

force, to the translation of the debates. Last year, with only one translator, we had an excellent translation as far as it went, but the temporary help which had to be engaged at random, did not prove satisfactory. Their translation was inferior.

The French speaking members of this House have as much right to get their reports in good French as the English members have to get theirs in good English. As I say, there is no fault to be found with the Editor of French Debates, as I think he is officially called. He is a good translator, but the assistance he has had to employ has not proved equal to the task. It is efficiency that we are after. Since we apparently have to be subservient to the House of Commons in matters of internal economy, just as it appears that we have to follow the United States in the matter of the International Court of Justice, I may say that in the other House they have thirteen permanent translators of Hansard. I therefore do not think this request on behalf of the French-speaking members is extravagant.

Now, the main question is the cost. I believe that we are entitled to two translators, even though it should cost more. But that will not be the case, honourable gentlemen. A saving, and a pretty considerable saving, will be effected. I need not go beyond the Report of the Internal Economy Committee to show it. In the Report presented on Wednesday, the 6th of this month, which is to be found at page 340 of the Minutes of the Senate, I read:

Translating Debates, \$3,825.

That is in addition to what is paid to Mr. Potvin. Translators in the other House are paid from \$2,800 to \$3,600 per annum. The remuneration of the new appointee will be a matter for His Honour the Speaker and the Clerk to decide upon. Assuming, however, that the translator is paid the maximum figure, there would still be a saving of over \$200 a year.

This year Mr. Potvin, I believe, was sick for some time, and we had not one translator at our disposal. Any of us who wished to enjoy a privilege similar to that of the English-speaking members of the House had no means of doing so, even by paying for it, as we have to do to a certain extent, because the one translator we had was sick. That situation, which may occur again, should not be made permanent. We should have two translators who will put in twelve or fourteen hours a day, if necessary, in order to secure the efficient translation of the debates of this House. The two translators would have more leisure during the recess, and would be able to catch

up with the work. This is what the Committee on Debates and Reporting wants. It is only reasonable, I think, and only fair to expect that there should be no serious objection to the adoption of this Report.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Honourable gentlemen, I am not at all satisfied that this Report should be adopted. I admit that I do not understand the question very thoroughly, but I have tried to find out something about it. I went to the Clerk of the Senate and asked him about the matter, and he tells me that there has been no complaint whatever on the score of the translator having too much work to do. If that is the case, why should we appoint more translators? It is all very well for my honourable friend to say that it would cost less. I have been in this House long enough to know that when you appoint more officials the cost is more—is bound to be more. I would like to find out more about this matter, and in order to do so I would move that this debate be adjourned.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: With what end in view? Does the honourable gentleman propose the adjournment of the debate till next Session?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, that would be a very good solution.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Or till tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: I am agreeable to that.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: Honourable gentlemen, I did not hear exactly the motion of my honourable friend from Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turriff), but as Chairman of the Internal Economy Committee I think perhaps I may be permitted to say a word or two. The Internal Economy Committee, as you all know, is one of the large Standing Committees of this House. It consists of 25 members, and is representative of all the different shades of thought in this Chamber. I must say that the Report brought in by my honourable friend from New Brunswick (Hon. Mr. Poirier) was a great surprise to me, because I thought that anything relating to the internal economy of this Chamber would first be introduced into the Committee on Internal Economy, which has been specially appointed to look after such matters.

It has also been a surprise to me to learn from the Report presented that there has been any dissatisfaction whatever with the manner in which the translation of the debates in this Chamber, and so on, is performed. You will remember that last year we appointed as a