

and unsatisfactory working conditions. The work load of this branch has increased by more than 50 per cent in the last 10 to 12 years; the sitting hours have become more irregular and longer, and there has never been any tangible recognition of the greatly increased burden under which we have carried on.

In the past I have recommended that the Hansard staff be increased from seven to nine reporters and that a substantial increase in salary be granted in order that the high standard of reporting which we have endeavoured to provide may be maintained. However, these recommendations have not been accepted, though I have a wealth of statistics I could cite to support my recommendations.

For example, in the last few years the committee reporting staff has been increased from four to six; the staff of committee clerks has been increased from five to six; the French debates reporting staff has been increased from one reporter and one editor not too long ago to five reporters and two editors at the present time, though their work load averages about 10 per cent of the work load of the English debates staff. The Senate reporting staff has been increased from four to six, and all these increases I suggest have been made because of the greater volume of work. The Hansard staff has remained at 7 during my entire association with it, which covers a period of more than 40 years; and other than the service-wide salary increases to companies for increased cost of living no increase has been granted in recognition of the vastly greater amount of work.

Incidentally, speaking of the Senate, I must say that this has been one of our greatest difficulties in obtaining staff. Working conditions for the Senate debates reporters are so much better, and the work load so much lighter, than ours, that we have lost several members of our staff to the Senate within the past few years, and whenever there are concurrent vacancies on our staff and theirs, they invariably attract the applicant. Not only is their work load much lighter; they have so much more free time that they are able to augment their salaries very considerably.

I do not know whether such a thing is feasible, but I do suggest that there should be a substantial salary differential in favour of our staff to make our situation more nearly equal to that of the Senate reporters, and that the extension to the Senate staff of any increase in our salaries or improvement in our working conditions should be carefully reviewed in the light of these facts.

Without giving further statistics and arguments to support my suggestions, which I could provide ad nauseam, I strongly recommend that immediate consideration be given to the following recommendations:

1. That the debates reporting staff be granted an immediate across the board increase of 25% retroactive to April 1.

2. That the committee reporting staff be granted an immediate increase of 15%, similarly retroactive. I suggest this lesser amount because in my view it is necessary to maintain a substantial differential between the Hansard and committee sections in order to encourage members of the committee reporting staff to apply to fill vacancies on the Hansard staff, which they have not been anxious to do up to the present.

3. That the Hansard staff be enlarged by the addition of two reporters, making nine in all.

4. That the designations "parliamentary reporter" and "assistant parliamentary reporter" be dropped and replaced by "debates reporter" and "committee reporter".