

landers stole cattle. The rule with regard to correcting the *Hansard* is that a member may make any necessary corrections in his own speech, but no member is allowed to insert remarks and attribute them to another member, as was here done. Besides, no such words were ever uttered by Mr. Blake, and one—”

I suppose it should be “no one”

“had any reasonable pretext for making the alterations.

“Mr. Bowell, Minister of Customs, substantiated Mr. Blake's denial of having used the obnoxious words, but said they were certainly used by some one in the House. It appears the interpolation was inserted in a correction of Mr. Macmaster's speech, handed in by himself, and without the knowledge of the *Hansard* management, and it appears, further, that Mr. Macmaster has caused a large edition of his speech thus corrected to be issued for circulation amongst his constituents in Glengarry. Mr. Macmaster was not in his place in the House yesterday to make any explanation of the affair, which, in the meantime, looks decidedly colorable.”

I understand that an editorial article appeared in the *Toronto Globe* to the same effect. I was not in the House when the leader of the Opposition referred to this question, a few days ago, and this is the first opportunity I have had of bringing it to the attention of the House. Now, the charges contained in this article are substantially these: First, that I attributed my own words to another; secondly, that I inserted those words in the official report of the debate without the knowledge of the *Hansard* management, and thirdly that I had ordered a large issue of the *Hansard*, containing the corrected or revised edition of my speech, with a view of sending an erroneous copy to my constituents. Now, Mr. Speaker, the whole of this article, in so far as it relates to me, is either directly or indirectly false. It is necessary for me to explain the circumstances under which the occurrence took place. I was speaking in the franchise debate on the extension of the franchise to the Indians. I was pointing out the progress the world had made since 1642. An hon. member of the House cited the condition of the Indians at that period, and argued against the admission of the Indians to the franchise, upon the ground, to some extent, if not entirely, of the uncivilised condition of the Indians in 1642. I was pointing out the progress that had been made throughout the world since that date, and the inapplicability of an argument of that kind; I was referring to the progress of my own countrymen, the Highlanders of Scotland, in comparatively recent years. At that stage the hon. leader of the Opposition made an interruption; and the statement I now make with regard to that is in accordance with the statement he himself made to the House. I did not hear distinctly the words of the hon. gentleman's interruption; I was anxious to hear them, and I at once said: “I beg your pardon.” The hon. leader of the Opposition did not answer; he seemed to have turned to engage in a conversation or to exchange a smile with the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). I then turned about, being anxious to ascertain what words he had used, and said: “What did he say?” When an hon. member answered: “He said they stole cattle.” The hon. gentleman now smiles.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not smiling in the slightest degree with the view of casting any doubt on the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. MACMASTER. I am glad to hear that. I am stating the matter exactly as it occurred—

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt whatever.

Mr. MACMASTER. And I hope to satisfy the hon. gentleman that I am incapable of committing the act I am here charged with in the press.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with making a false statement.

Mr. MACMASTER. The answer was: “He stated they stole cattle.” There had been previously no reference whatever

Mr. MAOMASTER.

in my remarks to the stealing of cattle. I assumed that the information I received was correct, and that the hon. leader of the Opposition had made that statement. I never had the slightest doubt at all until I saw his statement yesterday morning in *Montreal*, that he denied it. Assuming that he had made that statement, I proceeded with this remark:

“I have no doubt my noble ancestors stole cattle and proved their prowess in war by going down to the southern country; and no doubt they crossed the Channel to where my hon. friend's ancestors were.”

Thus plainly showing, from the words of the original copy of *Hansard*, that I supposed I was replying in good faith to a remark made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. On the following day, Mr. Boyce, the revisor of the *Hansard* debates, came to me and delivered, as he is in the habit of doing, in the case of other hon. gentlemen, the first print of my speech. It was in the afternoon, I think, of Thursday last. I was to leave town on the following morning. A few hours afterwards he came to me and asked me if I thought I would be able to have the revise of my speech by that evening. I told him I would endeavor to do so, although I was very much hurried. I had in the meantime read my speech through, and when I came to the passage about which this controversy has arisen, I saw that the remark which I supposed the hon. leader of the Opposition had made was entirely omitted from the first print of *Hansard*; and hence it would appear that the words:

“I have no doubt my noble ancestors stole cattle, and proved their prowess in war, by going down to the Southern country, and no doubt they crossed the Channel, to where my hon. friend's ancestors were”—

were volunteered by me, whereas, in fact, they were uttered by me on the supposition that the hon. gentleman had made the remark: “They stole cattle.” Mr. Boyce came to my desk where I am now standing, and my friend, the hon. member for Ottawa city (Mr. Mackintosh), was also present; and I pointed out to Mr. Boyce, in presence of my hon. friend, that there was an omission in the first print of the *Debates*—that the statement of the hon. gentleman was not inserted, and that without that statement my remark was perfectly meaningless, and did not indicate to what hon. gentleman's ancestors I referred; and I said that in order to have a true record and to show my meaning and the reason I used these words, the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition should be inserted in the report. He said: “Very well, Mr. Macmaster; if it is correct, insert it.” I said: “I shall do so, and I assure you it is correct.” I inserted it myself, and if there be any blame in connection with it, the *Hansard* revisor, Mr. Boyce, is entirely free from blame, and so is everybody else, except myself, if blame there is. I asked Mr. Boyce if it would be necessary for him to call the attention of any one else in connection with the *Hansard* staff to it, and he said: “No; if it is correct it is not necessary.” I inserted the words, delivered to Mr. Boyce the copy of *Hansard* so revised, just as I always did on former occasions, and he took it, I presume, to the *Hansard* office; and the copy so revised was printed with the statement I have indicated attributed to the hon. leader of the Opposition. A copy of it was forwarded to me in *Montreal*, where I received it. Yesterday morning I read in the morning papers that the hon. leader of the Opposition had stood up in his place in this House and had said that these words were not uttered by him. He did not accuse me, it is true, of wrongfully inserting them. He made another remark, that was not germane to the matter, that the only responsibility he attached to my noble ancestors was that they had produced me. I do not think that remark was essential to the correction the hon. gentleman intended to make, because I trust, before I die, if my life is spared, that I may not be entirely unworthy of my noble ancestors; and I am very certain that I have nothing to be ashamed of in the record of