

wish to prevent the carrying out of so useful an institution—an institution of which I am decidedly in favour. I believe that we ought to continue it, and improve on it; and in the interest of good Government, that a true and faithful record should be had of the statements of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House. I cannot imagine any other reason for the attempt to kill it off, than a wish to prevent the existence of such a record. As to the expense, I do not think that the country should complain of it, for it is a mere bagatelle compared with the usefulness of the *Hansard*, which enables hon. members authoritatively—if the occasion presents itself—to quote the hon. member for Chateauguay *versus* the hon. member for Chateauguay, or the hon. member for Northumberland *versus* the hon. member for Northumberland.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON—When I discovered that the hon. member was opposed to the consideration of the report, I endeavoured to obtain a meeting of the Committee, which I think has the right to continue the system under the existing Order of the House; but I was unable to secure a quorum. Under the circumstances, we can have no *Hansard* at all.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—The expression of the House, communicated to the Committee, is sufficient.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—There is no House.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—The Government represent the House.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—I believe that the majority of the House are opposed to the continuation of the *Hansard*. If I were not of that opinion, certainly I would not assume the responsibility of taking the course I am now pursuing. With reference to the manner in which the reporters have discharged their duties, I have no fault whatever to find. I think that these duties have been fairly and faithfully performed. I strove with others for many years to have this system tried. It has been tried; and to my judgment, it is a failure. We are better without than with it; and I think that this is the present

sense of the House. Those who are in favour of it ought to have moved earlier in the matter. They had abundant time, and this is one of the Standing Committees of the House. They have always the ear of the Chamber; and there would have been no difficulty in bringing up the report at an earlier period when the benches were filled. If this had been done, I should have explained my views, and acquiesced with the decision of the majority if adverse to my opinions with the best possible grace.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—Why did you not take the legitimate way to ascertain what the opinion of the House really was; you may be wrong?

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—It was not for me to take the initiative. I repeat that I take the perhaps unamiable responsibility of enforcing the rules of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman from Chateauguay has pronounced a most severe censure on the Committee to which this subject was relegated. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that this Committee wilfully allowed this very important subject to pass over until the last moment, when everybody must know it was too late to come to any conclusion on it. It was the duty of that Committee not only to see that the *Hansard* was attended to for this Session, but that some policy should be arrived at for its continuance next Session. My hon. friend says he feels that the majority of the House are against the *Hansard*. I beg leave to differ with him, and to say I believe that when the House meets next Session the majority will be found to be in favour of its continuance. The country is in favour of it, and will not be willing to give it up. This will be a retrograde step in respect of a most important subject. I am convinced, now the country has had the advantage of an official record, it will insist on its continuance. The people have a right to have a report of the debates of their representatives which has some official character, and which is not tainted by the supposed political proclivities of the different newspapers which would otherwise be the sole re-

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL.