

staff than we could secure without largely increasing the expenditure to keep pace with the voluminous debates which occurred not long ago on the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill. In view of the general satisfaction which has been expressed with reference to the system which it is proposed to supersede, but which I really hope the House will hesitate before it does so, I say, looking at those things, it would be very unwise on our part hastily to abolish a system which has given very general satisfaction, and adopt another which it is said has been found to answer in another place. If the reports which we may see daily in the city papers of the debates of the House of Commons are to be accepted as a satisfactory illustration of the working of that system, I can only say that I deem such work to be very unsatisfactory. I have seen reports of most interesting debates, which I had listened to with the greatest pleasure in the galleries the preceding night, curtailed within the smallest bounds, and not given with the fairness that one would have a right to expect. I think it hon. gentlemen expect any section of the press to give a *resumé* of the debates of this House in a fair, candid and impartial spirit, they will be very much disappointed. In the first place, it would require a reporter of the very highest ability. It is not ordinary reporting, but special work. A man may be a first class reporter and yet not have the special talent and knowledge required to summarize a debate. And, in the next place, all the leading papers of the Dominion will probably find it more to their interest to publish the debates of the House of Commons and of the Local Legislatures, rather than of the Senate. I think we should look at the subject of our debates in a spirit rather different from what hon. gentlemen are inclined to regard them. If we look, for instance, at the debates of the House of Lords, and the manner in which they are reported in the London papers, we do not find that they are considered of sufficient interest to be given in extended form. There may be occasionally debates on affairs in India and Afghanistan in the House of Lords which possess special interest, because, perhaps, many of the speakers were per-

sonally concerned in them, and when such debates occur they are given at considerable length in the London papers, but the ordinary proceedings of the House of Lords, like proceedings of this House, have not sufficient interest to induce any prominent newspapers to occupy any large space in their columns or to incur any considerable expense in reproducing them, even in condensed form. For that reason I think the House will be acting unwisely in casting away the advantage they have enjoyed of occupying daily during the session so much space in one of the papers published here in Ottawa. For that reason I do hope that the House will hesitate before they adopt this report.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY — I have no desire to say much on this subject, because it is well known that my views on the general question of reporting do not run on all fours with the opinion of a great many gentlemen in this House. My contention has always been that we get too little for our money, and that we pay a great deal for which we get no adequate return. I have no doubt the members of the Committee have done the best they could. They have given the question their careful consideration, and I cannot go quite as far as my hon. friend who proposes to oppose the report, but there are one or two points on which I should like to have a word of explanation from the hon. Senator who has charge of this matter. The question of revision of speeches comes up, and I should like to know whether these copies for the newspapers are to be sent after the reports are revised or before?

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE — Before; they are to be sent immediately.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY — If they are to be sent before revision, then it is obvious we shall have reports sent out to the country as our utterances when we have not had an opportunity of revising them, and the revision will only apply to the permanent record. Nobody reads them, as we have been told on several occasions, and they can only be useful as a book of reference. That will make an objection to this system which does not apply to the present arrangement, because now, when the debates do go before