

those interjections which are picked up by the man who has the floor should be included in the debates; in other words, if it is a frivolous type of interjection, perhaps it is the Speaker's wish this not be included, in which case that renders the problem relatively simple.

Mr. AIKEN: I did not understand that. If all the frivolous remarks were excluded, there would be a lot less *Hansard*.

Mr. ERVIN: Yes, indeed. As a matter of fact, the speaker of the Ontario legislature was moved to remark to me one time, "We are not printing a funny paper". For this reason he did not want some of these interjections in. I could not help thinking it would be a good deal less readable if some of them were left out.

Mr. COWAN: Oh, no!

Mr. ERVIN: Even under the worst circumstances, I am satisfied interjections to the extent they wish them included can be included under a tape recording system as well as with reporters.

By way of supporting this, may I say that in Ontario they found interjections actually were picked up more readily by the tape recording system than they were by the reporter. They carried on a duplicate system for a period of a year. They recorded the debates and reported them by the shorthand method. Therefore, they had the ability to compare the tape recording with the transcript from shorthand. They found there had been much missed by the reporter.

Mr. AIKEN: Mr. Chairman, it is very close to the time when the committee has to break up. Some of us will have to leave shortly. We have not heard too much from Mr. Buskard this morning, although we did have his evidence last week. I wonder whether Mr. Buskard would care to comment on any of the evidence which has been given this morning so that it will be rounded out, shall we say. Mr. Frenette has explained the situation in respect of the French debates, and Mr. Ervin has put forward his opinions in connection with both the work load and the system he has recommended. I wonder whether Mr. Buskard would care to reply to any of these points at this moment.

Mr. BUSKARD: I do not know quite where to start. Perhaps I might start with Mr. Ervin's comparison. He suggested it was difficult to find something with which to compare the reporting difficulties and practices of *Hansard*. Mr. Ervin went to the Ontario house. I suggest a much better comparison could have been made by using the United States congress or the British House of Commons. Neither of those institutions has a tape recording system and neither is contemplating a tape recording system. In the British House of Lords they put in a tape recording system not long ago as a backup means of helping the reporters, but I understand the reporters very seldom use these tapes. One of our men has recently returned from there and has firsthand experience.

It seems to me that if electronic recording were a completely satisfactory method of procedure the United States, which is the most gadget-minded country in the world, would be using this system at this time.

As far as the Ontario legislature is concerned, the reporters know the standard of reporting that existed prior to the introduction of the tape recording system. The reporting was done on a contract basis using whatever reporters were available, experienced or not, trained or not. Reporters were called in to take half an hour or an hour, whatever time they could spare. They had no knowledge of members, procedure, practice or anything else, and the only thing that could be expected was an unsatisfactory report.

Some reference has been made to *Hansard* being a verbatim report. We have never pretended that *Hansard* was a verbatim report and if we did turn out a verbatim report we would be out of a job within a week.