

editorial on the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster), and in that editorial I find that the member for Yale (Mr. Barnard) and myself are represented as not having voted on the division on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver. I will read the article for the information of the House. After dealing with the absurdity of the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bunster), it goes on to say:

"Where was Mr. DeCosmos? Where was Mr. McInnes? Where was Mr. Barnard? Echo answers where. Sir John A. Macdonald, the only other representative of the Pacific slope, was present, but made no sign, though Mr. Bunster turned upon him a mute appealing gaze that would have moved a man of stone."

I need not tell this House that I was present, and that I voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver; so did the hon. member for Yale. I did so upon that occasion, and I am prepared to vote against it as often as it is brought down in this House.

Mr. BUNSTER. If the hon. member for Westminster feels aggrieved at having given a wrong vote for my motion, which in duty bound he ought to have done, it is no fault of mine; and if other hon. members were absent it was no fault of mine. If I saw fit to bring the motion before the House, it was my privilege to do so, and if this House and the country did not think fit to endorse my motion I could not help that. I made the motion in justice to a contract that exists. I brought that motion before this House to remind the House and the country of the contract between British Columbia and the Dominion, guaranteed by Lord Carnarvon.

An hon. MEMBER. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is a little out of order. It is very well for an hon. member to state that a report is incorrect, and, of course, any hon. member can correct anything which has not been well reported; but no new question can be raised.

Mr. BUNSTER. The statement in the paper is not correct.

Mr. McINNES. My object in bringing the matter before the House, was that it placed myself and the hon. member for Yale in a false position. No doubt there was an object in the article, as they must have known that I was in my place, as also the hon. member for Yale, and that we recorded our votes. I simply wish that the reporter of that paper may be more accurate in his reports.

Mr. SPEAKER. What I stated does not apply to the hon. member who has just spoken. He was in the right when he protested against what was reported—that he was absent from his seat the other day. He stated that he was present. Of course it is a question of fact. What I mean is, that when an extract from a newspaper is read, and the statement contained in it corrected by a member, no new question ought to be raised.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has a right to make this statement, but if this practice is to be availed of as extensively as it appears to have been availed of recently, we ought to have a new heading to our proceedings, "Motions for the correction of errors in newspapers." Seriously, I hope this privilege will be availed of with great discretion, because if, on both sides of the House, we propose to correct all the mistakes of newspapers, we shall have very little else to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that we ought to deal with these subjects with a great deal of prudence, and unless charges, seriously affecting a member in respect to his duties as a member of Parliament, the matter should be passed over as an error of the Press. The hon. gentleman is quite right from another point of view. He knows perfectly well that if the majority of this House were to attempt to correct all the errors of the

Grit press, no other business would be done during the twenty-four hours.

Mr. ANGLIN. If we attempted to meet all the false charges made by the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite, I think all night would be occupied.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. If this practice relating to the reporter's gallery, which we all respect to a certain extent—and we respect the Grit reporters, although the hon. gentlemen opposite do not do so—is to prevail, the reporters' gallery must be considered a part of this House, and members must single out reporters and say: "You have said so-and-so, and I wish to controvert what you have said."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and if any reporter who is allowed to come into the House to report the debates, adds to that position that of correspondent, and takes to slandering members or stating what is false, I think the House, in defence of its own privileges, should see that the reporter should be expelled from this House.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I rise to a question of privilege. In the report in the *Ottawa Free Press* of the speech delivered the other night by the hon. member who bears the same name as myself, that hon. gentleman is reported as saying:

"Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) called attention to a pamphlet sent to his constituents with 'Thomas Robertson's compliments.' He had no objection to that hon. gentleman sending this literature, provided he stated it was Thomas Robertson, of Shelburne. (Laughter.) Hon. gentlemen might laugh, but forgery had been committed. He had collected two of the wrappers, which bore the initials 'T.R., M.P.' There was only one other gentleman who could sign these initials, and that was the member for Shelburne, and he had been assured by that gentleman that the signature was his. He passed on to charge the Opposition with pursuing an unpatriotic policy, and with having failed in their attempts to create an agitation."

I do not think that this is a correct report.

THE ESTIMATES.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT enquired when hon. members might expect the Estimates to be brought down.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not before Wednesday next.

EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. White (Cardwell) for an Order of the House for a statement of the number of persons who have passed from Canada to the United States by way of Sarnia and Windsor, since 1st of January, 1880, and of persons who have within the same period come into Canada from the United States by way of Windsor and Sarnia, &c.; the motion of Sir Richard J. Cartwright in amendment thereto; and the motion of Sir John A. Macdonald in amendment to the said amendment was resumed.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT'S amendment that 1st January, 1870, be substituted for 1st January, 1880, was negatived.

Mr. THOMPSON suggested that a statement of those who went into the United States by way of the Suspension and the International Bridges be also asked for in the motion.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) objected to the suggestion, on the ground that reports had already been obtained from these particular places, and that if necessary they could be made the object of a subsequent motion. It was better this motion should pass as it stood.

Mr. ANGLIN said that when this question was first introduced, hon. gentlemen opposite asserted that the statements respecting emigration from Canada were grossly exaggerated. It was difficult to obtain precise information