

the translators already engaged to remain that time after the close of the Session, in order to complete the work. A majority of the French members of the House have made frequent complaints to the Committee in regard to this matter, and the Committee, after considering it carefully, and being satisfied that the present staff were inadequate to discharge this duty with sufficient promptitude, decided to engage another assistant. I may say that since the long night sittings commenced, the average quantity of printed matter has been nearly thirty pages of the *Hansard*. The translators consider that three pages a day is a fair day's work, and it was necessary, therefore, even allowing for the work that can be done by the French reporters, that a regular staff of eight translators should be appointed, and in view of this fact the Committee decided to appoint another one. Mr. Poirier was chosen because his testimonials were of the very best kind, and he was personally known to many members of the Committee as an accomplished journalist, and as a man specially qualified to undertake this work. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee were as reluctant as any members of this House can be, to add to the expense already made necessary to carry on this work; but it seemed to them that if the work was to be made at all satisfactory to the French members of this House it was necessary to engage another translator.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) suggested that as the House voted nay to the last amendment they ought to vote yea to this one. I differ with him altogether. As long as we preserve the system of an official debate, I have always voted to make it efficient and have supported any proposition that would tend to give us a thoroughly efficient and satisfactory report. I believe that it is worse than useless when it is otherwise. One of the conditions of its being efficient is that the French translation should be not merely good, but also rapidly brought out, so that our French conferees may have an opportunity of having the reports of important debates early while yet they are fresh and while their course is directed to them. The report of the Committee, both collectively and also in the statements of the hon. member for Cardwell and the hon. member for Huntingdon, indicate, that for the work this number of translators is required. When the press of the Session commences—and you cannot anticipate the debates—there is somewhere, upon an average, about thirty pages of the report daily, and the hon. member for Cardwell considers three pages a day good work for one translator. You have a proposition now to have eight translators on the permanent staff besides the two stenographers, whose work, the hon. member for Cardwell says, must be deemed equivalent to only one; you have therefore, the present equivalent of nine translators, when ten would be required to do the work. It seems, therefore, that the suggestion of the Committee is a right and proper one, in order that we may have an efficient French as well as an efficient English report. I propose to support the report of the Committee, in the view that as long as there is an official report it should be correctly and expeditiously brought out.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know the reasons that have prompted the hon. member for Montmagny to make this motion, as he has given to the House but very brief explanations. I for one, Mr. Speaker, will not be suspected, I am sure, of speaking in an interested manner upon this motion. I know that some members of the Committee and members of the House complained the other day, either that the salaries given to the translators were not adequate for the work they had to do, or that their number was not sufficient to do the work imposed upon them. I do not want to discuss the action of the Committee—I suppose they have thoroughly considered the work the translators have

Mr. SCRIVER.

to do. They have asked for the appointment of an additional translator, and against the gentleman whose name is mentioned I have nothing to say. We are not to judge of the political qualifications of the reporters and translators of the *Hansard*; but if I were to say anything I would say that so far as efficiency is concerned, so far as knowledge of the language is concerned, and so far as thorough qualification for the work is concerned, the gentleman whose name appears in this motion is as well qualified as any others at present on the staff. I did not know before his name was proposed by the Committee, that he was an applicant, but upon learning it I am very much pleased that he is to be nominated as one of the permanent officers of the staff. On the general question, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think I can speak with entire disinterestedness. We should not call up any unpleasant reminiscences of the past, when the question is to secure a competent officer of the House. The only questions that we should consider in the choice of reporters and translators for the *Hansard* are those of knowledge, ability and general qualification.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is one reason why I cannot support this amendment, and it is this: that while I voted cheerfully for the abolition of the report as now conducted—although I failed to accomplish what I intended by my vote—it now comes to a matter of supporting the Committee in their decision upon a domestic question. I have always taken it for granted that the House should support its standing Committees in their reports unless special reasons may be urged against such a course. I have heard no such reason urged at this time, and I shall support the recommendation of the Committee, which is considered essential to the system, so long as we have it; otherwise I would fail in the discharge of my duty to the House, although I voted for the original amendment.

Mr. BERGIN. I rise merely to say that the Committee appointed this gentleman as one of the translators on the recommendations as to his qualifications, and we declined to consider his politics at all. We felt that it was not the duty of the Committee to enquire into a man's politics but into his qualifications, and that politics have nothing whatever to do with a man's qualifications as a servant of this House.

Amendment (Mr. Landry) negatived.

Mr. AMYOT moved in amendment that the said report be amended by substituting in the fifth paragraph, for the words "commencing with next Session," the words "including the present Session." He said: I think that by this arrangement all parties will be satisfied, and we will have a permanent and effective staff for the *Hansard*. If the translators deserve that salary, they deserve it as well this year as next year. It is nothing but justice to give them immediately the salary to which they are entitled in the opinion of the Committee, and I think, also, in the opinion of this House. It is a trifling matter to this House. We must remember that this year they have done the work with only seven men, and they are, therefore, more entitled to increased remuneration this year than they will be next year when there will be eight men. As I said at the beginning, it will be satisfactory to all parties and there will be an end to the discussion.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Committee hesitated long before concluding to advance the salaries of the translators. It was felt that the same argument would not apply to the translators as to the *Hansard* reporters, as the latter had been trained to the work, possessed special adaptability and their places could not be supplied. It was considered a matter of justice towards them to advance their salaries, and the advance to take place after this Session. After considerable discussion it was finally concluded by the Committee to advance the salaries of the translators in the same pro-