

taining for future generations what the honourable gentleman has said during his term of office in the Senate, as well as what has been said by all other members of this House.

I fail to see why the honourable the junior member for Halifax brought this proposition before the House. Is he not aware that, in contradistinction to the public press, Hansard is a record, while the public press is ephemeral.

Hon. Mr. DENNIS: What happened before Hansard was established?

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Its establishment was an incident of the growth of the country. It is to be remembered that Hansard renders more service to the country than any individual organ of public opinion in the country, because an organ of public opinion states one thing to-day and the day or the week after it states the opposite. There is no controlling the vibration in the newspaper offices; and I speak from experience, for I have been an old newspaper man and know how the public opinion of this country can be camouflaged or deceived by spurring out a certain opinion to-day and contradicting it a week later. The public press have a great mission to perform, and they can perform it only by publishing the facts and then allowing the public to judge of the facts. I do not believe that a writer in the public press should be heeded more than the first individual you meet on the street. Who is he that writes the editorials? Who was I when I wrote editorials? An unknown. Up to the present day editorial opinion has been paramount, but let me venture the prediction that the day is fast coming when editorial opinion will avail nothing and will amount to nothing. What is editorial opinion? It is the production of a brain which is trained, which may be educated, which may be intellectual, but it is also the production of a brain that is none of the three, and the public swallows the product of that brain as gospel truth. That is the value of editorial writing to-day. It has the upper hand, but the day is coming when every reader of a paper shall be his own editor. All I ask in any country, and especially in this country of ours, is that the newspapers state facts plainly and clearly, without prejudice, without perversion, without untruth. I want no description of a meeting by a reporter. He goes to a public meeting, scientific, political, religious or otherwise, and what I want from his pen is not his impressions of what

Hon. Mr. CLORAN.

occurred in that meeting, but the ipse dicta of the speakers; then I will be in a position to make my own description and to put a value on what has been said. Up to to-day the contrary system has prevailed. A reporter goes to a meeting, and what do you find the next morning or the next afternoon? A description of his own ideas, his own views, and probably of his own wants. That is a false principle to follow in regard to the enlightening of a people; and I firmly hope and believe that the day will come when reporters will simply give the facts and let the readers of the facts come to their own conclusions and exercise their own judgment. That is the difference between the public press and Hansard. Hansard consigns to print that which remains immortal—the views, the statements and the opinions of the men who are charged with discussing a public, national or social question. The reader of Hansard is his own editor. In Hansard there is no description of anything—only what the speaker has said; that is one benefit of Hansard.

The next benefit is that it prevents a public man from making statements to-day which he could reverse and deny the following year—a privilege given to the public press. It is a privilege given to editors of papers to declare one policy to-day, to deny it to-morrow, and to proclaim another the following day. With Hansard it is impossible for a public man to do that. I make a statement to-night on a public question. It goes into Hansard in black and white. It confronts me forever afterwards in life, and a year later I dare not make a statement contrary to what I have already said. It makes a speaker in the other House or in the Senate careful of the truth, which the newspaper press does not do. If I make statements here to-night—and I am making some—and happen next year or two years from now to deny that I made them or ever held such views, all any honourable gentleman has to do is to send for the volume of Hansard and confront me with the statements which I denied that I had made. That is the value of Hansard—what I would call the philosophical value of Hansard.

The other night I heard the honourable gentleman say that Hansard consigns to its pages trivial statements, heated arguments, personalities. Why not? Why not give to posterity a true picture of the situation? A triviality sometimes contains more force and more truth than a so-called serious statement concocted under the candle-light. Give me fresh outbursts of opinion and I