

because the mere publication of the statement laid before the committee, made from authentic sources, of the comparative expenditure and the comparative increases of expenditure of the two Houses, would have been an answer to a great deal of the foolish calumnies and slanders that are published about the Senate on this particular subject. I therefore entirely concur in the views that have been stated by different hon. members that the debate in question ought to appear and that everything which we find it necessary to say in discussing these contingencies should be published, and I do not believe that anything that is said on that subject can produce any other effect than to add to the credit and standing of this honorable House in the eyes of the people.

HON. MR. POWER—If the hon. gentleman had been present at the debate to which reference has been made I do not think he would have applied the language to it which we have just heard. It was a debate which was anything but calculated to elevate this House in the eyes of the public and further; it was a debate which conveyed no valuable information to the public. It was a debate in which a good deal was said as to the character of one of the subordinate employés of the Senate. Was that the sort of thing which should go to the public upon our records? That is the only reason why these domestic matters are referred to committees, that they are not subjects of a kind which should be discussed in public. Men make statements with respect to the characters of employés which may be altogether wrong, a which may turn out, upon further investigation, not to be well founded; but still, when cases of that kind are brought up, there must be a certain liberty of discussion, otherwise the truth is not to be arrived at. Hon. gentlemen must see that the floor of this House is not the place where such discussions should take place. That was the principle on which the committee recommended the non-publication of the debate in question. The hon. gentleman from Amherst and the hon. leader of the House both spoke a good deal of valuable truth as to our not being ashamed that the details of our expenditure should be made public. There was no question of making public the details of our expenditure. The debate did

not deal with that at all, but dealt with the characters of certain employés.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I understand from what is told me that the discussion turned to some extent upon the merits or demerits of some employé of the House, as to the propriety of continuing him in the service of the Senate. One of the calumnies circulated freely about the Senate is that we retain in our employ persons who are unfit for their duties, and that in this way we are squandering the public money. Is there anything more calculated to aid this House than to show that there is nothing of the kind?

HON. MR. MILLER—The question of superannuation was involved in the discussion.

HON. MR. POWER—The question is whether a debate which dealt with purely domestic matters of that kind and did not deal with the subject of our expenditure directly should be published. Now, what took place in this matter? There must have been something a little unusual in the character of the debate when the reporter himself asked the question of the chairman of the Debates Committee whether this particular report should be published or not. A good deal has been said, particularly by the hon. gentleman from Victoria, as to the great liberty—the unpardonable liberty—taken by one member of the committee with this debate. Now, I happen to be the member of the committee who took this unpardonable liberty, and I may state what the liberty consisted of. The reporter himself was under the impression that this debate was not one that it was desirable to publish, and spoke to the chairman of the committee in that sense. I afterwards, in the course of the evening, happened to see the reporter. I did not go to see him about this special thing; but I suggested to him that, as the committee were to meet the following morning, it might be as well to defer the publication of this particular debate until the committee met and had a chance to deal with it. Accordingly, the committee met the next morning and did recommend that this part of the debate be not published, and now the question for the House is, whether the committee were right or wrong. It is absurd to talk about an outrage upon the liberties and privileges