

as 'complete bedlam' and it is remarkable that any sense at all was made of the debate which took place. The tape recording, however, faithfully recorded the proceedings and, with the assistance of the interjection stenographer and the console operator, an accurate record of the debate was produced in Hansard. The phrase "interjections by hon-members" is used frequently to indicate interruptions which did not qualify for inclusion.

52. When questioned about the possibility of publishing Hansard for the following day the Speaker said that this is not considered necessary in the Ontario legislative assembly and no good reasons have been advanced to have this done. There is no doubt however, that it could be done by reducing the amount of time the members have to review their speeches as is done in the House of Commons in Ottawa. There is another small problem with relation to the casual nature of the staff employed but this could be overcome if it became advisable to do so.

53. An indication of the satisfaction of the house generally in the system of recording debates is contained in a comment by Mr. D. C. MacDonald, leader of the New Democratic Party in the Ontario legislature, April 18, 1962, at which time he said,

On a number of occasions in the past, we have discussed the publication of Hansard in the legislature and expressed dissatisfaction with the way that it was being handled. But it has been my personal impression that it has never been handled better in this legislature than this year. Indeed, with a serious disability of not having the facilities available that they have at Ottawa for handling Hansard, they have approached the dispatch and the efficiency with which it is handled there, and I for one would like to express my appreciation.

This was followed by a similar comment by the Premier, the Honourable Mr. Robarts.

54. There seems little doubt about the satisfaction and the success of the experience of the Ontario legislative assembly in recording debates. While economies involved have not been accurately assessed, the saving of \$10,000 during the first year is, at the very least, being repeated each year that the system is in operation.

#### *House of Commons Recording Experiments*

55. A short experiment using dictaphone equipment to record debates was conducted by the House of Commons Hansard staff during the late spring of 1961. No written conclusions were presented however. The only report on the use of recording equipment that could be located was one presented by the reporters to the Speaker on May 19, 1961 immediately prior to the installation of the equipment.

56. In order to further investigate the feasibility of recording debates the Speaker authorized two additional experiments during March, 1962. A short statement to this effect appears on pages 1815 and 1816 of Hansard for March 15, 1962. Standard dictaphone (plastic belt) recording and transcribing equipment was used in both experiments.

57. The first of these tests was designed to assess the clarity with which debates could be recorded and to compare transcripts typed from dictaphone belts with those produced from shorthand notes.

58. The results of this test followed closely the experience of other jurisdictions during the early stages. Except for getting used to the transcribing machine, the operator had little difficulty in transcribing. The typing time for an average ten minute take was 33 minutes. A comparison with the reporters