

which the country appreciates and which the farmers want, and I think we ought to supply the necessary money to carry it on effectively.

The Haras National Co., for the use of 6 stallions for the Experimental Farm. \$6,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I suppose these horses are kept to improve the stock of the country for export purposes. Now, we have heard a great deal about Great Britain being the best market for Canadian horses. I have examined the records, and I find that for the last three years Great Britain has imported only 1,026 horses more than she has exported. I believe myself, that we can never establish a thoroughly successful trade in horses with Great Britain owing to the long voyage across the Atlantic. Germany supplies the largest number for the British market, and Denmark also supplies a large number. Before the passage of the McKinley Bill the United States imported 25,000 horses more than they exported, but after the passage of that Bill, that number has been reduced to 15,000. The horses used at the experimental farm are not the kind to improve the breed of the country, neither for carriage horses nor for farm horses.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I would like to ask if these horses are eligible to enter for the Chicago Exhibition under the standard regulation there laid down?

Mr. CARLING. I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Dominion Millers' Association.—(Mr. Stevenson.)

### OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). (Translation.) I beg to move:

That the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House, during this session, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the suggestion of the Debates Committee, this report recommends the appointment of Mr. Desjardins, shorthand writer, to replace the late Mr. Marceau.

Mr. LANGELIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a most important question. This report, I understand, suggests the appointment of Mr. Alphonse Desjardins as French shorthand writer at a salary of \$2,000 a year. I have nothing to say

against the gentleman personally. He is very well known in Quebec, is quite respected, and I am sure that, if all that is necessary were to publish a summary of the debates of this House, there would be no question in reference to him. The gentleman referred to has been publishing the report of the debates in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, but that was only a summary and was not the same thing as we have here and for which we pay. In Quebec they had only a summary, and after each speech was reported, the report was handed over to the member who made the speech to see whether it was a fair summary or not. But that is not what we want here or what we pay for. We pay \$2,000 a year for each shorthand writer. Two thousand dollars for a session is a very big salary, we must admit, and I was under the impression that Mr. Desjardins, although a very respectable man and a very competent man to publish a summary of the proceedings, was not a shorthand writer. I did ask the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) if the committee, or if he himself, understanding the French language, was aware whether Mr. Desjardins was a shorthand writer or not. He stated that he was relying on the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White).

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). The hon. gentleman has twice made a statement which is not exact. I said that one of those who mentioned Mr. Desjardins as being qualified was the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), but I said I had relied on several members who knew Mr. Desjardins better than I did, because I did not know him or his ability as a stenographer, but the testimonies I received from those who did know him were such that the committee unanimously thought they were justified in appointing him. As to the testimony of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), I only mentioned him as one of the newspaper editors who were supposed to be an authority on the matter, and I did not confine myself to that testimony. Before recommending the appointment of Mr. Desjardins, the committee enquired as to his capacity and qualifications, and the conclusion was, from all we knew of him, that he was one of the best qualified men we could appoint.

Mr. LANGELIER. I must say that that is not the fact. When I first spoke to the hon. gentleman on this subject I was not quite sure in reference to Mr. Desjardins' qualifications, but I have been to Quebec twice since then, and have taken information from those who know him, and I am told that Mr. Desjardins cannot write more than 50 or 60 words a minute, which is completely insufficient to take shorthand notes of the speeches in this House. If we pay \$2,000 a session for the shorthand reporter of the French debates in this House, we have the right to get the best work for our money, and there is no lack of good shorthand reporters in the French language. There are some in Quebec who can write easily 200 words a minute and there are some in Montreal, and those I spoke to told me it was quite out of the question to suppose that Mr. Desjardins could do the shorthand reports of this House. If you want abridged reports it is all right, but I think it should be the first duty of the committee to ascertain whether Mr. Desjardins is able to write at least 150 words a minute, because that is the least rapidity at which a shorthand writer should write in order to