

Hon. Mr. WATSON: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: It means two years instead of one year.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: This is a very serious amendment. In practice this is what takes place. The freight comes in from the United States—from Pennsylvania, or from Chicago—and passes over half-a-dozen different railways. There may be claims for overcharge. It is very difficult to adjust such claims. The files of the different railways have to be sent from one company to another, and it takes months to adjust the matter. Sometimes a company has to pay the claim and is then reimbursed by other companies, but as a rule I think the claim is not paid until it is adjusted among the different companies concerned. The claim may be paid by one company, or it may be divided among several. So it is very important that it be made within a reasonable time; otherwise it is very difficult to adjust it. I happen to have had personal experience in adjustment of a number of cases of such claims, and I think the delay of one year was reasonable. If there is a claim to be made it should be made within one year, otherwise it is very difficult to adjust it. I think extending the time for the adjustment of claims to two years is unreasonable.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I may say, briefly, that the request for the extension of time from one to two years was made by the employees because of the experience in a number of cases where men who had been very seriously injured had lain in hospital month after month and had amputation after amputation, and did not know until after one year had expired after the accident whether or not they were going to be permanently disabled, and therefore could not enter into litigation with the company. After the year had passed by the company would say: "You are now out of court, because a year has expired." That is why this amendment is brought before the House.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: I see that it applies only to injuries; so my objection does not stand.

The amendment was agreed to .

The Committee rose and reported.

On motion of Hon. Sir James Loughheed, the amendments were concurred in.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON.

DEBATES OF THE SENATE.

REPORTING FOR THE PRESS.

Hon. Mr. FARRELL moved that the third report of the Standing Committee on Debates and Reporting be concurred in. He said: This report merely asks for a renewal of the agreement made in 1913 with Mr. Hannay as reporter and Mr. Fortier as translator.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL: I think it is well that the members of the Senate should know what they are doing. It has been the practice for a number of years past to employ a special Senate reporter to prepare a synopsis of the proceedings and debates of the Senate. It was presumed that the press would pay some attention to the proceedings of the Senate if they were furnished gratuitously with a report of the proceedings; yet very little attention has been paid to the Senate by the press. The point to be considered by the Senate now is whether we are justified in continuing the payment of a special reporter for making a synopsis of the proceedings of the House which is utilized only to a very limited extent, and under certain circumstances, by the press of the country. When Parliament is in session we pay \$40 a week to the reporter and \$15 a week to the translator. There is very little for the reporter to do, and very little has been done in the way of translation. We have not, to my mind, received an adequate return for the money we have spent. During the present session of Parliament we had a vacation of over two months, and during that time the reporter received \$20 a week for doing nothing. During the present year we have paid nearly \$3,000 for these services. It is for the Senate to consider whether we are justified in expending money in the manner in which it has been expended, without receiving an adequate compensating return in the form of publicity by the newspapers to the reports which are furnished them. I wish the Senate to understand that I am not finding fault with the manner in which the reporter has performed his duties; but that though he has performed his duties to a certain extent in a satisfactory manner, I contend that the Senate is receiving no consideration from the press though these reports are furnished for nothing. I may add in this connection that, so far as the committee is concerned, I stand a glorious minority of one. The other members of the committee were in favour of the report which has been presented. There-