

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 25, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. P. H. MCKENZIE (South Bruce). Moved that the third report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I beg to move in amendment:

That the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be not now adopted, but be referred back to the said committee with instructions to continue the examination of the witness, J. A. Smart, and obtain from said witness complete information regarding the accounts of the parties forming part or connected with the North Atlantic Trading Company, and that the said committee be given full power to this effect.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the report the House is asked to concur in simply refers to Bill (No. 14) in reference to milk cans, and ordering the committee to print 1,000 extra copies. That is all that is reported.

Mr. BERGERON. Read the report.

Mr. MONK. That is the report of the evidence taken in connection with this matter, the report that this motion and amendment refer to. Perhaps the chairman will state whether that report gives the evidence taken on the subject matter referred to in this motion, the evidence of Mr. Smart.

Mr. MCKENZIE. No, the motion that the House is asked to concur in refers to the milk cans Bill.

Mr. MONK. That report has not come up yet?

Mr. MCKENZIE. No.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal) moved that the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of this House

during the present session, be concurred in.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). What is that report? According to the information I have seen regarding it, this report proposes to make a permanent increase in the cost of the 'Hansard' for ever afterwards. It proposes to employ parties to prepare an analytical index which shall be separate from the index in the 'Hansard' of the House of Commons, and we are to pay \$750 for each one of two parties year after year as time goes on, to prepare this. The chances are that the expenditure will be increased in the future, it now amounts to \$1,500 a year. It seems to me that the question of expense might be considered. When we already get every year in the 'Hansard' volumes an index which is practically an analytical index, it does seem to me that there is no urgent necessity for an additional index. You are now proposing to make this additional expenditure permanent. The question is, do we require an analytical index at a cost of at least \$1,500 a year in addition to the index which these volumes now contain.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). It strikes me that although an analytical index is an excellent thing in itself, it is not a thing that is practically useful. It is bad enough to have to keep track of the 'Hansard' volumes themselves; but if you have a little volume outside the 'Hansard' entirely, you will almost never use it. It is only in cases where you want to go into questions very minutely that you will have recourse to an analytical index. It seems to me the index we already have is quite sufficient for the needs of any member doing work in the House. This makes another volume outside the 'Hansard' itself, and this additional index would only be practically useful for those who wanted to make a very close study in reference to any matter. But I doubt very much whether it is practically useful or necessary, and it adds a great deal to the cost of the 'Hansard' each year, which is now very considerable.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would like to hear from the chairman of the Debates Committee, or some other members of it, the reasons that have impelled them to make this report.