

to a government department to have them translated,—even if such private member were willing to pay for the actual translation? I hope the Secretary of State will investigate the matter and find out whether or not the Prime Minister or any other member of parliament, no matter how meek or little he may be, may take advantage of the bureau for translations or the public printing bureau to have his speeches printed at cost price.

Mr. CAHAN: As a matter of fact any translation that was done by the bureau either in whole or in part of any addresses given by the Prime Minister was performed before any speech was delivered. In the ordinary course the bureau for translations received certain documents from the Prime Minister's office with a request that they be translated. The bureau translated them. The matter was not referred to me nor did it come within my knowledge, but the bureau acts at the request of a public department as they receive work to do from day to day.

Mr. DUFF: The question is as to whether or not the work to which reference is made constituted a governmental document. If the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State or any other minister wished to issue a governmental document to the public it would be all right to have that document printed in English and French by the public printing bureau, or to have it go to the translators to have translations made. I understand the allegation made by the hon. member for Kamouraska is, however, that the Prime Minister was taking advantage of the fact that he was Prime Minister to have a private and political speech made by him in a certain part of this country translated into French at the expense of the people of Canada,—although I will admit he may have been willing to pay for the actual cost of translation.

I wish to say to the Secretary of State the taxpayers are not paying translators who translate into either the French or the English language to translate speeches of private members of parliament made outside of this house. My understanding is that the translators, whether they translate into English or French, have to translate only what happens within the precincts of parliament, and not anything which may arise from a happening in Halifax, Vancouver, Montreal or the Prime Minister's quarters at the Chateau Laurier.

Mr. RHODES: I had no knowledge of the matter raised by the hon. member for Kamouraska, and his having done so brought to me the first intimation that any such question had arisen. I rise for the purpose of

saying that the fullest information will be gladly disclosed, and that we will secure complete information. I feel quite certain that as has been the case hitherto, if any printing or translation was done for the Prime Minister he would have arranged in advance to pay for it. There was no printing; it was a question of translation. I have risen to state that the item now under discussion has to do with printing and binding of the statutes, and the moneys required therefor. Those moneys are necessary in the present fiscal year. There will be an item in the supplementary estimates for the next year; this will come down in the course of the next few days, and will provide ample opportunity for complete discussion of this matter. Therefore I hope that under the circumstances hon. members will permit the item to pass on the understanding that full opportunity for discussion will be available when the item comes down, as undoubtedly it will.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before the minister secures the information may I draw his attention to the answer which was given. The question was asked, "Were the translators paid any extra salary for that additional work?" and the answer was "No." They were paid no extra salary; they have only their usual annual salary. Then the question was asked, "Was that translation work given to the translators as part of their official duty?" And the answer was, "Yes."

Mr. RHODES: This is the first time I have had the matter brought to my attention. The statement is made that no additional salary was paid to the translators by reason of certain work having been done, but it by no means follows that because that statement was made the work was not paid for. So I think it would be unfortunate to have a wrong impression created without first having full knowledge of the facts. I suggest the discussion might take place to greater advantage in connection with an ensuing item at a time when we will have all the facts.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am greatly relieved, because I was wondering how the broadcast we Liberals expect our leader to make at a later date would be translated. I now find the method of doing it.

Mr. POWER: I should like to ask the Secretary of State if it is a fact that any member of parliament may go to the bureau for translations and have newspaper clippings translated for the purpose of preparing his speech? Is that the custom?