

me and pointed out the language attributed to him in the press, and said it was not strictly correct—that if he had used such language it was not his intention to do so. He explained to me what he did say, and I trust the opportunity will be given the hon. gentleman, when present, to make his own explanation. I merely make this statement, not in justification of anything he did say, but simply that the House may know he came to myself and had a conversation with me in reference to the matter, in which he said the language attributed to him was not strictly correct.

Mr. IVES. I believe it is generally understood that the class the hon. member referred to, were the Chinese, and I believe there are other hon. members who agree with the hon. member for Simcoe, in not desiring that a very large number of Chinese should come in.

Mr. TYRWHITT. In regard to the omission of that portion of my speech, which does not appear in the *Hansard*, the only portion which does not appear, was a retort to a remark of the hon. member for Montreal Centre. As well as I can remember, the remark was that should the Orange banner be hoisted in this city it would prevent immigration. My retort was, it would prevent a class of immigration which I, for one, did not wish to see here. As what I said has been misconstrued, as I was evidently misunderstood by the hon. member for Prince County, (Mr. Hackett), I took the earliest opportunity of explaining to that hon. member my meaning, which was that I made reference to political offenders and fugitives from justice.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty in this case is, that the hon. member who introduced this subject has called attention to the fact of the omission from what he supposed to be a correct report of our Debates, of an important statement in the speech of the hon. member for South Simcoe. It is remarked on all hands that that omission has taken place. I think the attention of the House has been properly directed to that circumstance, and the attention of the Committee on the publication of the Debates ought forthwith to be directed to it. It is worse than useless we should have a publication, bearing the stamp of authority, issued as a correct report of our Debates, from which important passages in the speeches of hon. members are either deliberately or accidentally omitted.

Mr. PICKARD. I would ask the hon. member for L'Islet, whether he believed the document he read here was strictly true, which was said to be published in Belfast, and whether it was not read here on the floor of this House for an effect politically in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have just asked the hon. member for South Simcoe, whether he had any communication with the reporters in regard to the withdrawal of the words referred to, and the hon. gentleman states he had not. The rule is that everything said on the floor of this House shall go into the reports next day, and hon. members are permitted to revise, but not alter their speeches, with a view of correcting what is manifestly a misinterpretation. Since the debate has occurred, I have received a note from the chief reporter, and it may be as well to let the House know the explanation he gives in regard to this omission. He explains that at times the reporters fail to hear, and rather than insert what is erroneous, omit the passage altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. We all heard it.

Mr. WHITE. I am not at this moment excusing the reporter. His duty is to report every word uttered; and the object in adopting the present system, under which the printed copy comes to us without revision, is that hon. members may not have an opportunity to change their speeches before the first publication. I think, on the whole, we have no reason to complain of the conduct of the reporters.

Mr. BOWELL.

in this regard; the only drawback being that occasionally a reporter may misunderstand an argument, either from over-fatigue, or any other cause, and report it, therefore, incorrectly. That does not often occur, and when it does, the speaker has an opportunity of setting it right in the revised edition; but he has not the right to suppose anything he may have said.

Mr. RYKERT. I may draw attention to another very important omission made a few nights ago, in the case of the hon. member for Middlesex, who made the stupid blunder of confusing the names of Xerxes and Canute, in an absurd remark about whipping the sea—a blunder which was noticed by the whole House. But instead of the remark appearing in the *Hansard* as uttered, as I supposed it would, it was changed, and the absurd blunder which nobody could justify, more especially when committed by the hon. member for Middlesex, who was a school-teacher, does not appear in the *Hansard*, as it should. That was altered the next day in the *Hansard*, and the proper correction was made in the first copy that was brought down to the House. Now, if that had been reported as it ought to have been reported, the country could have seen exactly how correct the hon. gentleman was in his quotation.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like simply to say—as attention has been called to me—that I am exceedingly obliged to the reporter who corrected what was a slip of my own at the time; and I am exceedingly thankful to learn that there are literary gentlemen in the House of the high culture and attainments of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who can detect those literary blunders. It is unfortunate for me; but, perhaps, it is something that other hon. gentlemen have not found out, in their own experience. I do make mistakes. There are other hon. gentlemen who, though they make mistakes, have not the penetration nor the perception to discover them until they had been pointed out across the floor of the House. I acknowledge my ignorance, and I confess to the hon. member for Lincoln that for once, in my experience, he knows as much about these literary matters as I do, and as every other hon. member in the House does, and as the reporters at the desk do. I stand corrected, and I hope not to deserve another such rebuke from him for a long time to come.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I think the hon. gentleman who brought this matter before the House need not fear if there is any reference at all to Irish Roman Catholics. I do not think, Sir, from my knowledge of that class of the community, that they are at all afraid of an Orange flag. They see lots of them, they know what they are; and I can tell the hon. gentleman another thing: that, so far as Irish Roman Catholics are concerned, they would rather have an Irish Orangeman for a neighbor than a Frenchman—it looks much better. The Irish Roman Catholics can take care of themselves, and Irishmen generally can take care of themselves, and the hon. members for Quebec need give themselves no trouble about us.

CUSTOMS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 34) to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Customs.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 81,

Mr. BOWELL. It does not read correctly. I desire to have it read in this way:

"Except only in case where it is otherwise provided herein, or by regulation of the Governor in Council, no entry shall be deemed perfect unless an invoice of the goods entered, duly certified in writing thereon as correct by the person, firm or corporation from whom they are