

of certain Fishermen. From the Senate.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Jacques Cartier) (translation) moved :

That the Second Report of the Special Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House be adopted.

He said : This report, Mr. Speaker, is intended to confirm the first report of the Committee adopted on the 2nd of June, and asking for the appointment of an assistant reviser for the French version. The Committee, on application made to it, first took Mr. J. C. Dansereau on trial, and upon the report of the chief translator that he is perfectly competent for the work, the Committee, at a subsequent meeting, decided to recommend his appointment to be made permanent, at a salary of \$1,000, to date from 3rd June ; notice has been given, and I now ask for the adoption of this report.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask to let the matter stand until another day, because I think the whole question of the translation of the *Hansard* ought to be reviewed in this House. The translation is not certainly what it ought to be, and it is so defective as to call for serious consideration. I am sure the hon. gentleman cannot be satisfied with the French version of the *Hansard*.

Mr. DESJARDINS. We are satisfied so far, because no complaints have been made since we have had the additional help asked by the House. I understand that the translation has been going on satisfactorily, and from the report we have received from the chief translator concerning the efficiency of the officer to be appointed, we understand he is perfectly competent to fill the position to which he has been named, and we now ask the House to concur in the report. This report is only the consequence of the first one which was adopted by the House when the appointment of an assistant reviser was asked.

Mr. LAURIER. The whole thing can be revised again, at all events. I have not recently looked at the translation of the latter Debates, but only judge by the translation of the early Debates this session, and certainly that was not at all what it should be. I will take the opportunity of looking at the latter translations, and if it shows improvement I will raise no objection.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. leader of the Opposition might as well bring up that question on the vote for the *Hansard*.

Mr. FOSTER. While the *Hansard* question is up, it may be pertinent to say a word with reference to the reports. There is something wrong with them. The takes are not uniform and some are execrable, and it is more trouble often to revise the speech than to deliver it. I feel exactly of this opinion, that, if we are to have a *Hansard* we ought to have it thoroughly correct. When a speech is taken down, it ought to appear as delivered, and not the opposite or not a very inaccurate reproduction of what the speaker has said. I would rather see the *Hansard* abolished than see it kept on in its present inefficient condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reply to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance, I am glad to say that I have carefully and closely criticized the few speeches I have made in the House this year, and I must acknowledge that the reports this session are more correct than those of any previous session. I think the way the utterances of members are taken down is remarkable for its accuracy and reflects great credit upon the reporters.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So far as I am concerned, I have found the reports very excellent in most instances. Occasionally I find a word has been misapprehended or that the reporter has perhaps mistaken the word for another similar in form, but I have nothing to complain of as to the accuracy of the reports, not only during this session, but during the past three or four sessions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to endorse very fully the remarks made by my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Mills). My idea has been that the reporting this session has been better, and more accurate than it has been for the many years I have sat here.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it must have been inaccurate before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is true that in some previous sessions I have sometimes had to complain that what I have said has been misapprehended by the reporter, but this session I have had no such complaint to make, and only the other day I remarked to my hon. friend how wonderfully accurate were the reports produced. Of course, I know nothing in regard to the French translation.

Mr. DAVIN. As a member of the Debates Committee, I may say that we have paid a great deal of attention to the question which has been raised, and last session I was under the impression that there was one member of the staff—I do not know who he was, and never attempted to find out—who was weak ; but this session I have been observing, and it does appear to me that the staff seems to be quite efficient. It is an astonishing thing to me that the report is as good as it is, and for this reason—the reporters sit there, as it were, between two fires. Gentlemen on the other side of the House are talking, and we know how gentlemen are talking on this side. I know that it is most difficult to report a speech when men are talking all around you. I know that, when I was a reporter in the gallery of the House of Commons in England—I suppose I must have been considered very peremptory in my style, but on what is called a full dress night, there is a gallery where members can sit close up to the reporters' seats, and the box which I occupied happened to be next to that gallery, and I had to say to them, "I cannot report when you talk this way." That would occur when perhaps Mr. Disraeli or Mr. Bright was addressing the House. It is amazing to me, as I have said, that the report here is as good as it is under the circumstances, and, comparing that report with what I know, though, of course, I have myself found occasionally a word omitted or misapprehended by the reporter, the Finance Minister may be assured that the report is pretty well done. For instance, the other night in the tariff debate I found that I heard one of the speakers make a certain statement, and I went to the Finance Minister and said : Is that correct? He said : "No, that is not what he