

worked grave and serious injury. The *Times*, adopting the false report forwarded from Ottawa as to the terms of that resolution, has published an editorial article which is calculated to bring the mover of the resolution in amendment, and those who supported it, into contempt. I do not know that there is anything more important at the present time than to give the English public a correct view of the policy which the colonies intend to pursue in regard to the mother country. I will read the amendment as it appears in the *Times* :

"OTTAWA, April 26.—The Dominion House of Commons yesterday discussed for several hours a motion brought forward by Mr. McNeill, to the effect that when the Parliament of Great Britain admits Canadian products to the British markets on more favourable terms than it grants to foreign products, Canada will be prepared to extend corresponding advantages of reduction of duties to British manufactured goods."

Now, Sir, in amendment to that resolution I moved the following :—

"That inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain, should be reduced."

This was a simple, plain and clear resolution, and one would suppose that its meaning could not fail to be understood by anybody who read it or heard it; but, instead of that, I find that the *Times* report says :

"Mr. Davies strongly opposed the resolution as being impracticable, and moved an amendment that Canadian goods should be admitted free into Great Britain, British goods being allowed a reduced duty in Canada."

Sir, I never moved a resolution that Canadian goods should be admitted free into Great Britain. We are aware already that Canadian goods are admitted, and have been admitted, free into Great Britain for many years. The *Times*, in commenting upon the ignorance displayed by the mover of the resolution, remarks :

"The Opposition put forward an amendment, which Sir John Thompson, the ministerial leader, treated as a subterfuge in view of the Liberal policy of discrimination against the mother country, and which is on the face of it, hollow and unmeaning. To demand that Canadian goods should be admitted free into the United Kingdom is a mere rhetorical phrase, for we tax no Canadian product except spirits, and Canadian whiskey is not likely to compete successfully with Scotch or Irish in the home market. At the same time, these Canadian free-traders would retain the right of levying duties on British goods."

Now, everybody will see how serious this is. The resolution has been misrepresented, and in the form in which it is published in the London *Times*, it is calculated to bring the party who supported it into contempt. I think the *Times* is quite justified in making the comment it did upon the report of the resolution that was sent to it; but we know, and everybody knows who debated the question on the true assumption and the knowledge of the facts—the assumption and knowledge of the facts which were incorporated in my amendment—that it would certainly be a mere hollow and unmeaning resolution if it was as reported by the cablegram to the *Times*. I desire, so far as I can do so, to make a public correction of this report in the hope that it may reach the quarter where it has been misrepresented. I do not wish to make any further remarks upon it except that, in justice to the gentleman who forwarded the cablegram, I would like to read to the House his explanation which he wrote me the other day. He says :

"I greatly regret to find, from certain statements made in the *Globe* of Saturday, that in my despatch to Reuter

summarizing the debate on Mr. McNeill's motion in favour of preferential trade with Great Britain, your amendment to the resolution should have become so changed in course of transmission as to largely destroy its effect."

"Largely destroy its effect;" it completely altered it, and substituted a resolution which is absolutely unmeaning.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a transformation scene.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In an ordinary matter affecting the interprovincial relations of Canada, I would not make a complaint, because our local papers would at once correct the mistake; but hon. gentlemen see that in a grave matter affecting the fiscal relations between Great Britain and her most important colony, it is a very serious thing for the policy of a party to be misrepresented to the leading organ of public opinion of Great Britain. The letter goes on to say :

"I need hardly say that so far as I am personally concerned I neither did, nor desired to, misrepresent the scope of your amendment, and I greatly regret that it should have been placed incorrectly before the English public. By reference to my despatch on file in the C.P.R. telegraph office, it is clearly evident that this is the result of an unfortunate accident. The words which I cabled were as follows :—

"Mr. Davies strongly dissented; resolutions impracticable. Moved amendment, Canadian goods free Britain, duty British goods reduced Canada."

There is no doubt the *Times* has not misrepresented the cablegram that was received.

Mr. BOWELL. That does not necessarily follow.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen can judge that for themselves.

Mr. BOWELL. It would depend a great deal upon the manner in which it was filled up. A word might have been put in there which would turn the whole meaning.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The letter goes on :

"Before filing the despatch I carefully read it over to see if there was any likelihood of its terms being misapprehended, and it seemed perfectly clear to my mind that there could be no difficulty in properly extending the paragraph in reference to yourself. As intended to be extended it would read as follows :—

"Mr. Davies strongly dissented from Mr. McNeill's resolution as impracticable. He moved in amendment that as Canadian goods are admitted free into Great Britain, the duty on British goods should be reduced when entering Canada."

Of course if that had been cabled, I would have been satisfied, and justice would have been done to the party who supported the resolution. The letter goes on to say :

"This summary of your amendment, as you will readily perceive, was calculated to place the Liberal party in a far better position in the eyes of the British people than if the full text of the amendment had been transmitted, inasmuch as the qualifying words 'mainly' upon which, in my humble judgment, the whole point of your argument hinges, was omitted by me. This was due to the fact that I had not seen the amendment at the time, and was simply told its tenor by one of my *confères* in the Press Gallery. In 'filling out' the message, the telegraph editor in England has evidently not grasped the meaning of the despatch, hence the mistake which has occurred."

Well, Sir, I can only say that I deeply regret this mistake. It is very probable that the mistake will not be rectified. Everybody who knows anything of English public life knows to what an extent the London *Times* is looked to for a correct report of what takes place in the outlying parts of the Empire. This debate has been given the importance of an editorial article in the *Times*, and the travesty of the resolution which we moved, and the ridiculous character which it is made to assume