

money market of the world. But I want to point out that just at the time the credit of Canada was reaching that high point, and when Sir Charles Tupper was practically securing those advantages from the Imperial government, another agency was at work. It was the agency of the hon. gentleman who sits next to the Finance Minister—the agency of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); and what was he doing? Promoting Canadian credit? No; he was writing to the *London Economist*, telling the people of England that they had better look out for Canadian securities, because Canada was being ruined and her people were being bled white, and the country was on the road to destruction. Another thing: I want to ask my hon. friend in all candour whether he thinks that in 1893 we would have been in such a good position as we were had we adopted the policy of unrestricted reciprocity in 1891. We had an election in this country in 1891. It was the election in which the hon. gentleman and his friends were supporting unrestricted reciprocity with the United States of America.

Mr. McMILLAN. And what was the election brought on for, but for the government then in power to get authority to go down to Washington to discuss that very question?

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is disturbed at these facts.

Mr. McMILLAN. Not a bit. I am disturbed at statements that are not facts.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he will answer the question?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend does not seriously want me to answer that question. He asks me whether I think the position of Canada would have been as good in 1893 if the Liberal party had won in 1891. He would not take my judgment on that question, I am sure. I believe Canada would have been in a better position.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am delighted at the hon. gentleman's answer. What he has stated is that this country would have been in a better position in 1893 if unrestricted reciprocity had carried in 1891, with discrimination against Great Britain. The opinion he expresses is not the true and heartfelt opinion of two men who sit on his own side of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You do not know that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentlemen are there to answer for themselves. Why, Sir, the Minister of Finance says we would have been better off under unrestricted reciprocity. Why, then, are the men behind him ashamed to admit that they ever sup-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

ported that policy? We should have had, as the hon. gentleman knows now, and as every business man in Canada knows now, the same sort of disastrous financial panic as they had in Australia.

Now, while we are touching the question of unrestricted reciprocity, I should like to have a word with my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). At his innocence I am greatly astonished. The hon. gentleman sat for many years on this side of the House; he campaigned in many parts of Ontario; and yet he had—I will not say the hardihood, but the assumption to get up here the other night and say that his party so far as he knew never had advocated the absolute removal of the restrictions on trade between this country and the United States. He said: 'I always thought that we should have a free list and a dutiable list, that there would be some things on which we could agree, and other things on which we could not agree, and that is the policy of the Liberal party of Canada.' I want to ask the hon. gentleman's friends behind him whether they corroborate that statement. As my leader suggests, why did the Hon. Edward Blake leave them if it was only an ordinary reciprocity that they advocated? Is there a gentleman on the other side of the House who was engaged in that campaign of 1891, who does not know that the cry of hon. gentlemen opposite from the greatest to the smallest was for absolutely unrestricted trade between this country and the United States of America—continental free trade, unrestricted reciprocity? Let me tell the hon. Minister of Customs what his leader said.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did your leader want?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I shall come to that in a moment. He wanted a limited reciprocity which would give us a quid pro quo, but which would leave us in control of our own tariff, and with no discrimination against Great Britain. Of all the little attempts to answer an argument, the smallest is the attempt of my hon. friend to saddle on the gentlemen on this side of the House the policy which he is so ashamed of now that he declares he never supported it. What did the hon. gentleman say the other night? We proposed a broad treaty of reciprocity. 'I do not think anybody contemplated anything else than that there would be a scheduled list of goods upon which the parties might not be able to agree,' said he. One of his leaders said in Toronto, in September, 1899:

The policy which we advocate is the removal of every commercial barrier which exists between this country and the United States. The Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will stand by this policy. I am not expecting to win in a day, but am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until this cause triumphs.