

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is in the vote for the current year. There were special votes for collections, such as that of the O'Callaghan American collection, purchased in New York. That is in the appropriation for the current year. We have no such requirements this year, and so the vote is reduced by \$1,260

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no detail of that. It might be well for the Clerk of the House to put that in another time. All the other details are given.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will have that prepared before we close.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By the way, is the First Minister prepared to give any information as to who shall be appointed Librarian? That would be of some interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a matter under consideration just now.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I suppose the system of promotion will be adopted?

Mr. BOWELL. After examination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Qualifying examination or competitive?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are a good many applications, and I am proud to say that it is looked up to as an office of great importance. Gentlemen of the first rank in science and literature in Canada, have thought it worthy of their acceptance if it were offered to them. The question is not literary or scientific attainment. I know a good authority on these matters, Goldwin Smith, who says a Librarian who reads is lost. We want a man who understands books and looking after books. It ought to be a matter of very great care to select the Librarian. He should be a man acquainted with literature, a man of business, a man who knows the trade of book-selling, in fact, who knows how to purchase books at the cheapest rate in the best market. Then he ought to be a sort of walking dictionary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He must read the books.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He must have read before he is appointed Librarian, and of course he is expected to keep up his reading, to a certain extent; but a man may be a very scientific man or a very literary man, and yet make a bad Librarian.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall try, with the assistance of the two Speakers, who will have to be consulted, to get a good man to satisfy all these requirements. I think my hon. friend called the attention of the House to the necessity of carrying out the principle of promotion, which has been advocated so strongly to-day. I think that is a correct principle—if we find in the Department persons who are fit for the work. Whether they are or not, I am not prepared at present to say.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are all united in heartily wishing the First Minister abundant success in filling the position properly. We hope he will get a good man, who will in some measure fill it as well as the gentleman who filled it lately.

Mr. MILLS. To whom have these applications been made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy some have been made to Mr. Speaker, and some to the Government.

Mr. MILLS. Is it the intention to allow these names to go to the public?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that it would be well. I do not think those gentlemen who applied and were rejected, would like the public to know it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The public is interested in knowing the names of these men, and would like to canvass their qualifications.

Mr. MILLS. The public might assist the hon. gentleman in making a selection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the public cannot take the responsibility.

Mr. CHARLTON. The public, however, can express its opinion, and that is of some value.

40. Printing, binding and distributing the laws. \$12,000 00

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I wish to make a remark on this item. There appears to be a good deal of dissatisfaction in the country with reference to the distribution of the Statutes. In the first place, they are very late in coming out. Last year they were not sent out until within a month or two of the present Session; and when they do come out, they are sparsely distributed, so that it is a very difficult thing for people to get the laws. Now, every man is bound to know the law, and it appears to me that something should be done towards making a larger distribution of the laws. I may mention, in connection with this, that a large sum of money was expended last year in printing the reports of the Agricultural Committee. Each one of these reports is about the size of the Statutes that were passed last Session, and, I suppose, cost nearly as much as those Statutes did; and I venture to say that a more useless work has hardly ever emanated from this House than that report—at least that is my humble opinion. A man taking up that report and reading first one statement and then another, can hardly fail to see who is the author of each one. One man is a Grit, to be sure, and the other is a Tory. After they have made their statement, some of them think it necessary to explain on which side of politics they are. One boasts that he is not Conservative, but just a good Baldwin Reformer. Another man says "I am no Grit, I can assure you, but I believe in the hon. Edward Blake." That is the way they wind up some of their reports. Now, this House went to the expense of publishing that report and distributing a number of copies among the members—some twenty-five or thirty copies; and when we remember that the Statutes have been but sparsely distributed, I should hope that the Government would take some means to extend more generally their distribution throughout the country, so that the people can have the laws more freely.

Mr. CHARLTON. I consider that report is perfectly useless, and it certainly was a most unnecessary expense to print it to the extent of twenty-five or thirty copies for each member. So far as I am concerned, I never distributed them at all. The information contained in them was not reliable, and in many cases it was misleading. It was purely an electioneering document, and was issued for electioneering purposes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is quite evident that my hon. friend (Mr. Robertson) represents a city constituency. I distributed those reports, and I can say that they were read with the greatest interest by those who received them in my constituency. A Committee of Parliament went to considerable expense in getting that evidence, and it does seem to me that the least that can be done is that the public at large should have the benefit of the report. At any rate, the report was published by order of this House, and on the recommendation of a Committee of this House; and I think that the argument in favour of a larger distribution of the Statutes might have been urged without reflecting upon the House itself, and upon one of its Committees.

Mr. MILLS. I am an agriculturist, and I entirely concur in the views expressed by the hon. member for Hamilton. I think a more useless report never emanated from the press. In my opinion, it is discreditable to Parliament to