

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister says that he believes it is prepared according to the Order of the House. I will submit it to the hon. gentleman himself, and I am sure I will convince him that it is not prepared according to the Order of the House.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I would like to be permitted to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) to the fact that somewhere about the middle of last session I asked to have brought down the papers regarding the dismissal of David Shontz, postmaster at Didsbury, Alta. The papers have not, as far as I am aware, come down. I do not think that they can be very difficult to prepare. It is the only dismissal in which I was interested, and I should like if the minister would have the return prepared and brought down.

Mr. PELLETIER: I will inquire about it, and if it has not been brought down I will have it brought down.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS POST OFFICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. SINCLAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the necessity of having a post office money order branch in the House of Commons. I understand that the House of Commons is altogether under the control of Your Honour, and that is the reason I mention this to you instead of to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). It often happens that members and senators require to send small sums of money through the mail, and it is very inconvenient to have to go to the city post office or to the banks. The messengers are very capable, but it is difficult to make change and also difficult to instruct messengers in regard to these matters. It would be a great convenience to the members of the House if a money order branch were placed within the precincts of the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know how far I have any authority in the premises, but I will endeavour to get information on the subject as far as I can and try to meet the wishes of the members of the House.

Mr. PELLETIER: There has been an understanding that letters could be handled here at the House of Commons, not under the control of the Post Office Department. But the department is very jealous of the money matters. We might come to an un-

derstanding by which one of our officials could come here, and thus try to meet the desires of hon. members.

#### 'HANSARD' REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to draw attention to a statement with certain comments thereon which have appeared in the Globe recently.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that this is quite out of order. While under special circumstances it is permissible, when the Orders of the Day are called, for members to ask questions or to refer to papers that are not properly brought down in answer to orders for returns, in my judgment it is not permissible for a member to rise and introduce subject after subject, because that would interfere with the regular work of the House. I am referring to the matter only in the hope that the hon. members will keep a little closer within what is a well understood rule of the House, and thereby facilitate the transaction of business.

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to keep within the rules of the House, but this matter is one concerning the House, and I think it would be in order almost at any time. The comment is in regard to the correctness of the 'Hansard' report, and the allegation is that certain words, expressing a very definite idea and used by one of the members for Prince Edward Island, have

4 p.m. been omitted from the unrevised 'Hansard.' This is surely a matter of sufficient importance to bring before the attention of the House. It is thoroughly understood that 'Hansard,' particularly the unrevised 'Hansard' shall be a verbatim report of what has occurred in the House. If undesirable expressions have been used, it is possible that they may be corrected in the revised 'Hansard.' As I am not on the Debates Committee, I do not know what latitude is allowed in that direction. But, unless 'Hansard' is to be an accurate report of statements made in the House by members when ostensibly expressing their views on behalf of their constituents, it certainly has not the value that has generally been attributed to it. Therefore I think it is only right that this matter should be brought to the attention of the House for the purpose of having it brought in the most public manner to the attention of whatever authority exists having control of the 'Hansard' report.

Mr. CARVELL: What are the words omitted?