

On section 1—export tax on furs:

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Honourable gentlemen, I have had one or two interviews with the officials in the Department who have charge of this Bill. They came to me to discuss the amendment which I suggested the other day, and after going over the matter we agreed upon the following amendment, which I wish now to move.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: You discussed the two amendments?

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Yes; we discussed both the amendment proposed by my honourable friend from Toronto (Hon. Sir Allen Aylesworth) and the one I proposed, and we agreed on the following as a substitute for subsection (r):

The levying of a tax upon furs to be shipped or carried from the Territories to any other part of Canada, or to any other country.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: What is the meaning of that?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It is to strike out the objectionable expression "export duty" or "export tax." Honourable gentlemen will remember that there were two amendments suggested; one from the honourable gentleman from Toronto (Hon. Sir Allen Aylesworth), and the other from the senior member for Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Belcourt). As my honourable friend from Ottawa has said, the Department has agreed upon the new form of amendment which he has just moved. It means that this is done with the consent of the Minister of the Department.

The amendment of Hon. Mr. Belcourt was agreed to.

On section 2—coming into force:

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I may say that I am disposed to accept the postponing of the date when the Bill will come into force until the 1st of January, 1929, but the loss of \$75,000 or \$100,000 will be upon the conscience of the honourable gentleman from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach).

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: What is the reason for the postponement?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My right honourable friend was not here when the honourable gentleman from Edmonton suggested that traders are leaving now for the north and they would not be able to disseminate the news of the new policy.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I pointed out that the outfits which were leaving now would not return until next year, and that people like

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY.

the trappers and traders in that north country should be given ample notice as to when the Act begins to operate, so as to arrange their business in accordance with it. They are trading now for next year.

I move, in amendment, that the date for the coming into force of the Bill be changed from January 1928 to January 1929.

The amendment of Hon. Mr. Griesbach was agreed to.

The preamble and title was agreed to.

The Bill was reported as amended.

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

TRANSLATION OF SENATE DEBATES

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. POIRIER moved concurrence in the third report of the Standing Committee on Debates and Reporting.

He said: Honourable gentlemen, lest some of you fail to remember the contents of this report, or failed to take cognizance of it, I will read it:

The Standing Committee on Debates and Reporting beg leave to make their third Report, as follows:—

Your Committee find that the present arrangement for the translation and publication of the French version of the Senate Debates is not satisfactory, and beg to recommend to the consideration of the Senate that the previous arrangement of employing two debates translators be restored.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: What was the old arrangement?

Hon. Mr. POIRIER: I am going to explain it. The purport of this recommendation is simply to revert to the old order of things. We had, pretty nearly since Confederation, two French translators of the Debates. I will admit they did not give full satisfaction. Two years ago, for most excellent reasons, I have no doubt, it was proposed, not by the Committee, but some other authority, to change what had existed since the beginning and to have one translator only, with the privilege of employing help in periods of rush.

Now, honourable gentlemen, what my honourable friend from St. John (Hon. Mr. Daniel) has said about the stenographers is true in this case. He contended, quite properly, I think, that we should have permanency in the staff; otherwise the work done is apt to be of an inferior character. As I say, the same principle applies, and with greater