

other members of the committee agreed with Shipherd that the record was practically useless. Dawson, the stenographer, made an explanation. The substance of which was that he was out of practice, and had found it difficult to secure the requisite help in transcribing his notes. In view of the severe criticisms of members of the committee, he declined to act as stenographer any longer, and suggested that his predecessor, Mr. Hayes, be reinstated. This, of course, could not be agreed to, as Hayes was not an officer of the House, and the only thing that could be done was for the committee to adjourn, which they did. The friends of the Speaker claim that he was imposed on in regard to the appointment of Dawson, who was represented to him as a man of first-class ability, and was backed by extraordinary influence. Much sympathy is expressed for Mr. Dawson, who is an estimable gentleman, and who explained to the committee that he had been for a considerable length of time out of practice, and believed that in the course of a few weeks he should be able to do correct and accurate work. The Chairman expressed himself very kindly toward him.

"At a subsequent session Shipherd begged the indulgence of the committee for the purpose of calling attention to the official reports of the proceedings. He said: "I have been examining this morning the hundred pages or more of printed evidence, as prepared from the notes of the official reporter, and I find many omissions and many glaring inaccuracies. I must protest against the inconsistencies and gross absurdities which I noted in this printed evidence, which has just been received from the Public Printer. I find more than twenty mistakes on a single page."

"Messrs. Rice, Belmont, and others of the committee expressed dissatisfaction at the official reports, and thought some means should be adopted to secure correct reports of the proceedings before the committee.

"Mr. Shipherd stated that upon careful examination each day he found the Associated Press reports as nearly accurate as could be desired, and as it was a matter of some importance, inasmuch as the evidence would be submitted to the House and the country, that the investigation should be reported correctly, he would suggest the propriety of revising the official reports, using the Associated Press reports as a basis.

"The official reporter recently appointed to supersede Mr. Hayes desired to make a statement, and explained that he was out of practice on assuming the duties of official reporter, and had engaged an assistant, who would relieve him during the morning.

"The Chairman inquired if the gentleman whom he had engaged was a reporter, and upon replying in the negative he turned to Hayes, who was present to report the proceedings for the Associated Press, and requested him to make the official report. Hayes declined, for the reason that he was not under oath, and was moreover engaged for the Associated Press."

The above despatch has a pretty strong bias,

which is particularly manifest in the paragraph alluding to the accuracy of the "Associated Press" reports, and we feel quite safe in presuming that the inspiration came from Mr. Hayes, who would naturally be piqued at the appointment of Mr. Dawson. The latter—whose full name is Noble E. Dawson—was private secretary to General Grant in his trip to Mexico, and did considerable reporting in the West in years gone by.

Journalists are prone to moralize upon serious subjects, and write apostrophes upon catastrophes. We have undertaken to point out one lesson to be learned from the above incident. The lesson is for the politicians, and is this:—*Appointments of stenographers should be made entirely regardless of politics.* If the best man happens to be a political "friend," very well; but if he be a political enemy, why should he not be appointed? The profession of stenography does not offer sinecures to party "hacks;" it calls for, and demands, skilled labor, special talents, and peculiar fitness by education. It cannot become a rendezvous for worn-out politicians, like so many other branches of the Civil Service in all countries. Stenographers should not be strong partisans, and never are—at least in this Dominion. If there is anything in the Constitution of the Republic which sanctions or encourages the election of stenographers because of their political leaning, the profession should take steps towards a constitutional amendment.

There are some minor lessons to be learned from the above event. They may be briefly summarized thus:—(1) It is possible for a shorthand writer to get "rusty," therefore he who would compete must repeat. (2) It is well not to go into deep water till you have learned to swim—comfortably. (3) First-class reporting facilities, and skilled assistants, are essential to good work. (4) Let all stenographers be humble, for accidents sometimes happen in the best-regulated families.

SHORTHAND IN CHICAGO.

BY FRANK VEIGH.

If there is a marked peculiarity about the average Chicagoan, it is in his boasting proclivities and his unstinted praise of his native city. He has no hesitation in declaring that Chicago is not only the hub of the west, but in many respects it is the undisputed hub of the universe, with a mass of radiating spokes on which are inscribed "pork," "enterprise," "beer," "music,"—and an additional supremacy in "wickedness," and "mud," might well be claimed. And now comes the Chicago shorthand professor—Dan Brown, as he is familiarly called—and claims a spoke on which he has inscribed "Chicago, the centre of the shorthand world!" A few days ago while in Chicago I climbed up a flight of stairs in the Athenæum building, and found myself in a large room where a number of ladies and gentlemen were busy manipulating the keys in a score or more of typewriters, and exercising a number of sharp-