

be promoted to be an assistant editor to edit the work of the parliamentary transcriber. If this is done you not only reduce the staff from 16 to 11, but you also bring about a saving of approximately \$30,000 a year in salaries, which I think is less significant, but nevertheless it is there.

Mr. AIKEN: Mr. Buskard?

Mr. BUSKARD: There is one point I would like to make. As far as I know—and certainly not over the last 12 years when I have had the responsibility—there has never been any serious complaint about the quality of *Hansard* reporting. I have been told—although I do not take credit for it because I simply took over the system already in operation—that ours is the best parliamentary reporting system in the world.

The suggestion now is that you should scrap eventually a system which has been found to be satisfactory in favour of something which may or may not work out. I emphasize the fact that that staff, once it is broken up, cannot be reassembled.

Mr. COWAN: You would never have to reassemble it.

Mr. BUSKARD: I do not understand.

Mr. COWAN: If you break up the present staff in favour of tape recording, you would never have to reassemble it. I am sure of that. I have had years of experience with machine recording, and it has been eminently satisfactory.

Mr. BUSKARD: I too have had years of experience, and speaking from my years of experience I would hate to see tape recording replace live reporting. However, that is a matter for you gentlemen to decide.

At the same time, if I may comment a little further, it is almost implicit in Mr. Ervin's report that in all the cases where there has been a switch from manual reporting to tape recording it has been done as a result of a shortage of competent reporters.

I believe that was the case at the United Nations; I believe that was the case in the Ontario house; and I believe that was the case in other jurisdictions. It seems to me that the answer is to institute a training program to provide competent staff.

Such a program has been instituted in at least three places that I know of; one right within the federal civil service, namely, the Canadian Pensions Tribunal, which has instituted an in-training program to train their own reporters. Another is that of the Ontario Supreme Court which has instituted an in-training job training program to train its own reporters. And a third instance is that of an independent reporting firm in Toronto which has undertaken some type of apprenticeship training.

It takes some time for this sort of training to bear fruit, but undoubtedly it will, and the shortage that now exists will be alleviated to that extent.

I have recommended that we do the same thing; that is, that we institute our own training group to provide for the filling of our own vacancies, thus getting away from dependency on reporters trained in other jurisdictions and in other practices. It seems to me that if that recommendation were adopted, we would thereby perpetuate ourselves and assure the house of the kind of service it has been accustomed to for the past 50 years. Mr. Ervin spoke of workloads. He chose one five-year period. Perhaps I could indicate two other periods. I have some statistics covering two ten-year periods, one from 1930 to 1939 and one from 1952 to 1961. In the first ten-year period I mentioned, the average number of pages of *Hansard* was 4,225 per year; in the second ten-year period the average number per year was 7,104, which is an increase of about 70 per cent. During that period of time the number of English debates reporters has remained at seven; it has been seven for over 40 years to my personal knowledge.