

the House, and when you look at the *Times*, and I hold it in my hands and read it constantly, you find that Reuter's telegrams of the proceedings of this House during the past two sessions have been nothing but perversions of the facts as they transpired, so far as they affect the relations between the two parties on opposite sides of the Chamber.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is so. You have only to look at the proceedings of the House during the whole of last session and you will find exactly the same misrepresentation, the same caricature, the same perversion of the facts exhibited in this telegram. I think it is monstrous that such a course should be pursued, and yet it has been persistently pursued during the last two years in connection with the cabled record of events that have transpired in this Parliament.

Mr. McNEILL. I very much regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should have thought it necessary to make so violent an attack upon a gentleman who has sent this cablegram to England. Now, what is the cablegram? It is this: "Canadian goods free Britain duty British goods reduced Canada." The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that must be read "when." A still more natural view, and one according to the facts, would make it read "as": as Canadian goods are free to Britain, duty on British goods will be reduced in Canada. It is more natural that it should be read according to the facts than contrary to the facts. It is more natural to suppose that the person who extended this telegram in England knew what the facts were, than to assume that he was ignorant of them, and when the gentleman sent the telegram over in this form, he naturally assumed that it would be construed in accordance with the facts, and not in accordance with a state of affairs that does not exist. It is simply because he did so and sent the telegram in the belief that any one knowing the facts would properly construe the telegram, that this attack has been hurled on that gentleman by hon. members opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The construction is shown by the view the *Times* has put on the telegram.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman will excuse me. The writer of the editorial article in the *Times* was referring to the telegram then before his eyes. He was not the person who extended the telegram. He was referring to the extended telegram. I was referring to the person who made the mistake in the extension of the telegram, and I think it a most unfortunate and most ungenerous act for hon. gentlemen opposite to make an attack on a gentleman who sent a telegram, that any hon. gentleman would understand at once to mean "as" and not "when."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman does not express any regret at the error that has taken place.

Mr. McNEILL. I am very sorry indeed that the error has taken place, and so far as the gentleman who sent the telegram is concerned, he has made the best reparation in his power. He immediately cabled over to the mother country putting the matter right, so far as he could. I must say that I think the hon. gentleman, if he will for-

give my saying so, should have read the letter of explanation a little more carefully.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I did read it all except the personal part, which I did not think would interest the House.

Mr. McNEILL. The latter part of the explanation was very important, and I was sorry that the hon. gentleman did not read it at the outset.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I made enquiries some time ago in regard to these cablegrams, and I ascertained that we were paying out money through the Government for these misrepresentations which were made through Reuter's agent. I should like to know how much money was paid for this work last year? It is bad enough to be misrepresented, but it is infinitely worse, if in addition to the misrepresentation, you are obliged to pay for the misrepresentation. I hope if the Government have been spending money in this direction, the expenditure will stop, because it is an outrageous act to be misrepresented and then to be compelled to pay for the misrepresentation.

Mr. DAVIN. Before these remarks on going into committee come to a close, I cannot but protest in the strongest language against the misconception of the journalistic profession that I find the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) entertains. To suppose, as that hon. gentleman has done, or must be supposed to suppose, that a gentleman sitting in the gallery, occupying a responsible position on one of the papers of this country, and a responsible position in regard to the first paper in the world, should deliberately falsify, in order, I suppose, to serve some party ends, what took place in this House, is one of those monstrous and erratic propositions that nestle in the brain of the hon. member for South Oxford so frequently, and which make us sometimes stand aghast at the capacity of an hon. member of this House of his standing for entertaining such absurd and monstrous notions. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) seems to have got excited about a very small matter. As a fact, the *Times* has taken very little notice of him or of his motion. It has not bothered itself much about it. The whole article is taken up in dealing with the significance of this House passing the motion of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill); but with a wave of the hand, it dismisses my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No wonder.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree with my hon. friend, no wonder. But, Sir, that wave of the hand is due to the fact that the broad Atlantic rolls between us. If they knew my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) as well as we do, they would not even have condescended to a wave of the hand. Having quoted Mr. McNeill's motion, the *Times* says:

"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."

Now, Sir, the statement that that is hollow and unmeaning is a statement that could be made with truth of the motion of the hon. member. Does anybody suppose that when the party opposite