

I think you will agree that this gives a clearer reproduction of the proceedings than the belt. This, of course, is electronic and it is an entirely different medium.

(The members listened to a further section of the tape).

The CHAIRMAN: Having heard the recording on tape, may we now go back to a recording of a belt of a part of the orders of the day for Friday, March 23, 1962.

(A recording of the orders of the day, Friday, March 23, 1962, was played at this point.)

Mr. ERVIN: That is the end of that tape.

The CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the members of the committee would like to ask some questions of Mr. Ervin regarding these recordings.

There is one question I would like to ask Mr. Ervin. When a tape has been made of a speech in the House of Commons—and I am referring now to the magnetic tape—would there be only one tape made? I am interested in what would happen if the operator made a mistake and wiped out the speech.

Mr. ERVIN: This is a problem that is more apparent than real, I think. In all the transcription that I have become familiar with over the last three years I know of no case in which a girl who was transcribing inadvertently erased the tape, because on most transcribing machines it is not possible to do this. The transcribing machine will not record, and therefore it will not erase. However, I think the members of the house will wish to make sure that the smallest and most remote possibility is covered, and for that I would suggest a complete monitor tape be recorded, a continuous tape of proceedings of the house, which would take place in the room where the control apparatus is situated, which would be a second recording in case any such thing did happen.

Mr. PAUL: Where in the house can you put the recording machine?

Mr. ERVIN: I would suggest the recording apparatus for the purpose of reporting *Hansard* would be in the reporters' offices. Much smaller tapes would be used to go along with the short ten minute takes that would be given. These would be quite small reels. Three of these machines would be installed, I would suggest, two of them alternating with a small overlap, and a third as a standby machine in case something went wrong with either of the other two. These would be installed and the parliamentary transcribers, as I have chosen to call the people who would transcribe from the tape, would transcribe these when they returned from their visit to the house, during which time they would make notes of the speakers and the interjections. They would simply take their tape reel off the machine and go into their office and type it.

Mr. AIKEN: I take it, in summary, you see no technical difficulties in connection with the installation of a tape recording service in the house?

Mr. ERVIN: No, sir, I am satisfied that the technical problems, to the extent they did exist, have now been solved by other jurisdictions who have installed this type of equipment and now use it quite successfully.

Mr. AIKEN: Our problem is not one of a technical nature but rather one of deciding perhaps which of two systems would be more useful to parliament. Is that the way in which you see it?

Mr. ERVIN: Yes, I think the choice is yours. I think either system works. The problems inherent in one way be sufficient to persuade you to consider another; and that was the purpose, I think, of my survey.

Mr. AIKEN: I noticed the speech of President Kennedy was very clear and direct, because of the fact that he was presumably reading, in the main, from a prepared text. Is the same sort of fidelity possible in all the house debates?