

sending in lists of subscribers. We thoroughly appreciate your assistance, brethren.

EVERY reader of the WRITER will be interested in the article on *Hansard* in this number. It relates, of course, in the practical details, to the plan adopted by the late contractor. We hope to hear from Mr. Bradley, the chief of the new official staff, in regard to the work under the Government scheme.

We are in a position to promise an extraordinary number next month. It will contain in a group the portraits of the newly-appointed *Hansard* staff, accompanied with a biographical sketch of each; a cartoon portrait of Prof. Dan Brown, of Chicago, Ill.; a number of cartoons by Mr. J. W. Bengough, a page of the Cross system of Shorthand, and interesting articles from valued contributors.

A STANDARD PHONOGRAPHIC SYSTEM.

A correspondent, who hails the advent of the SHORTHAND WRITER with delight, thinks the only thing Canadians now require is for some intelligent person to compile what he calls a "Standard Phonographic System for Canada." We doubt the correctness of this position. Various systems are needed to suit varied temperaments. The suggestion is an argument

MR. BENGOUGH'S REPORTING NOTES.

We have received transcripts of the notes in the case of Wilford vs. Grand Trunk, which appeared in last month's WRITER, from several stenographers in the United States and Canada. None of the transcripts comes up to the ideal, so far as regards giving "all the evidence but not all the words"; and there are some comical misreadings. The word "Wilson" has been translated into "Wellsley," "Wilslet," and "Wilsle." These are pardonable errors, for the shorthand form used was not strictly in accordance with Isaac Pitman—a most useful expedient being employed for the second syllable. More serious, however, are the defects in the spelling. For instance we find "directed," "landladie's"—used in the singular number, possessive case, "delived," "lodgeed" for "lodged." The last few forms have suggested these readings: "No, sir, not a treat;" "Did not go to St. Dufferin;" and "N't to treat." In one case words have been divided at the end of a line thus: "me-me," "beca-use." This is simply horrible, and no stenographer, however proficient among the pot-hooks, could hold a position if he practised such a "halving principle" in transcription.

None of these remarks applies to Mr. Horton's transcript except the first one. Although he is a Grahamite he is the only one in the list whose reading of the notes is perfect. With the transcript he sends the following:—

"My own notes generally afford me all the transcription I care for; but I send this as bearing upon the comparative legibility of systems. I was able to read Mr. Bengough's working notes more readily—if I have made no mistake in them—than I could Mr. Butcher's carefully written and (so far as I can see) correctly written specimen of Graham, although I myself have written the latter system for years. Indeed, after repeated trials I am still unable to solve Mr. Butcher's enigma. I can make out the Munson specimens pretty well."

THE FOLLOWING IS MR. HORTON'S TRANSCRIPT.

CHARLES WILFORD, sworn—

This action is for loss of goods and damages. The goods were delivered in 1875—July last, the latter end—three boxes I left at my lodgings in Hamilton to deliver to

against a "standard" system; for our correspondent is evidently dissatisfied with all the systems he has seen; and if he, for instance, were to compile a new one, the writers of the present systems would probably deem it as impracticable as he now deems theirs.

REPORTING THE SENATE DEBATES.

During a discussion on the subject of reporting officially the debates in the Canadian Senate, the Hon. Mr. Alexander said he observed the Committee recommended the renewal of the contract with the Messrs. Holland for the next season. The majority of the Committee felt that the work during the present session had been very well done, and it was the general feeling of the Senate that the Messrs. Holland had done the reporting most accurately, and had taken very great pains to do everybody justice. It was very gratifying to members of the Chamber, when they had made elaborate statements upon great moral and political questions, to find that their debates went to the country in such a way as to show that the Upper House was doing a good work. He was sure that he himself had no cause to complain of the manner in which the debates had been reported.

The contract has been renewed for another year. The cost of the service is \$4,500.

the Grand Trunk to come to Toronto by the Grand Trunk. I directed them to "Wilson, Toronto."

CROSS-EXAMINED.

Q.—What were you called in Hamilton? A.—My name is proper [h] Wilford; but where I lodged I was called Wilson more than Wilford.

Q.—You were called Wilson at Hamilton? A.—I was, because the landlady said it was a funny name to get into. Q.—How did you leave Hamilton, by foot or train? A.—I walked away to Wellington Square. I did not see these things put on board the train; I left them with my landlady; I forget what his name is—it was in King street where I lodged. I never delivered any goods to the Grand Trunk myself.

Q.—One of the boxes came back safe and sound? A.—No. I charge for something in each of the three.

Q.—You were called Wilford at Clark's? A.—I was not called at all, because they did not know my name.

Q.—Did you go to any tavern? A.—No, not particular.

TRANSCRIPT OF MR. KNAPP'S NOTES.

(See page 36.)

CHARLES MERRILL, a witness sworn for the people. Direct examination by Mr. VAN RIPER.

Q.—Your name is Charles Merrill? A.—Yes sir.

Q.—How old are you? A.—21.

Q.—Where do you live? A.—Hager.

Q.—What is your business? A.—Teaming and farming.

Q.—How long have you lived in Hager? A.—Well off and on about five years.

Q.—Did you know Phillip J. Seal in his lifetime? A.—Well yes, I was a little acquainted with him, not a great deal.

Q.—Do you know Stephen Crabb? A.—Yes sir.

Q.—How long have you known him? A.—Oh, about two years.

Q.—You was intimately acquainted with him, was you not? A.—Not very much.

Q.—Close friends? A.—Not very close.

Q.—Was you present at this dance? A.—Yes sir.

Q.—Did you see Phillip J. Seal there? A.—Yes sir.