

that we are not adding to the importance of the Senate, the interest taken in its debates or their accuracy, by the proposition made by the Committee, and I am prepared to vote against it and continue our present arrangement, which gives general satisfaction.

Hon. Mr. DEVER — I feel some delicacy in opposing the report of the Committee. I have no doubt they took the greatest possible care to devise the best system they could, but I must say that I am opposed to any change from the present arrangement, which has proved so satisfactory. I think it would be unfortunate for members of this Senate to be deprived of the opportunity of revising the reports of their speeches before they go to the public, because if they go in an imperfect or uncorrected state it will be impossible to remove or revoke the wrong impressions which they will create. Then, as to publicity, I cannot for the life of me see what publicity a few sheets of paper sent through the mails could give. Under the present arrangement we receive the *Citizen*, containing the reports of our speeches, on coming to the Senate in the morning; and we can send copies of the paper in large numbers to our friends, and in that way a good impression is created, and the business of the Senate is made known all over the country. The plan proposed by the Committee is not new. We had something similar to it in the session of 1878, and I can recollect at that time there was a very poor impression abroad with reference to this House. Since we changed the system there has been a marked improvement in public opinion in reference to the Senate, and the people entertain a different feeling for this Chamber. Three years ago it was quite a common thing to apply the most offensive epithets to this House; one gentleman going so far as to characterize it as an asylum for broken down politicians. I am sure the expressions of this House are looked for with the greatest interest by the people, who believe that we give serious and careful consideration to the subjects which come before us. I cannot conceive that it would be possible to improve on the present plan. It has given general satisfaction, and brought about a unity of sentiment amongst the

*Hon. Mr. Kaulbach.*

several members of this House. I am not aware that a single gentleman has a feeling that injustice has been done to him, and that is an important matter in a House of this description. It is better that this good feeling should exist than that any portion of the members of the Senate should feel that injustice was being done them because they happen to be in the minority. If the new system is adopted and members are not given an opportunity to revise their speeches, they will feel that they are not bound by their utterances as reported. Under the circumstances I certainly feel anxious to continue the present arrangement until the Committee can offer us something better.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN — I should like to know if the Committee have made any inquiry as to the cost of getting a half column or column summary published in some of the leading papers in Toronto or Montreal. I think that is the only way to get publicity for the proceedings of this House. The edition, I see, is to consist of 1,200 copies, of which 700 are to be distributed and the remaining 500 are to be revised and bound. That must involve a very considerable expense, and I should like to know whether for the same amount of money we could not subsidize the leading papers in Toronto and Montreal to publish a daily summary and whether such publication might not be substituted for the 700 copies that are intended for distribution?

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE — I may say that we did make inquiries, but were not able to get any satisfactory reply. If you leave it to the Toronto and Montreal papers to send their reporters, what would you very probably find? There would be different reports, and you would not have satisfactory summaries. Every hon. gentleman knows that it is very difficult to get correct summaries of debates. The leading newspapers are represented in the other House, and publish summaries to suit their readers. That would not be satisfactory in this House. The Committee are not wedded to the system recommended in the report, nor will they consider it at all offensive if the House should adopt a different arrangement. By this plan the speeches appear in print the day after they are delivered. If they contain