

the greater number of members of Parliament, and the increased work in the Library.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister of Justice thinks that the names chosen for those officers are unfortunate. I think it would be well for the Minister to suggest different names. I am sure the committee will be willing to make the change. It would be a great deal better to leave the names as they are under the existing law, and to say that the assistant librarian shall have special charge of parliamentary work and that his salary shall be larger than the salary of the assistant now is. I have already expressed my view on the subject. I do not think we ought to create this double-headed office when it is not necessary. Let us appoint, if we will, an assistant librarian with a large salary and with special duties, but let us not have two men with exactly the same powers. It is going to lead to all sorts of trouble and confusion.

HON. MR. ALLAN—Is it really contemplated that the duties assigned to those two officers should be as this sub-section A, in clause 1, would convey to us, that one is to be in point of fact the general librarian, having general charge of the whole library, the general collection of works, and so on, and that the other is to be an officer who might be more strictly called a parliamentary librarian, and whose duties shall be to advise members of both Houses on parliamentary law, etc.? If that is so, I can understand sub-section A and the difference made apparently in the powers of the two officers; but if one is simply the head officer and the other the assistant, I think the sub-section is rather misleading.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, I think my hon. friend is not right; there is not to be one head and an assistant. I apprehend there is to be one head to have charge of works relating to parliamentary duties, etc., and law books, and another to have charge of general literature. I understand that these two officers will be co-equal in rank and salary. Their duties will be arranged for them and distributed by the joint committee of the two Houses on the Library of Parliament,

and they will be under the direction of the two Speakers.

HON. MR. DICKEY—That is not so expressed in the Bill. It gives them equal power and control over the library. I am afraid there will be confusion, and I do not see how it can be avoided.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The confusion will be avoided by the rules which will be laid down by the Library Committee. They have co-ordinate powers but different names. They will receive their directions from the Speakers.

HON. MR. ALLAN—The awkward part of it is the last two lines of subsection A, which provides that they "shall have equal powers as respects the control and management of the library." Now, if both these gentlemen are to act under the direction and control of the Library Committee, then the Library Committee must be the supreme head. Otherwise I do not see how there can be two heads having control over the Library without the two clashing.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Committee, with the two Speakers, will be the head.

HON. MR. ALLAN—That will never do.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend recollects the system we pursued in the old Parliament at Quebec when we had two librarians; we had Dr. Todd representing the Legislative Assembly and Dr. Adamson representing the Legislative Council.

HON. MR. ALLAN—Were their powers co-equal?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, and their duties were the same and they were at the disposal of members of both Houses. The members of the Legislative Council, being better acquainted with Mr. Adamson, went to him, but not exclusively. I remember often going to Mr. Todd to consult him on matters relating to the practice of Parliament, he being familiar with that subject. I have no doubt other