payment of the same kind of money that the Government actually borrows, with 3 per cent interest? Nothing but blind and stupid partisanship, it must be admitted, prevents this.

And yet, for the purpose of making the people of Canada believe that our credit was so much better than that of the United States, the Finance Minister was either misled by those who made up that statement, or he suppressed what was essential in a fair statement of the facts to the public. Sir, I have as much attachment to my country as the Finance Minister or any one else; I have lived in the riding I represent as long as I can remember; the whole of my interests are in this country; I take no back seat to any man in this House for attachment to my country and its institutions; but I have not seen the day when I would stoop so low as to misrepresent a neighbour for the purpose of advancing the interests of my own coun-