

Yet we find that such officers as Clerks of Committees, Translators, Clerks of Votes and Proceedings, Journal Clerks, &c., are paid salaries from \$1,500 to \$1,800 per Session. It is unnecessary to enter into a comparison between the arduous and exacting nature of our work and the merely routine character of theirs."

I hope the translation of the *Hansard* is not comprised in that routine work. Everyone knows that the translation from English into French is work of a most difficult nature. In order to have the English language translated properly this work must be done by men of education, by masters of the language, who are able to give the genius of the language. The translator has to deal with questions of science, art, political economy, civil engineering, and other questions. If he is not well trained and is not a man of education, he cannot possibly make a good translation; and I believe it is a matter of as much interest to the French people of this country to have the *Hansard* well translated, as it is to the English population to have the English edition efficiently prepared. It is just that the English speakers should be well translated, and their remarks placed before the country in language which will do honour to the country and themselves. We have selected a translating staff, and why? Because it is composed of men of education, nearly all of whom are journalists and men of literature, and we know that, as in the case of the hon. member for Cardwell, journalists are always ornaments in this House, men who distinguish themselves by their talents and acquisitions; and no doubt many of the young men of the translating staff, if they had seats on the floor of the House, would do honour to themselves. I think it is but fair that the translators should not be left in that position. I think that these men who were brought here a year ago should not be set adrift and left out in the cold because it is necessary to supplement the salaries of the reporting staff. I admit without hesitation that the *Hansard* reporters ought to be well paid. I am aware of the labour they perform, for we are day by day witnesses of the great work devolving upon them. The translators are kept closed up in their rooms, they have a great deal of important work to do which cannot be done by the help of machinery, which is not done by sound, or in a mechanical way, but by their own labour, and they have to continue that work for months after the Session is over. It is impossible for seven men to do all that work, which is done by the eight men who are on the reporting staff, aided by their amanuenses and by mechanical appliances. Now, Sir, I hope, and I have no doubt the House will see to it, that the French translators shall be properly dealt with, and not left in a position which will compel them to abandon their duties—duties which they like, and which they expected, like the reporters, would make a career for them, so as to render it an object to them to make themselves perfectly masters of their work, so as to make a living upon which they could depend. As to the contract system, I object to it as applied to the French reporters, while the English reporters are appointed on an official system. I would ask that equal justice be done to all, and I have no doubt that the House will see that it is done.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the motion he has made as an amendment to the report, because the question of the translation of the *Debates* is, at this moment, engaging the attention of the Committee, and they hope soon to present a report expressly upon the subject, when the motion will be more applicable to the report itself. The hon. gentleman seems to draw a distinction between the French reporters with the English reporters. There are two French reporters standing exactly in the same position with the English reporters, and they are to receive the same salary.

Mr. COURSOL. I do not mean the reporters, I mean the translators.

Mr. COURSOL.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). So far as the translation is concerned that is rather a different subject from the reporting, and I think it would be better to discuss it on a report relating to that matter. There are on the Committee three French gentlemen who are thoroughly familiar with what is required with regard to the French translation, and as they are present I think I may say that it has always been the desire of the Committee to meet their views both as to the appointment of the translators, the remuneration they are to receive, and all matters connected with their work. I think the hon. gentleman may fairly leave it to the Committee to consider the whole question and to make a report upon it, because it is quite clear from the experience we have had with the present system, with the present number of translators—we may have to increase the number though we may continue the system—the present number will not enable us to do what is the earnest desire of the Committee should be done, that is, to give to the French members of the House their corrected, translated report at as early a date as possible. One of the misfortunes of the system was the want of a sufficient number of translators, and I believe the French copy is now considerably behind. I am sure that cannot be the desire of anyone,—it certainly is not the desire of the Committee. The Committee desires that the French copy should be in the hands of the French members at the earliest possible moment, and I am sure the House can trust the Committee, constituted as it is, to take up the whole question in such a way as to do fair justice to the translators, and what is perhaps more important in some respects, to the French members of the House. I hope the hon. gentleman will consent to withdraw his motion as an amendment to the report and allow the report to go. We will have a meeting in the beginning of the week when the whole question of the translating will come up, and we will then be able to discuss it.

Mr. COURSOL. After the explanations of the chairman of the Committee I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. DESJARDINS. As one member of the *Debates* Committee, I may be allowed to bear testimony to the correctness of what has been said by the chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Cardwell. We have always been met with a full and earnest desire to do justice to the French part of the system by those connected with the Committee. As has been said, the question of having a permanent staff was discussed years ago, and this year that system is on its trial. It has been found that the four translators who were appointed at the beginning of the Session were insufficient, and two others were added, and besides the assistance of the French reporters has been secured in the work of translation. Now, we have already recommended \$2,000 more towards the expense of the French translation than the same work could be done under the contract system. We expected that by adding to the cost and changing the system we would obtain more effective work, and that the French members would receive more satisfaction by the more prompt and regular issue of the French translation. That, however, has not been done yet. The last report the House adopted was to meet that requirement, but we are only trying an experiment, and if it is found that six or seven members of this staff are not sufficient I am sure the Committee will be disposed to meet the exigencies of the question.

Mr. AMYOT. I would have much preferred if the whole question of *Hansard* had been brought forward at once. I do not see why any difference should be made between the reporters and the translators. The translators require to be as capable men in their occupation as the stenographers themselves, and I find from the figures that the French translators are not treated in the same way as the official reporters at all. I find that the French proof-reader gets only