

Mr. ROYAL. In connection with the Reports of the Debates, I am very glad to hear from the hon. member for Middlesex that it is the intention of the Committee to recommend to the House the propriety of appointing a permanent translating staff. As the translation is made now, a great many errors occur, owing to the rapidity with which it has to be made, and also from the great difficulty of translating correctly English into French. A person must be fully conversant, first with the English language, and more fully still with his own, in order to do the work properly. In many instances the translation is deficient as regards correctness of language, and errors often creep in such as those referred to by the hon. Finance Minister. If this translating staff is to be appointed, I cannot too strongly impress on the minds of the Committee that they should choose first-class men, if not literary men—at least men who are fully conversant with their own language. With regard to errors which take place sometimes in the Reports of our Debates, we must not be too hard on the reporting staff, because we know that in some books we read errors of a similar nature to those referred to by the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. leader of the Opposition, which have crept in and destroyed the whole value of the Debate. It is impossible, owing to the rapidity with which these Debates are printed and distributed, that such errors should not take place. It would be better that we had no translation of the *Hansard* if we have not a first-class one, and it would be so much money thrown away if the translators to be appointed are not first-class men—not men appointed through favor, but through their own merit, experience, and reputation. I believe the step taken by the Committee is a step in the right direction.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I take this opportunity to throw out a suggestion to the Committee with reference to the distribution of the *Hansard* to newspapers. It is true that sometimes rather contradictory statements appear, and it is not to be wondered at. It is rather to be wondered at that, with speeches rapidly delivered and reported, and passing, after being rapidly written out, from the hands of the *Hansard* reporters to those of the printers, mistakes should not oftener happen. The rule is to send the uncorrected sheets to the different newspapers and except when, as in some cases, hon. members previously correct those sheets, the reports in the newspapers do not correspond with the sheets as subsequently revised and corrected. We know how easy it is to drop a figure in taking down a number of figures, making 100,000 in place of 1,000,000 and how mistakes are liable to be made such as that to which the hon. Finance Minister has referred, by substituting "hams" for "jams," making it appear as if the duty on hams had been changed to 5 cts. a lb., and it is only fair to the newspapers that means should be taken to furnish them with the corrected instead of the uncorrected sheets.

Mr. DAWSON. I quite agree with the last speaker that it would be decidedly better that a corrected copy of the *Hansard* should be sent to the newspapers. The first copy leads them into many mistakes, and it is very important that they should have a correct copy of the debates.

Mr. ORTON. The *Hansard* sent to newspapers ought to be provided with an index, and without this it is of very little use to the newspapers.

Mr. CHARLTON. The index is sent to the newspapers with the bound volume.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In reply to the criticisms of the hon. member for West Durham, of the mistakes made by the reporters, I have just to say that one or two of the mistakes in that speech of his own, were not made by the reporters but by the proof-readers. My attention was called to it, and as a member of the Committee, I find in referring to the manuscript that the words were correctly written by

the reporter, but incorrectly revised by the proof-reader. I make this remark in justice to the reporters.

Mr. BAIN. I take leave to dissent from the general current of this *Hansard* discussion. I never had a great worship for the *Hansard* myself, and I sometimes doubt whether those of us who do not make long speeches do not suffer enough in having to listen to them, without being obliged to see them distributed over our ridings afterwards. With reference to the proposal to furnish each member with five copies of the *Hansard*, I confess I have doubts whether it would not be found in practice to lead some of us into difficulty. We are supplied with only one or two copies, we can say to applicants who come to us for a book that is really an expensive book, that we are not furnished with them; but when our constituents come to understand that we are possessed of four or five copies to distribute freely, I am afraid we shall have many applications for a costly book that we will not be able to satisfy. With reference to another matter, I admit there is a great advantage in having distributed through the country speeches that contain matter of general interest to the people, but there is generally sufficient interest taken in that speech by the political friends of the speaker to secure a large distribution of it through the different ridings. Besides, this plan, while costing less would reach a great many more readers. I confess that I have strong objection towards increasing the expenditure on this *Hansard*. I would like, if it could be carried out, something after the fashion suggested in the early part of the evening by the hon. member for West Middlesex, by which a summarized abstract of the principal reports should be published, showing the farmers what was the business of the Departments and the general business of the country. I am satisfied that money spent in this way would do far more good than it will be in supplying each member with several copies of the *Hansard*.

38 Grant to Parliamentary Library... \$10,000.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is practically a vote for \$11,000, \$1,000 of which is wanted for the purchase of some books in the United States with reference to Canadian history.

Mr. BLAKE. If it be a fact that the present appropriation is \$10,000 plus \$1,000 which was added, requiring only \$1,000 more, the Government themselves taking the law books into their hands, as they appear to be doing, it will require only \$1,000 more to carry out the scheme of the Library Committee. I think I may speak for the Library Committee, and I think I may say that we were very anxious that the vote should be specific as to the \$2,000 for the purchase of works relating to America, and then a general grant of \$10,000. The hon. Finance Minister is proposing to give us \$11,000, and what we want is \$12,000, but in a different shape from this.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The vote asked for by the Library Committee was, as the hon. member for West Durham says, only slightly in excess of that asked for in these Estimates, namely, that the vote should be \$10,000 for the ordinary purposes of the Library, supposing that the Government would transfer to the Supreme Court the vote for the Law Library, as is proposed to be done, and that a further sum of \$2,000 a year, for five years, be granted for making a complete collection of books, relating to North America, a subject upon which this Library, of all the libraries in the country, should have a good collection. These are becoming more rare and more valuable, and the need of this further sum was brought with a great deal of force before the Committee by an hon. Senator, who was for many years a very respected and influential member of this House, and who has taken great interest in these matters. The hon. Finance Minister says that this is practically a vote of \$10,000, and we only need \$1,000 more to secure our object.