

speeches themselves; but you must permit those corrections, for otherwise a slip of the tongue might not be corrected. In speaking the other night I used the term train mileage, instead of car mileage. I was speaking hastily and dealing with a mass of figures; the hon. member for Lambton corrected me, but I thought I had said car mileage. In such a case, hon. members must be permitted to make an obvious correction of that kind, as it is necessary. But these instances in which, notwithstanding the great accuracy with which very long speeches have been reported, even when dealing with a mass of figures; certain corrections must be permitted, or we would have *Hansard* a record of what did not take place, instead of what did take place.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Unfortunately, it is not possible to accept *Hansard* as a perfectly reliable report of what passes here. I think myself that the *Hansard* reporters have done as well as they could possibly be expected to do; but I have observed on many occasions that words somewhat similar in sound but wholly different in sense, making in fact absolute nonsense, are introduced by the stenographic process. You may read for a long distance in the report what is evidently a very accurate *verbatim* report, and then you come on half-a-dozen sentences which are absolutely nonsense, which has been caused by the fact that there was a great deal of disturbance in the House, and the reporters could not hear. I do not know whether it is possible to adopt the suggestion of the hon. First Minister and have a supervisor or censor of the speeches, so that *Hansard* should be accepted as an accurate record of what passed; but I do say this: that I should object very much to be held bound by everything put down in *Hansard* in my own name, as would hon. gentlemen opposite, unless they took the trouble to revise their speeches. That is not possible in a great many cases. It is possible in the early portion of the Session when hon. members are not very fully occupied, and the House is not sitting very late; but no one who knows the trouble and labor of revising, can pretend to say that a long speech can be revised when delivered at three or four o'clock in the morning.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that the hon. gentleman, from the tone of his reply, somewhat misunderstood my observations. I did not intend to say anything in the slightest degree derogatory to the manner in which the reporters discharged their duty; on the contrary, what I said was, that they were placed in the painful position, from my point of view, of it being impossible for them to discharge the duty they are asked to do, for it was more than it was possible for the staff to do. They are over-worked, because there is not enough of them; that is the difficulty of which I complain. My view is, in accordance with the hon. First Minister, that it would be better if the speeches were taken entirely out of the hands of hon. members; but I do not believe—I suppose, at present, from the consequence of not being able to look at my speeches—that anything like a correct report of what has been spoken would result with a staff so scanty in point of numbers though adequate in point of ability. But having an official report, it should be a respectable and adequate report, and one free from errors, in which the utterances of the hon. members are correctly represented; and in order to secure this all the House has to do is to add, perhaps, two more reporters to the staff.

Mr. STEPHENSON. If that is the view of the House, the *Hansard* Committee will be very happy to present another report, in accord with the suggestions of the leaders of both sides of the House. The Committee felt the responsibility placed upon them; they felt the necessity of having an enlarged staff, but at the same time they felt that, under the circumstances, they would not be justified, and they did not feel themselves strong enough to make those recommendations, because they thought the House might not

sustain them. Therefore the Committee went as far as they could reasonably go; but if the House is of opinion that the staff should be increased, the *Hansard* Committee will be very happy to act on the suggestions made.

Mr. SCRIVER. In all the deliberations of the Debates Committee, the idea of the inadequacy of the staff has hardly ever been brought into consideration. I think the general impression among the members of the Debates Committee was that the work this season and last season was much harder than it had usually been, and harder, perhaps, than it is likely to be again. I do not understand, myself, that any complaint was made on the part of the staff, that the number was inadequate for the work, except in a few instances where there were all-night sittings. As the Chairman of the Committee has stated, the members of the Committee felt that they were placed in a somewhat difficult position. They were obliged by the great stress in the state of affairs to recommend considerable increases in the disbursements connected with the Committee, and they felt fearful that if they recommended some other changes that did seem judicious to them, they would not be sustained by the action of the House, and, therefore, they came to the conclusion that matters had better remain as they were, with the exception of such changes as they have recommended in the way of increased compensation to the reporters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I used to be very much surprised at the wonderful accuracy with which the speeches to which I listened in the English House of Commons were reported in the *Times* newspaper the next morning. I wondered how it was possible to attain such accuracy and precision in reporting those speeches, but I was somewhat undeceived when, after a very important debate in which it was necessary for me to furnish a leading member of the House of Commons with information in reference to the subject under discussion, before he had resumed his seat half an hour I was sent for to an ante-room of the House of Commons and his speech was submitted to me in type for my correction. I learned on that occasion the mode in which they attained such remarkable precision and accuracy in reporting the debates of the House of Commons; that measures were taken before the House rose by which the member, or some other person, equally familiar with the subject of the speech, would have an opportunity of correcting it. So far as my observation goes, from speeches submitted to my notice, the reporting in this House will compare favorably with that in the English House of Commons.

Mr. KILLAM. I should be the last one to complain of the *Hansard* reporters. I believe, as a rule, they have done their duties efficiently, especially when we consider that during the last part of the Session they have had to work as long as twelve or fifteen, or even eighteen hours at a stretch. Of course they are human.

Mr. MILLS. And the House was inhuman.

Mr. KILLAM. Yes, and the Government too, though I will not say anything on that point at present. These gentlemen have done as well as they could, but it is impossible for them, under such circumstances, to report every speech fully. My own opinion has always been at variance with that of the hon. Minister of Railways, as I do not believe in an official report of the Debates. I think the reports had better been left to newspaper enterprise. The hon. Minister of Railways, in his official position, of course speaks with advantage. He is able, in making official explanations, to say what he has to say from the book deliberately, and he is well reported. I consider the hon. gentleman a master of amplification, and that pages of his speeches as they appear in the *Hansard* might be well condensed, so that his ideas might be apprehended much more readily in an ordinary newspaper report. Measures are brought