

stitutes and institutions of that kind, and the proposal of the Committee is to have such a reserve of copies by means of this change that they will be able to give a bound copy of *The Debates* to each institution, so that they may be accessible to any person in the locality who may desire to consult them. In that case the members will receive only two bound copies instead of five, as heretofore. The number to be bound will be exactly the same as last year. The number of newspapers on the distribution list is about 500 English and 60 French. We will have 100 more English copies bound and 100 less French copies, so that in the aggregate the number of bound copies will be exactly the same. There will be a saving of 560 copies for daily distribution, which would, I have said, amount to a saving, according to a statement made in the Printing Department, of \$1,072 on the whole.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman state what is the saving effected on the daily distribution by itself—the diminution of the press daily copies?

Mr. WHITE. About 560 copies a day.

Mr. BLAKE. And how much is it in money?

Mr. WHITE. \$1,072. Outside that saving the condition is precisely the same as before. We print and bind the same number of completed copies, but instead of giving five copies to each member we give him two copies, and the other three will go to supply the press with bound copies.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad the hon. gentleman proposes to refer back the first part of the report—not that I have any information as to the individual who has been named, but because I think it will be a good thing, unless special circumstances require otherwise, that in all cases of vacancy on this staff an opportunity should be given, after knowledge of the vacancy has become public, for applications to be made to the Committee in order that they may have a large range of applicants from whom to choose. I say I know nothing of the individual, but I think that will be a wholesome rule to follow, and I hope that the Committee will adopt it with reference to this appointment. As to that part of the report before us, I must confess that I view with great regret the proposal of the Committee to discontinue the daily distribution to the press of the country. We have a system, whether it be for good or ill, of publishing an Official Report of *The Debates*, and the system necessarily impairs the fullness of the publication by the other media of communication to which the public has been accustomed to look. The great newspapers of the country do not publish as full reports as they otherwise would of the debates. Now, it is very important that the only medium practically superseding all other media the only medium by which the public can attain a knowledge of what goes on here, and as it goes on here, which is through the circulation, directly or indirectly, of their official reports—I say I think it of great consequence that the press of the country should have an opportunity, while the debates are going on, while Parliament is sitting and as soon as possible after the utterances of members have taken place here, of knowing what the views are of the public men of the country, the representatives of the people, what the current of discussion has been in respect of the matters which are in agitation. Full use is not made—I regret to be obliged to express the opinion that sufficient use is not made—of this daily issue. That we cannot help, but I think it is our business to give an opportunity to the daily press—I do not say of publishing our long speeches at all—but of having that information which is to be derived from a perusal of the debates and to express their views and frame their articles upon questions of public policy. I am not at all opposed, as long as the system of *Hansard* goes on, to arrangements being made by which the press of the country should receive a record in a permanent form of the debates, as well as the

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

daily issue. That is another question. If we are so variable as to decide that what we solemnly determined last Session was a mistake, that it was an error to give five copies to members, as the Committee proposed last Session, well and good; if it is decided that some other use of these extra copies, which is a better use, can be made, well and good; but it does seem to me an important thing, as long as we preserve an official debate, that we should not cut off the supply to the press from day to day of the means of obtaining early and authentic information of what goes on here.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe the conclusion arrived at by the Committee to send bound volumes of *The Debates* to the newspaper press in place of the daily issue, was in consequence of an application by the newspaper press of the country. Representations were made by those gentlemen that the daily issue was practically useless to them, that in point of fact it was not an authentic copy, not a revised copy, and that in being guided by it they were likely to make serious mistakes, and that, therefore, the bound copy would be much more valuable to them. It was to meet their views that the Committee took action with reference to substituting bound copies for the daily issue. The Committee sought to make an arrangement by which the expense of *The Debates* would not be increased by this change, and they have done so. It was thought the members of the House would give up the privilege of having five copies and taking two instead, in order that the expense might not be increased. I presume that the great mass of the newspapers in the country would prefer the bound volumes to the daily issue, and in that belief this change is proposed by the Committee.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know how thoroughly the members of the Committee have been able to consult the press in reference to this matter, but I am quite sure that the members of the press are not the only parties who should be considered in this matter. If they are under the impression for the time being that a bound volume at the end of the Session would be of more use than the daily issue, I do not know that we are obliged to accept that conclusion as final. I quite agree with the opinion expressed by my leader that the press ought to have both—I think I understood him to that effect. I quite agree that the unrevised reports of the speeches here are sometimes erroneous; but I must pay this tribute to the *Hansard* staff, that the reports are on the whole and in the average, remarkably good; that they are infinitely better, in my opinion, than any reports that could be secured by any newspaper sending reporters here at its own expense; that they, therefore, form an infinitely more correct representation of what passes in this House than any newspaper in the country could secure if the daily issue of unrevised reports were cut off. I am, therefore, strongly of the opinion that the daily issue should be continued as the only means whereby the press can comment intelligently, and at the time when comment is needed, on what passes in this House. We all know that the bound volumes do not come out until the middle of summer, and by that time newspaper comment on what passes this week or during the next few succeeding weeks would fall very flat. It is of the highest importance that the newspapers should possess for the purposes of comment the best obtainable report of the speeches here immediately after they are delivered. As regards the proposal to deduct three copies from each member of the House in order to provide bound copies for the press, I am not quite inclined to agree with the Committee. I have not found that the five copies which I have received this year were too many for the demands I had for them. I do not think any hon. member will say that he had any difficulty in disposing of his four spare copies. We nearly all have not only institutions that should possess a record of this kind, but in nearly every constituency there are leaders