

is another consideration. How far are we justified in making an arrangement for future sessions of Parliament? I know that we have been in the habit of doing so; but it is questionable how far the practice should be continued. Let the next Parliament, of whomsoever it may be composed, employ a reporter and pay him if it is thought proper. To my mind we are going a little beyond our duty. It was pointed out in the committee that some years ago I originated this practice of employing a reporter. That is quite true. I did so on the supposition that if a synopsis of the proceedings of the Senate were furnished to the press it would be utilized; but they have treated the Senate with the same contempt as previously. Whether it is because the press consider that this House is useless or that the utterances of the members are of no consequence to the community is a question which they have to consider. I have come to the conclusion, after three or four years' experience, that this is a useless expenditure, more particularly at this time when economy is supposed to be the order of the day. I could give the amounts expended during the last four or five years in this connection, but I do not think it is necessary to do so. I simply express my own general views on this question as to whether we should adopt this report and continue to make provision for the next session of Parliament. After considering the whole question, I think we are in duty bound to allow this matter to stand until the next session of Parliament, and to let that Parliament take such action as it may think proper. I know the answer to that will be: "You will not have any reporter; there will be nobody to take a seat in this House and make a report of the proceedings." Considering the results in the past, I do not think that will be of any consequence to the public or to the Senate.

Hon. Mr. POWER: Honourable gentlemen, I sympathize to some extent with the honourable gentleman from Hastings (Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell), but I think this is a question which may be considered from a different point of view. This Senate has been rather remarkable, I think, for the good sense which has characterized the debates. Perhaps I may say that ten years ago there was just as much wisdom embodied in our debates as at present, but we found that while words of wisdom were flowing from the lips of senators they never reached the public. We have had Hansard, it is true, but the proprietors of the newspapers did not seem to think that it was

worth the trouble of examining it to see if there was anything that was deserving of notice in the papers, and, if so, how much notice it deserved. The honourable gentleman from Hastings, who has had a large experience in connection with the press, realized, as the rest of us did, that this was an unsatisfactory condition of things, and that some means should be adopted to place at least a summary of the work done by the Senate before the eyes of the public, and this plan of having a gentleman to prepare a summary of the Senate debates for distribution to the various newspapers was suggested by him. We had a gentleman who discharged this duty for some time. I do not remember whether he left the country, died, or became too old or too proud to continue the work. At any rate, the Senate appointed Mr. Hannay for the purpose of making this summary. I think every honourable gentleman who knows about it, including the honourable gentleman from Halifax, the Chairman of the Printing Committee (Hon. Mr. Dennis), who is also a member of the Debates Committee, feels that Mr. Hannay did his work well. If honourable gentlemen will compare the notice which the Senate gets in the newspapers nowadays with what it got ten years ago, they will find that there is very much more attention paid to the proceedings of this House now than there was at that time. We pay thousands of dollars for the purpose of having a Hansard report made and translated, but, as the public do not see these reports, it is clear that the money is not bringing the results that it should, and that the only result of a public character that we get is the summary that Mr. Hannay prepares and distributes to the different newspapers. The honourable gentleman from Hastings, as he said, has felt, during the last three or four years, that the money paid to Mr. Hannay and Mr. Fortier, who translates the summary, is money thrown away. There is a good deal of money thrown away in connection with the Government generally, but I do not think that the money paid to Mr. Hannay can be said to have been thrown away. There has been no question raised about it hitherto, and while I think the honourable gentleman from Hastings is perfectly right in expressing his opinion on the subject, I think, on the whole, that summarily to get rid of these two gentlemen will not be in the interest of the Senate and will be to a certain extent a blow to the gentlemen concerned.