

these reports are published, and now, as this is made a separate vote, seems to be a good opportunity for the new departure. Is this \$2,000 the gross expense of editing, publishing and distributing the reports or is it supposed to be a net balance representing the expected stock on hand after the distribution, and after the receipt of the revenue which is obtained from the sales of the reports? The proper course, as I understand, in all these things—and I am afraid it is a course which has been departed from in this particular thing—is that the whole charge to the country of the service should be voted, and that you should get in as revenue, and put on the revenue side of your account, whatever the country receives in return for the reports sold. If, therefore, the editing of these reports, and the publishing of these reports, and the distribution of these reports costs more than \$2,000, inclusive of the stock which is reserved, the surplus of the copies which are always printed for future reference, we ought to vote the whole amount of that, and on the other hand get credit on the revenue side for the receipts from it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the correct statement beyond doubt. I find that in the item concerning contingencies and disbursements, Judges' travelling expenses, also salary of the Sheriff, &c.—\$5,000—the vote that has just been considered, there is an omission, and that after "Sheriff" there should be "Registrar as Editor." I understand that ever since the Court was organized and under both Governments, the Registrar has received \$400 per annum as editor of each volume—that is, he is paid out of that \$5,000.

Mr. BLAKE. So it is proposed to insert "for Registrar as Editor?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. Then the \$2,000 is the gross amount of the expense of printing and distributing the Supreme Court reports, and all the receipts go into the Treasury.

Mr. BLAKE. So that \$2,000, plus \$400 a volume, will represent the total cost to the country. If there are two volumes a year it will be \$2,800 a year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state his estimate of the revenue, as I am afraid that from certain circumstances it will not be so high as it has been.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will get an estimate of that.

Mr. WELDON. These reports are getting up to such a high price that very few persons are able to buy them. It is important that they should be published at as cheap a rate as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the cost I do not think it can be objected to. The cost, as I understand, is \$2 a volume. That is exceedingly cheap, and will no more than pay expenses. A book of reports published in English would cost you \$8, I fancy, a volume. As I understand it \$2 a volume is the cost to the profession. Certainly I do not think the Government is bound to supply the tools of trade to lawyers more than they are to anybody else.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is a very important object that the Supreme Court reports should be circulated as widely as possible. The Law Society of Ontario some time ago undertook, out of its own funds, to circulate them to all of the profession in that Province. That resulted in a large

edition being rendered impossible, and a large edition means a cheap price per volume. But the Law Society has been obliged to give up that, and the result will be that there will be a great diminution in the edition, and a corresponding increase in the price per volume to the public. It may be, that under the new regime, the circumstances having been before the authorities for a considerable time, the Government has ascertained the cost at which they expect to be able to issue that volume to the profession. That is dependent, to a considerable extent, upon the number of customers they expect to have. They know, of course, that there is no reason to expect any increase in the demand, at any rate, so far as Ontario is concerned. In Ontario I do not know whether steps are being taken to ascertain what the profession would do; but once again that depends upon the profession. The higher the price the fewer persons will take them. I agree that it is not expected that these volumes should be supplied to the profession at the public cost; but to a certain extent they are supplied at the public cost when the salary of the reporter is paid out of the public funds. But we ought to obtain from those who buy—I will not say the whole expense of printing and publishing the reports—but the expense of printing and publishing all those copies that are sold. It would not be good policy to charge the cost of the surplus copies upon the number of copies that are sold. They will ultimately bring a return and the cheaper you can issue the book the more copies you can circulate. My theory of the case would be that the sum, whatever it may be, \$2,400 or \$2,800—being the gross cost of printing all the copies, including the reserve copies—that we ought to deduct from that gross cost what would be the cost of getting out the copies that yearly may remain in stock and which may subsequently be sold, and make the remainder of the price, divided amongst the number of copies expected to be sold, the cost of the edition. I am afraid it will be something more than \$2; because I think it was \$2 to the general public; and to the law society of Ontario who took 1,000 or 1,200 volumes in bulk, a considerably smaller sum was charged. Of course, these are considerations that ought to be taken into account.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the volume should be sold to the profession at as low a price as is consistent with the public. I do not think that we are bound to furnish these books at the cost of the Government, but they should be furnished at cost price. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that to the price should not be added the whole cost of the edition, because the reserve copies are certain to be sold some time or other, and the computation should be made at what the copies likely to be sold within the year will cost, and that should regulate the price. I understand the matter is under the consideration of the Department of Justice, and that it may be found necessary to add another dollar to the cost and make it \$3 instead of \$2. The next item is sundry disbursements connected with the Maritime Court of Ontario—travelling expenses, \$100; salary of Registrar of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Quebec, \$666; salary of the Marshall, \$333; for the purchase of law reports and text books for the Supreme Court of Canada, \$1,600. The last named item appeared formerly under the heading of Legislation or Miscellaneous.

Mr. WELDON. With respect to Vice-Admiralty Courts, I may remark that I moved for a return of the despatches with respect to the Vice-Admiralty Courts in the Maritime Provinces. These are Imperial Courts, and a new procedure came into operation on 1st January which is much more simple than that formerly in force, and which will make the courts more valuable. In England the High Court of Admiralty has power to order a sale; our Vice-