

That is the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The next year the hon. gentleman made another speech, in which he said 'the offer made by the government is a limited offer. Which government?' The government of the Conservative party he means. 'While our offer is of unlimited reciprocity.' All that pretty much disposes of my hon. friend's pretension.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It does not refer to the same thing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Here are the words of the hon. gentleman:

It is an offer of unlimited trade such as my hon. friend to my left proposes.

That was my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

My hon. friend has proved to the satisfaction of every one who will take a calm view of the matter that absolutely unlimited reciprocity is preferable to limited reciprocity.

No words could be stronger. If words mean anything, they mean that the policy of these gentlemen was the absolute removal of every barrier to trade between this country and the United States, and I say that if that policy had prevailed in 1891, this country would have been in the maelstrom of financial failure in 1893, just as were Australia and the United States.

But, there is another hon. gentleman who spoke on that question, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The hon. Minister of Customs said that nobody in the Liberal party had ever advocated any such thing, so far as he knew. But, he must have heard this speech, because he is a tolerably good attendant in the House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think I said commercial union.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, unrestricted reciprocity, but, as the hon. gentleman mentions commercial union, I will, if he likes, read the description given by the hon. member for North Norfolk of commercial union too. They are both on the one page. As to unrestricted reciprocity the member for North Norfolk said:

I do not profess to speak for the world and all men. I speak for myself. I understand by unrestricted reciprocity an arrangement that would admit into the United States all the natural and manufactured productions of Canada, all the productions of Canada of any nature, character or name whatever, free of duty, and that the same thing would be given by the other country in return.

There is a definition which, I submit, is pretty clear, of absolutely unrestricted reciprocity, which the hon. gentleman said he never supported, and which was not the policy of his party, although every one in this country knows that it was in 1891. I come now to deal with another matter for the moment. The hon. Minister of Customs said, when discussing the question of industries:

The hon. gentlemen boast of having brought capital into this country. They boast of the millions invested in the iron industry through their policy. Where are these millions which they invested?

That is the question asked by the hon. gentleman. Let me tell him that some were invested in a town called Brantford, once represented by the hon. gentleman, but which rejected him in 1896.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was speaking of the iron industry.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman was speaking of general industries, and afterwards specified the iron industry. In the town of Brantford, which rejected the hon. gentleman in 1896, because it had no confidence in his policy, because it believed he was about to do what he said he would do, viz., uproot protection absolutely—in that town I am told that in 1878 the Massey-Harris Company employed 100 men, and in 1896, 400 men. The Waterous people employed 150 in 1878 in that same town, and 230 in 1896. The Buck stove works gave employment to 100 in 1878 and to 215 in 1896. The Cockshutt works had 10 men employed in 1878 and 70 in 1896. I am told that between 1878 and 1896 the bicycle works began with 300 men, a cotton mill was established with 250 men, a carriage works was removed from the United States with 150 men, a binder twine factory with 50 men, the Gould, Shapley & Muir Company with 100 men, and the Verity Plough works with 200 men.

I am told, too, that there is an industry in Brantford called the William Paterson Company (Limited), which makes biscuits, candies, pickles, jellies and jams, and in the history of the county of Brant, published in 1883, I find a paid notice written, of course, by the dictation of the firm themselves, giving a description of that business, in which there is this statement:

The Paterson business has doubled itself in the past five years, from 1878 to 1883, and has reached such dimensions that he is obliged to increase his facilities and enlarge his quarters.

Mr. COCHRANE. Have they reduced the duty on biscuits?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No. That would be disinterested patriotism. The high protection on these articles is kept up. I am told, too, that they have increased those quarters twice since 1883, so that, I think, so far as the hon. gentleman's locality is concerned, his answer is met by the record of his own business. Now, then, he asks where are the iron industries that were established under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? I remember when those iron duties were put on in 1887. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce thundered against them. The then Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) was abused right, left and centre by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with