

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton)—Sir Charles Tupper denied that positively when charged with it, and stated that his speech on that occasion was misreported.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—He had the advantage of being far away from the source of information, because it was in London his speech was made, but I will simply refer to the 'Associated Press' reports which came here, and which found their way the next morning into the official Tory organs of this country. I am satisfied to accept what the good Tory organ, the 'Gazette' of Montreal, reported of the speech, and my declaration will stand by it or by the statement in the 'Mail and Empire.'

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Cannot the hon. gentleman accept the denial of Sir Charles Tupper?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I should like to see that statement, of Sir Charles Tupper and compare it with the reports which appeared in the papers.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Hamilton)—I was present at the meeting of the Chambers of Commerce in London when Sir Charles made his speech, asking that the British government give a 5 per cent preference to Canada on her products. It was declared that the treaties could not be denounced. A leading man there said those treaties would prevent their giving a preference. Sir Charles Tupper declared then that the treaties could be denounced, and he tried his very best to get them to do it, but the government would not denounce the treaties until Sir Wilfrid Laurier got there, and when he did get to the other side the treaties were denounced. Sir Charles Tupper did his best, but he could not succeed.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—It only shows that where Tory science fails Liberal methods will succeed. We are told that this preference given to British goods has brought us nothing in return. As the Secretary of State has said, why is it that concurrently with the denunciation of those treaties—concurrently with the reduction of the duty upon British goods, our trade has expanded in Great Britain? Is it not because of the action of the Prime Minister

of Canada in Great Britain, of the action of our parliament in giving that preference to British manufactures? We have spent a lot of money in Great Britain in advertising our country. I have heard numbers of speakers on both sides of politics declare that the presence of the Prime Minister of Canada at the jubilee celebration, the speeches he made at that time, the importance of the representation of the colonies in Great Britain, and the ascendancy over them all of our own representative, have been of greater value to Canada than all the money spent previously for advertising purposes. From that moment our trade has expanded, and why? Because, as every one knows Canada was hardly known in Great Britain or in Europe. The North British colonies had not yet attracted the attention of the ordinary man in the street in Great Britain, but from that moment when it was heralded that we were giving British goods a preference in our market without asking for a *quid pro quo*, we were doing something for Great Britain, our goods commanded a better price. If it is not due to the action of parliament and to this preference that we gave, to what is it due? I have heard the question put, how is it that the United States expanded its trade in the same proportion as Canada? I do not think so, but there is one thing I know, the consular agents of the United States in Liverpool and London since 1896-97 have yearly reported to their government that Canada's goods were displacing United States products in that market. I have seen and read reports of these consular agents and every year they have advised their government to beware of Canadian competition. So that from that moment that Great Britain's attention was drawn to the possibilities of Canadian commerce—was drawn to the fact that we were doing something for the metropolis—from that very moment our trade has expanded, and if the action of the government and of parliament at the time is not sufficient to justify the expansion of our trade in the extraordinary proportions mentioned by the Secretary of State, I would point out again, with the concurrence of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that the action of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has contributed a great deal towards the