

agreement of my hon. friend is a fair agreement; I am not assailing him for it. The agreement was that on overdrafts which we might have from the bank of our financial agents in England, we should pay the current Bank of England rate. It is a fair and reasonable arrangement. But at that particular time there was a panic condition in the country. My hon. friend should have stated in fairness that the rate was entirely exceptional, and should have stated the nature of the arrangement under which it was made, but he did not. Had the bank insisted upon the letter of the arrangement as it had existed for some years, they could have demanded 7 per cent., but I was able by negotiations with the bank to secure a reduction of that even at that panic period to 6 per cent., and so stated in the House, and if that escaped his notice, I can understand his repeating the statement to-night. However that may be, we did not pay 7 per cent., although if we had done so, it would have been under an old arrangement, which, as a rule, is fair and reasonable. My hon. friend is quoted as saying he never paid more than 2 7-8 per cent. It must be evident that my hon. friend must have made some such statement, and that to the great disadvantage of his successor.

I do not feel very much concerned about the matter from a personal point of view, and I do not suppose my hon. friend does—neither of us is anxious to blow his own horn. But, when the effect of his criticism would be to bring discredit upon the finances of Canada, I think I have a right to complain. And I think he did not put that matter as fairly as he should have done. If he thinks it important that any comparisons be made in that respect, I can only say that I think this government had no reason to be afraid of those comparisons. The hon. gentleman had many transactions—properly and necessarily—in the way of temporary loans. There are records of fifty-four transactions in the way of temporary loans. Some were for moderate sums and some for sums running up to \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000. In not one of these transactions did he obtain the rate of interest mentioned in the Hamilton speech according to the 'Mail and Empire.' In several of them, the rate was 4½ per cent; in fifty-two out of fifty-four, the rate was 4 per cent. or upwards. In only two out of that long list of transactions was the rate below 4 per cent. One was made at 3½ per cent. and one at 3 per cent. Now, the lowest rate of interest ever obtained on a temporary loan by the Dominion treasury was not obtained by my hon. friend as his remarks would imply. If there is any credit—I do not attach the utmost importance to it, but I have a right to reply to the hon. member's criticism—let it be stated that the lowest rate of interest was not obtained either by the hon. gentleman himself or by any of his predecessors, but by the present administration, for we have borrowed money as low as a fraction above 2 per cent. for a time. But I should not confine myself to the hon. gentleman's temporary loans. He says the 'Mail and Empire' did not report him correctly; but he evidently made comparisons between the success of his own loans and the lack of success of his successor's loans—if he did not mean that, I do not see the purpose he had in view.

Public Loan..

I have made an examination of the public loans made in the time of my hon. friend. In no case, either for a temporary or for a permanent loan, did he ever obtain the rate of interest stated in the speech at Hamilton, as reported. I have the record before me, and I find that the lowest rate of interest ever obtained by him—and it was a fair rate, and I am not complaining of it—was in 1894, when he issued a loan of £2,250,000 at 3 per cent. and running for forty-three and three-quarter years, for which he obtained £97, 9s. 2d. for every £100 of stock. The net rate of interest was 3.16 per cent.—over 3 1-8. Now, my hon. friend