

\$400, while the English corrector gets \$800. I do not see why there should be that difference.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman will allow me to explain. The English corrector of proof is a very different officer; the French corrector has simply to correct the proofs, but the English corrector has to get up the index of *Hansard*, has to prepare copies for members, and all that kind of work, which is entirely different.

Mr. AMYOT. There seems to be a certain way of showing why we are treated as inferiors. I do not see why our translators, who are here all the Session, who are the most capable men on the press, should only get \$800, and the only remedy which is proposed to that is to increase the numbers. I think the number is sufficient at seven, because they are translating every day as the sheets go before them, but the salary does not seem to me to be sufficient. I concur entirely in the recommendation that \$2,000 be paid the stenographers. All capable men should be well paid, and I say that the translators require to be capable men and they should be well paid. I admit that the Committee is very active, but they seem to be afraid to make any suggestions favourable to the French translators, when the question comes up here or before the Committee. I would have preferred that they should have asked the decision of the House on the whole matter, and not come here at one time with one class of men, and another time with another class. But after the assurance has been given that these translators will be treated well, I have no objection to the withdrawal of the motion. We must understand that in our Province the French *Hansard* forms part of our history, too, and when we speak here we want to be able to see our sentences not badly or erroneously translated, but so translated that it will not require to be compared with the English version to find out what we may say. We want the *Hansard* service well performed. I think Canada is rich enough and respects itself enough to have a fair, correct, and good translation of the *Debates* here. Now we must remember that if we rise to speak in English, it is out of deference to the House, even though we run the risk of annoying members by making mistakes, and getting laughed at and snubbed a little sometimes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. AMYOT. But we risk speaking in English so that we may be understood by all our fellow members.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will risk myself in speaking English, but I do not think I will be snubbed. I agree with the hon. member for Cardwell that the stenographers, the shorthand reporters, as we call them, should be well paid, because their work is of a very arduous nature, and they must not only be able men, but men acquainted with the matters brought before the House. A man may be a good shorthand reporter; but unless he knows the history of the country, unless he is familiar with current events, and with the measures brought before the House, he will not report correctly. Therefore, these gentlemen require to be well educated; they must be good scholars; and they should be well paid, especially when we see during what long hours they must be at work in the House, and in their office, in order to give us the reports of the *Debates* on the following day. But, on the other hand, I must say that the translators require also to be good scholars. A good translator must know history, geography and all that takes place; he must have the education of a gentleman, and therefore he must have studied many years before he is competent to come here and translate well. Therefore, the translators cannot be put on a lower level, so far as capacity is concerned, than that which the shorthand reporters should occupy. Under these circumstances, I think their case should be looked into and examined; and I think it would be more satisfac-

tory to all, if, instead of moving the adoption of the report now, my hon. friend from Cardwell would withdraw his motion, leaving the report before the House. Then let the Committee in another report bring the whole matter before the House, so that we may consider the two reports together. I think that would be more satisfactory to all; and I think my hon. friend will see that we should do that. Otherwise, there will be a feeling that the French translators have not been looked after as well as the stenographers. I think the cases of both classes of officers should be considered and dealt with by the House at the same time.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think, in justice to the Committee, it ought to be understood that no complaint has come from the translators of their being insufficiently remunerated, and that the present translators are receiving a greater remuneration than some of them received under the contract system. I am not disposed to institute any comparison as to the amount of work performed, the difficulty of the work, or the qualifications required by either class of officers; but certainly, so far as the mere labour is concerned, that of the translators is not so severe and exacting as that of the reporters. We learn from the gentleman in charge of the translators, that they are occupied eight or nine hours a day, and that they do their work during the regular hours of the day, whereas the reporters are at work until a late hour of the night or an early hour of the morning.

Mr. BLAKE. After the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that no representation has been made to the Committee by the translators that their remuneration is inadequate, I think the Minister of Public Works will see that there is no reason for postponing the consideration of this report. It has nothing to do with the question of the remuneration of the translators. A representation has been made to the Committee by one portion of the official staff; the Committee have considered it; and they make a report upon it. Their recommendation is either right or wrong; we should either grant it or refuse it; but it in no way depends on the question whether there ought to be an increase of the emoluments of the staff of another branch of the service, who, as it appears from the statement of my hon. friend from Huntingdon, have up to this moment made no suggestion that they ought to get more money. Now, so far as I am aware, public servants are not inapt to point out their rights. If they think they ought to have more remuneration, we are pretty sure to hear it; and as the Committee have not yet heard from the translating staff, I think they are not in the least to be blamed for not having dealt with that matter. I agree with the hon. member for Cardwell and with other hon. members who have spoken as to the high qualifications which are essential to the proper discharge of the duties involved in that branch of the service with which we are now dealing, as well as in that branch to which allusion has been made, the translation. There is no doubt that high powers are required in respect of each. The character of the labour, the extent of it, whether it is day or night work, whether one is so severe as the other or not, the character of the special training required, and other considerations may arise in deciding what the proper scale of remuneration is. For instance, if I were dealing with this question I would like to enquire what the relative amount of work performed by the translators is to that performed by the ordinary translators of the House, who I think are worked almost the whole year round. Not that I wish to institute comparisons. I think it is a pity that we should lug in a discussion on this other topic. It has nothing to do with the present report. The present report has to do, not merely with English officials, but with French officials also. It has to do with the whole stenographic staff, English and French,