

average is nearly from 2,400 to 2,700 volumes a year. You will see therefore that in ten years from now, on the lowest computation, there will be an increase of 25,000 volumes. The number of volumes now is about 65,000. The yearly increase is not likely to be less, because there are a number of new societies coming into existence from which we get books in exchange. Necessarily the volume of matter pouring into the library must annually be considerably larger. Next year, for example, I anticipate the total increase by donation, exchange, and purchase will be probably three thousand. The library as at present arranged is certainly most inconvenient, and it is very unfortunate that there should be such a large number of separate rooms. A modern library should not be arranged on that principle at all. Whether the rotunda principle would be provided here, of course, is not a matter for me to say. When I went round the world, four years ago, I visited no less than nine separate Parliamentary Libraries—Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide, Perth, Victoria, Vancouver, Toronto, Winnipeg, Albany (N.Y.), and others; and the conviction that remained on my mind when I came back was that the large single-chamber system was better than our system of dividing rooms. It is exceedingly difficult in this library, unless you have an enormously increased staff and necessarily increased expenditure, to exercise proper supervision, and consequently there cannot be that closer and more effective attendance given to members that I should like to see and for which members themselves frequently express a desire. It would be my great ideal to see the library arranged on the British Museum and Ottawa principle—namely, to have one large room, which could be surveyed by one or two assistants in a glass office on the ground floor, with writing and smoking rooms branching off the main ground-floor room, but with the whole of the books in the main building. The whole difficulty in that case is the question of expansion. However, that is a question for the architects to consider, and not for me. There is no doubt whatever that the library as at present arranged fails altogether to meet the requirements of Parliament and the country. The question of newspapers alone is a big item. We are now filing over forty daily papers in the library. There must be altogether over a hundred newspapers in the library, and, however small or large a newspaper may be, it is carefully filed, because it may contain reports of meetings of local bodies and information as to many other local and district matters. We have in the cellar 16,000 volumes, and, although it is sometimes said that it is not desirable to keep a large number of official publications, yet occasions do occur when very old books are required which it might be considered would never be needed. The same thing occurs in regard to the publications of the Imperial Government, the official publications of Australian and other colonies. They represent several thousand volumes. They could not be disposed of, and we must have room for them. The waste of time involved in searching for books in so many separate rooms is very great. The arrangements in the present library are altogether very unsatisfactory. The difficulty in arranging for space in the present library has been largely responsible for the misplacement of volumes, of which members have complained.

3. Have you formed any idea as to what additional space you would require as compared with what you have now?—I may say this library is now practically full—that will sum up the position—and that the increase is so great that within the immediate future—within two years—there will be a very serious lack of space. After the two years the increased difficulty will be on a much larger ratio as times goes on and there is no more space to play upon. The basement is nearly full. We could get a little more room there by having more shelving, but it is very questionable whether that would meet the difficulty. At all events, it would be only temporary.

4. Have you given any consideration to the question of a site? You know the object of the Committee's inquiry, and you know the various propositions that are afloat. Now, supposing it should happen that the Parliamentary Buildings remained permanently on the Government House site, would it not be expedient that the library should be removed from its present site down nearer the Legislature, or do you think it would be convenient if members had to go across to the library?—No, I think it would be inconvenient. I feel certain that at the present time members are not referring to many books in the library that they would like to refer to simply on account of the difficulty in getting across in time to refer to the books. Members frequently have this session asked me for certain information and got me to tabulate that information for them on account of the distance of the library from the Legislature. It means a great delay in having the books sent backwards and forwards, and it actually affects the value of the debates, because members do not go to the reference-books for information which they would use in their speeches simply because of the great difficulty in getting them over in time.

5. Then, I understand you to say that, in the event of the Parliamentary Buildings being permanently located where Parliament is now sitting, the library should be brought nearer?—Absolutely, and that with the least possible delay. I cannot conceive of any state of affairs in which the library could be of any great value were it any great distance away from where members actually sit.

6. As a matter of fact, you have spoken of a totally differently arranged building?—Yes.

7. Would it be possible to do that on the present site?—Certainly not, unless a totally different building were erected.

8. And that would involve pulling down the present building?—Yes.

9. *Hon. Mr. Bowen.*] You think that the whole library ought to be in one room—the reading-room ought to be one large room and not divided?—Yes, I do, on the principle of the British Museum, or the Ottawa principle. I might suggest that it may be advisable that I be instructed to get the plans of four or five libraries built on that principle.

10. *Hon. Dr. Findlay.*] What proportion of the books in the library, roughly approximated, do the novels bear to the reference-books?—A mere drop in the ocean. We spend, roughly, about £35 a year on novels and current fiction. We are, however, I must say, the only library that I know of that spends money on fiction; but, of course, the amount is very small.