

than the sum of \$800, which is paid to them, and there is an enormous disproportion between that sum and that of \$2,000, which is to be paid to the stenographers. If I wished to make comparisons of this nature, I would say that the value of those who are reporting the speeches is far superior to that of those who make the speeches; inasmuch as the members of Parliament—and we have a great number, and we might have a still greater number if we made application to get more—are only receiving \$2,000. Well, I think this would be rather over-rating the relative value of those who report speeches and of those who make them. Well, Mr. Speaker, on the whole, I shall once more suggest, and I shall ask as a special favour from the Government, and from the Chairman of the Committee of the *Hansard*, that the adoption of the report of the Committee be postponed till to-morrow or the day after, so that the House may have before them all that which is necessary to judge both as to the cost of the *Hansard* and of the equitable remuneration which ought to be granted to the different members of the *Hansard* staff.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The chairman of the Committee must be pleased that the report has been unanimously endorsed by all the members who have spoken. I merely rise to ask a question on one point, and it is this: If I understand the report aright, it says that this increase shall take effect from next Session. I had thought that the advance had been given because of the efficiency that had been manifested by the staff, more particularly this year, though also no doubt in past years. If the work of the staff during the present Session has warranted the Committee in making this recommendation, I cannot understand why its operation should not go into effect this year. Perhaps the Committee have some reason which those outside of its number are not aware, and as to this point, members would like some explanation.

Mr. COURSOUL. After the explanations given by the chairman of the Committee and the different views elicited from hon. members, I feel that the motion I made has had its effect—that whenever this matter comes before the Committee again, the question of the French translation will be treated with that fairness which we all expect should be applied. I would not have made the motion, except for the remarks which fell from the chairman of the Committee, that another method would have to be adopted before the close of the Session in regard to that work, meaning thereby that the Committee would in the future have the work done either by contract or by some other system of which I am ignorant. It was in order to secure to the translators permanent appointments that I rose, and I hope this discussion will have the effect of leading the Committee to decide not to abandon this experiment, which has only been in operation a year, but to give it a thorough trial in the future, so that we will be able to decide whether the translation is well done, and whether the cost is excessive. As it is now, it is only an experiment which costs the country \$1,400 more than was asked under the contract system, while the reporting has increased from \$12,000 or \$13,000 to \$18,000. Under these circumstances I feel it my duty to withdraw the motion, but I hope the Committee will as early as possible bring in a report on the question.

Amendment withdrawn, and Report concurred in.

RESIGNATION OF F. X. O. MÉTHOT, ESQ.

Mr. MÉTHOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform you that my intention is to resign my seat as a member of this House; consequently, I now resign my seat as member for Nicolet, in the House of Commons.
Mr. OUMET.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the House will allow me to express the regret felt by the Government, and felt also, I am sure, by the House, at the idea that the hon. member for Nicolet is going to leave us. He has always shown himself very attentive to his duty, and I do hope that his successor will be as valuable a member as he was himself.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the adoption of the Fifth Report of the Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament. He said: I may say that this report is one which refers to the method of carrying on the printing of Parliament. It recommends no positive action, it simply submits certain papers which came into the possession of the Committee and reserves the matter for consideration. It does recommend, however, the extension of the present contract for one year, in order to give time to consider the whole question, which I suppose, the Government intend to consider, according to one of their reports, and a statement made on the floor of Parliament. The contracts would terminate on the 31st of December, this year, and in order that there may be time to consider the whole question and either continue the contract system or adopt the system of a Government Printing Office, the Committee recommend the extension of the contracts for paper and printing for one year from the 31st December next.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are separate contracts?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Report concurred in.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the adoption of the Sixth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament. He said: This report simply recommends the printing of a number of papers, and an addition of \$200 to the salary of young Mr. Botterel, which was unanimously adopted. He is now getting \$600, and is said to be of great use in the distribution office. It also recommends an addition of \$50 per Session to the salary of the Sessional messengers in the distribution office, making them the same as the salaries paid in the Senate. They were paid the increased amount by special vote last year, and it is now proposed to make the addition permanent to these two Sessional messengers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there any difference between their salaries and those of the other Sessional messengers?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As I understand the salary of the ordinary messengers is \$200, and this increase makes the salary of these two men \$250 as they are considered to be more constantly employed. They go up and down like buckets between the printing office and the House, continuously.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I hope the hon. member will allow the motion to stand as it will involve some discussion as to the payment of these salaries?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Of course if a Minister says it should stand that is sufficient. Still this is what they received last year, by a special vote, and it is the sum which is paid in the Senate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that this will involve consequences elsewhere. If we are to increase the salaries of these messengers why should we not increase the salaries of all the other messengers who are here permanently, and who are asking and sending communications for such increases? I would ask the hon. gentleman not to