

good. I always give my copies to public institutions in my own province, and I believe the distribution of the debates, after being delivered to members, ought to be to public institutions and public libraries, where they would be kept on record and the people in every district of Canada could have an opportunity of consulting them. Other members may do as I have been doing, but I do not think it is generally done. It is because we think we might change the course of the distribution in our province, and in other provinces where there is a population of French Canadians who do not understand English, that I suggest that the Debates should be distributed where they will be kept on record for consultation. In the different parts of the country, if the head men of the municipalities want to consult public documents they have to come to Ottawa, or some such place, to find copies. If those documents were distributed, as I have just stated, you would find a copy in every part of Canada in a place where it could be seen, and that is the best way to distribute. The third part of our report concerns Mr. Smith, who reports for the newspapers and who has been kept on the reporting staff for some years past. The report recommends to the House the advisability of continuing his services.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I should like to ask the chairman what suggested the idea of putting in the words "adjourned or prorogued." The reason I ask the question is, to ascertain whether the committee supposed for a moment that the government ever intended to adjourn the House until next spring, so as to make it a continuous session. I have good reason to believe that the question was suggested, and it is stated, whether correctly or not, that the leader of this House was in favour of it, in order to prevent the large expenditure involved in holding a second session, but his party were not in accord with him, whether they are or are not in accord with the leader of the other House. But the determination, after discussion, was that the parliament should be prorogued and not adjourned. I will not say why. We can draw our own inferences from that. If the hon. gentleman moves the adjournment of the House until next spring, whether the majority would carry it or not, he should have my support, but I do not believe the spirit of economy prevails to

such an extent that there is any likelihood of that suggestion being carried out.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—I am not aware of ever having expressed any opinion on the question of adjournment or prorogation.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—Before the committee the question was, what would result if it was an adjournment and not a prorogation? If it was to be an adjournment, the reporters would have a right to receive \$300 per week during the recess, and, that question not having been decided, I suggested myself that these two words should be added to the report, so as to cover both contingencies.

The motion was agreed to.

THE STATIONERY SUPPLY.

MOTION.

Hon. Sir JOHN CARLING moved the adoption of the first report of the joint Committee on Printing.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I desire to call attention to a report which has been published in the papers reflecting on the Senate, and I think the reporters or editors, whoever they may be, have taken a liberty which is altogether unjustifiable. I notice in the *Toronto World* of the 1st, the following paragraph referring to the action taken by the Senate with regard to the restaurant. After giving the motion which I moved in reference to limiting the privileges of the Senate restaurant, in certain respects, to senators, and mentioning my name, the reporter says:

There is no doubt about the Senate's action being influenced by the decision of the House of Commons, early in the afternoon, to cut off the leather trunks and stationery of the senators after the session.

The *Montreal Herald* reports it in this fashion:

The Senate this evening got a blow back at the House of Commons, for having deprived the senators of their trunks and stationery perquisites, by passing a resolution that thereafter the privileges of the Senate restaurant shall be confined to senators. Those members of the Commons who have been "visiting the corner stone" since the sale of liquor was prohibited in their restaurant, will hereafter have to go dry or carry a pocket flask.