

Huron Signal

DEVOTED TO COUNTY NEWS AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE

Fortieth Year. Whole Number 2000.

Goderich, Ont., Friday, Feb. 4, 1887.

MOILLICUDDY BROS. PUBLISHERS \$1.00 A YEAR IN ADVANCE

THE HURON SIGNAL
Published every Friday Morning, by Mc
GILLICUDDY BROS., at their Office, North at
GODERICH, ONTARIO.

FRIDAY, FEB 4th, 1887.

Our Ticket.

For Dominion Premier,
HON. EDWARD BLAKE.

West Huron in the Commons,
M. C. CAMERON, Q. Q.

"The Hoodie Brigade Must Go."

A CAMPAIGN LIE NAILED.

Mr F. F. Lawrence desires us to state that the statement made in a Clinton newspaper that he drove Mr Cameron home helplessly drunk on the night of the local election is false. Mr Lawrence says that while he is a solid Conservative he does not believe in such mean political warfare.

ONE WORD ALTERS MANY.

Grit Joker—Tory Jones here said that Porter was not a fair speaker.
Tory Jones—I never used those words. I never said "not."
Grit Joker—Well, you said all the other words.
Tory Jones—But the words have a different meaning with that one word put in or out.
Grit Joker—Just so. And so have M. C. Cameron's words when the word "treaty" is in or out.
Tory Jones sneaks away.

AN ACTUAL FACT.

A prominent Conservative got himself into a bad box one day last week. A Liberal handed him a copy of an election pamphlet to get him to read a certain sentence.
"What date is there on this book?" asked the Tory.
"None," replied the Grit.
"What name is signed to it?" said the other cautiously.
"No name at all," returned the Liberal.
"Then it's no good, and I don't want any of it," said the Tory, spinning the little book.
The roar of laughter that followed this repudiation of Sir John A. Macdonald's pamphlet on Indian affairs showed that the Grit had scored a big point by the Tory's admission. The pamphlet is indeed "no good."

Out of the mouth of the Government officials the Government is convicted of allowing the Indians to suffer from starvation. For proof of this see the evidence produced on our sixth page.

The Montreal Post, an Irish Catholic daily, says: "The next Premier of Canada will be an Irishman and a Home Ruler. Let Irishmen in Montreal and wherever they may be keep that in mind, and help its early realization by voting for the candidates who avow themselves supporters of Blake and Home Rule."

The Presbyterian church of Canada has put itself on record against the terrible neglect of the Indians by unjust and immoral farm instructors. Rev. Mr. Robertson, superintendent of Presbyterian missions, says the Indians were starving at various points. For proof of these charges see article on our second page.

HOME RULES in Canada, more especially in West Huron, will rally around M. C. Cameron and Blake all the more closely since *The Orange Sentinel* has denounced Mr Cameron in a violent editorial for "strenuously supporting the diabolical Costigan resolutions"—meaning, of course, the first resolutions. The paper containing the attack can be seen by any Home Ruler who will come to this office.

The question of "Home Rule for Ireland," so dear to many of us upon this side of the Atlantic, is not the least of the matters before the electors of the present day, on account of the shabby treatment of the cause in the now celebrated Costigan resolutions. On page three of this issue of THE SIGNAL will be found a well-written resume of the history of the question in the Dominion Parliament, which should be read by every Irish Canadian who has a heart for Motherland. Mr Blake's noble stand, and Mr Cameron's votes, are to be commended.

THE WORD "TREATY."

A Contest That Hinges Upon One Word.

Because That Word Changes the Meaning of a Whole Sentence—Vindication of M. C. Cameron by the Official Report of the Debates—The Very Defence of Porter Proves Cameron to be Right.

There were perhaps a dozen men at Porter's meeting on Wednesday evening of last week who understood what all the row was about. If, as the Tories now claim, Mr Porter was mistaken in thinking that the unreviced proofs of members' speeches in parliament sent to the members and the press were what constituted *Hansard*, then only two men, Mr Cameron and the *SIGNAL* reporter, understood the full extent of the Tory blunder. If Mr Porter knew that the book he held in his hand and quoted from was not the official report popularly known as "*Hansard*," then the word "fraud" is too mild to describe the piece of platform scoundrelism to which he was a party. Here is a full history of the controversy on the word "treaty"—a controversy that has proved to be a "boomerang" for the Tories.

In the pamphlet issued by Sir John A. Macdonald in reply to Mr Cameron's speech on Indian affairs the following is quoted by the premier as

"MISSTATEMENT NO. 13."

"We promised and were under TREATY obligations to supply the Indians, just fresh from the plains, from which the buffalo had disappeared, with fresh beef, etc."

It is absolutely untrue that the Government promised, or was under TREATY obligations to supply the Indians with a pound of fresh meat. Mr Cameron knew perfectly well that his statement was false. There is no treaty obligation to supply the Indians with food at all, except in Treaty No. 6, made in 1874.

Speaking at Clinton in reply to the pamphlet, Mr Cameron answered this charge by stating that he had not said that we were under TREATY obligations to supply the Indians with fresh beef. The word TREATY is not to be found in the *Hansard* in that connection. The words in the *Hansard* are "We promised and were under obligations to supply the Indians, fresh from the plains, from which the buffalo had disappeared, with fresh beef."

The word TREATY cannot be found in that particular sentence in the *Hansard*. Mr Porter essayed at Goderich to prove that Mr Cameron's denial at Clinton was untrue, and the sentence as given in the pamphlet was to be found in the official report of the debates known as the *Hansard*. He read a sentence containing the interpolated word TREATY, which altered the meaning of Mr Cameron's statement altogether, and Mr Cameron instantly denied that he had used the words as read by the Tory candidate. Porter then falsely claimed he was reading from the *Hansard*, the official report, and charged Cameron with denying his own words. The fraud attempted was shown up in THE SIGNAL last week, and to prove our case by the leading witness of the other side, we quote the *Star's* defence of Porter's trick, with all the falsehood and ignorance displayed in the article, to prove more fully our contention that the words "TREATY obligations" were not used by Mr Cameron in the *Globe*, THE SIGNAL or the OFFICIAL REPORT known as *Hansard*. The following is the false and stupid article in which the *Star* in its ignorance gives away the whole case:—

Mr CAMERON and HIS QUOTATIONS.
Mr Cameron was very uncomfortable last Wednesday evening, when cornered by Mr Porter with a quotation from his great speech on the Indian question. He made some attempts at explanation which sounded very foolishly, as, for instance, that the *Hansard* Mr Porter read from was a campaign edition gotten just fresh from the plains from which the buffalo had disappeared, with fresh beef. But, instead of beef, we supplied them with salt pork.

The copy of *Hansard* which lies before us, containing the stenographers' report of Mr Cameron's speech, is that furnished by Government to the newspapers of the country, regularly from three to five days after each day's session of the House. On page 756, at the bottom of the second column, it gives precisely the same words as we have quoted above. We have heard it stated that Mr Cam-

ron claims now his speech was revised and corrected—would not altered be a better word?—after the first copies were struck off. Well, will he explain how, if he did not use the words imputed to him as above, the *Globe* on the morning after his speech in a three column summary of it, reported him in these words:

"These were not the only complaints which the Indians had made. We were under obligations to supply the Indians with fresh beef. Instead of this we supplied them with old and rusty pork, although pork was fully double the price of beef."

And his own special organ, THE SIGNAL, on May 14th following, just one month after, in a verbatim report of his speech, furnished possibly by Mr Cameron himself, gives these words on the point in question:

"These are not the only complaints that the Indians have been making for a number of years. We promised, and were under obligations to supply the Indians, just fresh from the plains, from which the buffalo had disappeared, with fresh beef. But instead of fresh beef we supplied them with salt pork."

If Mr Cameron denies that he ever made use of these exact words, he must prove that the stenographer garbled his speech. This will be even a more difficult task than proving his charges against the government, for we have the testimony of Hon. Edward Blake himself that the work of the official reporters of House of Commons debates is done with exceptional correctness and faithfulness.

At present we prefer to believe the *Hansard* before us, corroborated as it is by the *Globe*, and Mr Cameron's own organ, THE SIGNAL, and so will the public.

The above article from the *Star* completely gives away the case of the Tories. The claim that Mr Porter read from the *Hansard* is false, misleading and absurd, as the Tory candidate has admitted at Benmur, Kingsbridge and other points that it was not the "official record" that he read from at Goderich. The report does not become official until it is read and corrected by the member who delivered the speech. [See our article on "*Hansard*" describing the mode of official reporting.] The first quotation given by the *Star*, taken from Sir John A. Macdonald's discredited pamphlet, contains the words "Treaty obligations," while the quotations selected by the *Star* from the *Globe* and *SIGNAL* do not contain the term "Treaty obligations"—but merely the term "obligations"—a different thing altogether, as will be proved by Mr Cameron at the meeting he intends to hold in Goderich on Friday, Feb. 13th. The evidence of two witnesses is in law stronger than that of a single witness, and when witnesses called for the prosecution support the defence their testimony is overwhelming. The *Star* cites three witnesses—the pamphlet, the *Globe* and THE SIGNAL—to prove its case. The word "Treaty," which governs the entire sentence is not to be found in the quotation made by the *Star* from the *Globe* and *SIGNAL*, and because of that the quotation is in sense altogether different to the one taken from the pamphlet. A man who does not see the difference between the first quotation and the two following ones given by the *Star* must be either a blockhead or a knave. The testimony on hand so far stands thus. Mr Porter has on his side:

THE BOGUS HANSARD.
Sir John Macdonald's Pamphlet.
Mr Cameron has to support him:—
THE OFFICIAL HANSARD.
Globe. Cameron's Pamphlet, *SIGNAL*.

In conclusion, we repeat that when the editor of the *Star* said the *Hansard* was before him while writing the article he told what in plain language is called a lie. The Tories in Goderich had not a copy of *Hansard*, the official report of the proceedings of parliament, until after Mr Porter had quoted from the bogus *Hansard*, which was the book lying before the editor of the *Star*.

EVERY Irishman should read the article headed "Erin go Bragh," on our third page.
The schoolmaster is abroad. Mr Porter, in his lithographed letter, received by many voters, says he is in favor of the progressive "development" of our national resources. A man who is so antiquated as to spell "development" in that fashion is hardly likely to know how to practice it. Mr Porter, however, will have a worse spell after the 22nd.

HON. EDWARD BLAKE defines the Liberal Trade Policy as follows: "I believe in the view of the Moderate Protectionists—an ample advantage to the home manufacturer. Free Trade, as I have repeatedly explained, is for us impossible, and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect or defective and unjust."

THE HANSARD.

How Parliamentary Speeches are Officially Reported.

Why the Name "Hansard" is Given—How the Work is Done in England and in Canada.

In the county of Huron, and indeed throughout the Dominion, there has been a great deal of discussion of late over the *Hansard*, or the official report of the debates and proceedings of the House of Commons. The title *Hansard* has been an enigma to most of the electors, and indeed the Tory candidate for West Huron and the editor of the Tory organ in this town, appear to have been in woful ignorance as to what *Hansard* really is.

This peculiar title is given to the official reports of parliamentary proceedings, from the fact that Luke Hansard, of London, England, who for years printed the bills, committee reports and other records of the British House of Commons, conceived the idea of printing for the benefit of members of parliament and politicians generally a book containing approved reports of the speeches made by members of the House of Commons. Mr Hansard (and his sons have succeeded him in the work) arranged that the fullest and fairest reports of members' speeches should be clipped out of the morning newspapers, and a copy of each speech sent to the man who delivered it, for revision. Special reports are taken by shorthand writers on Hansard's staff of such portions of the debates as are rarely given, or given very briefly, in the newspapers. After the speeches have been corrected by the members, they are printed and bound, and parliament buys a number of copies for distribution among the public offices and departments. Many of the members of both houses, foreign governments and public libraries also subscribe for the work. It is practically a private enterprise, but the government requires a guarantee from the Messrs Hansard at the beginning of each session that the work shall not exceed a certain fixed price—on a similar basis as the agreement made between the Ontario government and the printers of the school books.

The Canadian system of official reporting is even more advanced than that of the old country. At first the work was "farmed out," but there was so much dissatisfaction amongst the members, reporters and others, that a further step was taken, and the work of reporting the debates, etc., was taken in hand by the government, and the reporters became regularly salaried officers of the House. There are six of them—four write English and two French. One versatile stenographer is equally at home reporting English or French. The work of reporting has been reduced to a fine thing by the Canadian *Hansard* staff. All of them are first class men, equal to any, as a body, in the world. They report in "takes" of ten minutes each, and as his "take" is finished, the writer quietly withdraws from the table and his successor quickly and noiselessly steps into his place. There is no friction, no loss of time; hardly a word is missed, unless the members are banging desks, as very often they do when the House is turned into a "bear garden." Last session when the government was being attacked by Messrs Cameron, Charlton, McMullen and others, the Tories made it a rule to endeavor to break the force of the Liberal assault by slamming the lids of desks, and indulging in loud and vulgar out-calls. On the whole the reports of the official stenographers are very well executed, and with the exception of the omission of an occasional word or the addition or exchange of another, which sometimes means little, and sometimes means a great deal, there is not much to complain of in them even as at first issued in the rough sheets, un-stitched and uncut, and unreviced by the speaker. When the member goes to the House the day after he has made his speech, he finds one of these proofs on his desk for revision. On each of them (as will be found in the bogus *Hansard* produced by Mr Porter in Goderich at his recent meeting here), will be found the following:

"NOTICE TO MEMBERS.
Necessary corrections to members' speeches for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.
The member then corrects his speech,

all mis-hearings by the reporter being amended, and superfluous or unintended words being stricken out. The government printers correct the proofs, as amended and approved of by the speaker, and the type is then taken by the foreman of the composing room, and devoid of heading and the "notice to members" quoted above, the revised speech is made up into new pages, and these pages when printed are bound together and become the official copy known as *Hansard*. The proof laid upon the member's desk the morning after he speaks, a copy of which is sent to the press in advance of the corrected and official report, is no more considered as a conclusive record or an official report than are the reports in the *Globe* or *Mail*.

The official record of Mr Cameron's speech on Indian affairs was printed five or six months before the Hamilton "pamphlet" was issued by the Indian department, and nine months before Mr Porter endeavored to palm off the imperfect, unreviced and bogus copy of the *Hansard*, which was not *Hansard*. An article in this paper, in another column, will show the importance of distinguishing between the bogus and the real *Hansard*.

THE *Globe* says:—Mr Cameron will be in the House of Commons again, and no Tory who manages to crawl back to that assembly will dare to accuse Mr Cameron there of having garbled the evidence or distorted it in the slightest degree.

THE sheriff has again been passed over by the Government in its selection of returning officers. It is just like Macdonald. However, he has made a certain measure of reparation in appointing Mr Corbett returning officer in West Huron. Mr Corbett was a prosperous woollen miller, until the N. P. knocked him out. It is only fair that he should be given something at the hands of the Government.

THE Toronto Telegram, which has been in favor of the Dominion Government of late, says regarding the Tupper deal:—"Sir Charles Tupper's accession to the cabinet will be a help to the party on the stump, but whether his accession will be a help to the party in the country is another question. Despite his splendid abilities Sir Charles is not altogether acceptable to the Conservatives, and it would be idle for observers to shut their eyes to the fact. He is probably no more corrupt than Sir John. But there is this difference, that while Sir John helped everybody else, Sir Charles has helped himself."

THE Tory press is now willing to admit that the impudent slanders against Mr Mackenzie and Mr Blake are false; willing to admit that some of the accusations against Sir John are true, willing to admit anything—anything at all—except the sweeping indictments of M. C. Cameron against the Tory party in general. But are they not true? Judging from the bitterness displayed against Mr Cameron, paralleled only by the dead-end made against Mr L. S. Huntington, after the Pacific Charter revelations; there must be a good deal of truth in Mr Cameron's assertions.—[Essex Centre Liberal.

SPAKING a week or two ago on Northwest affairs, Hon. Mr Mills, who was the Liberal minister of the Interior, said he "had actually been blamed for not settling the Half-breed claims in 1878 before going out of office, and by the supporters of a Ministry who had been in office seven years after without doing anything! The fact was, that on coming into office in 1874, the Mackenzie Government had found a vast area of Half-breed claims relating to Manitoba, and it had taken four years to get these into shape, the Conservative Government having done nothing from 1870 to 1874 except to pass an Act which considerably complicated the question. These Half-breed claims had only just arisen when he was leaving office, but he had taken care not to complicate them further by new surveys."

A LIST OF FINANCIAL FIGURES from the Official Gazette, published by the Government:—
"The statement of revenue and expenditures for the fiscal year ending 30th of June, on account of the consolidated fund as follows:—
Revenue \$33,311,420
Expenditure 39,176,972
Deficit \$4,864,553
There is a plain admission from the Government itself of an enormous deficit.

"THE BOSS BIBLE."

A Feast for a Number of Tories Who Never Read the Scriptures.

Rev. G. F. Saiton, on Sunday evening, delivered a slashing criticism of what he, in order to create popular interest in his discourse, called "The Mutilated Bible, Better Known as the Boss Bible." These were a large congregation; and among those occupying seats of advantage were a number of Tory leaders and ward politicians whose names in connection with reading of the Scriptures, is provocative of a smile. The following is an impartial synopsis of the style and argument of the clever and vigorous pastor of Victoria street Methodist church, who, it will be seen, clears the Ontario Government from the charge of collusion with Archbishop Lynch as was falsely charged by the Tories:—

Before announcing his text, the preacher prefaced his remarks by stating that he was not a politician. He already knew too much of politics to be either a red hot Conservative or a rabid Grit, and he believed there was not a man in the congregation (though there might be two or three women—who know everything) who knew how he would cast his vote and influence in the coming elections. Yet, though not a politician, he had the three requisites for judging the book he held in his hand (the "Boss Bible" he called it). First, he brought to it an unprejudiced mind; second, he was a student of the Bible; and third, he had been for nine years a public school teacher, and knew the wants of day school pupils. He strongly urged the people not to make political capital out of what might be said.

The text was taken from Jeremiah 33rd chap. 23rd verse, "He cut it with his penknife." After graphically describing the history of Jehoiaikim and Jeremiah up to the time of his text, the reverend gentleman said "This treatment of the Divine Word did not occur in this case once for all; this self-same thing is being done in so-called Christian lands every day. Elishama's penknife is as busy as ever." The first man denounced as a sinner who ran his knife from Genesis to Revelation, and rejected the whole; and the second was he who cut out portions of the Bible and rejected them. One cuts out the story of the creation, and another the story of Jonah. One crosses the word "Hell," and then declares there is no hell because his Bible contains it not; and another cuts out the phrase everlasting punishment, and as he wipes his bloody knife imagines he has witnessed the reality. "No, sir, you shall not rob me of one single chapter or of one single verse or of one single word. Nay, I dare you to remove the dot of an 'i' or the cross of a 't' from the message God has given me."

It is urged that the selections placed in our public and high schools is a sacred Bible, a mutilated thing, a book of bits and scraps, a book through which the scalping knife of Archbishop Lynch, of G. W. Ross, of W. H. C. Kerr has been thrust until little or nothing of the original scripture is left. Now, so far as I can ascertain, Archbishop Lynch and the Catholics had little, almost nothing, to do with it. The book was in shape long before Ross was appointed Minister of Education. Teachers did not want it; they asked for a calendar or list to guide their Scripture Selections. Liberals are not to blame for it is the compilation, I believe, of a Conservative; and Conservatives are not to blame, for it was sanctioned by a Grit Government. I will not forget it is a book of Selections, still I wish in my heart of hearts the wretched mutilated thing had never been authorized. Only "Selections," but he wished Jeremiah and Esther had had some place. Only "Selections," but he was sorry that the book of Romans, the great foundation epistle of the doctrine of justification by faith, had, with the exception of a few verses been entirely missed. But are even the selections correct? Take the third chapter of James. Here the lesson begins in the middle of verse 2 and closes with the last verse but one. Oh I go on say, perhaps the paragraph ends there! Not at all. The paragraph ends with the chapter, and the last verse complete the sense. Take the 39th chap. of Genesis as given in lesson 17. It reads smoothly to the 6th verse, then slips over to the middle of verse 17 (and in place of the verses arranged there are words nowhere to be found in the Bible from lid to lid.) It then misses verses 18 and 19, goes on with verse 20, reads to verse 23, out of which it misses a word, leaps over to chapter 40 out of the middle of verse 4, of which it continues to miss the sentence "and he served them," and winds up as though the whole Scripture and nothing but Scripture had been given. It is the most mutilated, up-to-date bit of Scripture ever met with in public schools. Take I John 1:1. The selection begins at first verse, travels along to the 6th, misses two beautiful paragraphs, hops into the middle of a third destroying sense and harmony, and winds up with looping off the last verse of the chapter. The sermon on the mount, the 23rd of Peter, the 81st Psalm, the 21st of Revelation, and many other passages were then referred to. Brethren, there are in this book five score such mutilations. Five score penknife cuts through which the life-blood of the gospel streams, leaving it a dry, lifeless, withered thing. Through these stark, staring wounds there come eloquent appeals for the truth. God grant the time may not be far distant when the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing, but the Bible will be the most conspicuous object in all our schools.