

is the least we can expect for the orderly conduct of the work of this chamber.

Again, I thank the honourable senator for having raised this matter at the opening of the session.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck: Your Honour, may I make a comment on this matter?

In the old days in the Senate the Speech from the Throne was read throughout, first in English and then in French. The result was that those who spoke French understood the whole speech and those who spoke English understood the whole speech. As it is at present, we switch from one language to the other in the course of the speech. I do not like this method. The result is that those only who are thoroughly bilingual understand the entire speech. Those who speak only French understand only half of the speech and those who speak only English understand only half of it. It is necessary to wait until *Hansard* is distributed to learn what has been said by the Governor General on such an auspicious occasion.

I do not see any advantage in this current method of reading the speech, and I wish we could go back to the former system of having the speech read in its entirety, first in one language and then in the other—I have no preference which language comes first. In that way all of us will hear and understand the entire speech.

Hon. Donald Cameron: Honourable senators, I rise to say that I do not agree with my good friend Senator Roebuck, that speeches should be read in both French and English. I can sympathize with those honourable senators—and I am one—who do not have any great facility in understanding spoken French, but if the translation system is made to work, then I think that meets the need of Senator Roebuck and of us all. I certainly have felt that it was a change for the better having the reading of the speech alternate between French and English, and I hope that practice will continue.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: That is satisfactory if we are sitting at our own desks where we have the earphone, but this is the first opening of a session in my many years in this chamber when we have sat at our desks. On a full-dress occasion we sit in chairs along the front of the aisle and the ladies are seated behind us, in which case we do not have access to the translation facilities. Therefore, I think my objection stands.

[The Hon. the Speaker.]

Hon. Mr. Cameron: Senator Roebuck is quite right in that respect.

THE SENATE

CHAR SERVICES—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. Allister Grosart: Honourable senators, I rise also on a question of personal privilege which may also concern all members of the chamber.

I should like to call attention to the fact that every day on the way to my office I pass a door in which there is a brass plate inscribed: "Senate Char Service". I do not know what the authority is for this title for these 18 gentlemen and 40 ladies who serve us so well, but I hope that honourable senators would agree with me that it is not in keeping with the concept we have of the services rendered by our friends.

"Char" is a very old word. Perhaps the only thing that really commends it today is the fact that it is a very old Irish word. But even that, in my opinion, would not be sufficient justification for continuing its use in these particular circumstances. Over the years it has become associated with menial tasks, and also relates to "chores", which again suggests repetitious and dull work. Certainly this association has existed for at least three or four hundred years, since Shakespeare's time.

Perhaps on a day when this Chamber has been graced with so much of our Canadian feminine beauty, including Her Excellency, of course, it may not be out of place for me to make a reference to the great Queen Cleopatra, one of the classic beauties of all time. I am sure all honourable senators will recall that in Shakespeare's play *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act IV, Scene XV, Antony dies and Cleopatra, struck to the heart, faints. Her maid rouses her to the inspiring words "Royal, Egypt, Empress!" Cleopatra, quickly recovering from her faint, replies:

No more, but e'en a woman, and
commanded

By such poor passion as the maid that
milks

And does the meanest chores.

I suggest, honourable senators, it is an ugly anachronism that a word with such associations should be carried forth into this chamber in this the twentieth century. I might add that those who are involved would welcome a change with respect to this personal affront that I have felt when passing that brass plate daily in coming to this chamber. It has