

Journal is a translation of the English edition. It would therefore be anomalous to have two branches of the Journals' office for the House of Commons, and it seems but fitting and proper that the official who heretofore had charge of the French section of the Journal should be placed in the translation branch under "Journals". That is the explanation I have to offer and it seems in logic the fair position to take.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think the law requires that the proceedings of this House should be conducted and reported in both languages and not in one language and translated into the other. If we must accept the situation as described by his honour the Speaker, we would have just as much right to ask that the proceedings should be reported in French and translated into the English language. Both languages are on a footing of equality under the law and I think that this proposed arrangement is a change which would not be acceptable to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be the last person to suggest that the French language has not an equal status with the English language in this House. The position that I take has no reference to the French language as such. If the Clerk at the Table were one who spoke the French language and chose to enter the Journals in French, the position would be transposed; the translation would be into the English language. But that would not affect the position at all. It is illogical to insist that there shall be two Journals for the House of Commons; I do not see how it can be done. You can have one Journal in two languages but you cannot have two Journals.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It should be under the same branch I submit.

Mr. BELAND: The practice, which was established some seventy years ago and which has been followed ever since, has been highly satisfactory. It think it was in 1842 that the two heads of the Journals were first provided for, one English and one French. The reason for it, I think, is obvious. Although, as Mr. Speaker says, there is only one Journal, this Journal is published in two languages. If you have only one head, he must be thoroughly conversant with both languages; otherwise you could not say that he is a responsible head. It is in view of the fact—and I speak very frankly—that there are very few English-speaking people in this country who are thoroughly conversant with French that it was provided there should be two heads,

one English and the other French, in order that the Journal may be presented in both languages with a man responsible for each edition. That principle was confirmed in 1866, again in 1867, if I mistake not by classification in 1885, also in 1904, and in 1913 it was confirmed again by Dr. Sproule when Speaker. Really, I do not see any reason why we should do away with one of the heads of the Journals, be it the French head or the English head. The person who might be the head of the Journals might be an English-speaking gentleman and he would not likely be thoroughly conversant with the French language. Under such circumstances, who will be responsible when we present to you the fact that the French Journal is not in proper form? The translator? The translator may be held responsible to a certain extent but the head, or editor of the Journal in French, should be responsible and if there is no French head he cannot be held responsible. I know that there is no desire on the part of his honour, the Speaker, to do away with the English or the French language. I know he is animated with a desire to be fair and impartial in this regard, but I maintain that unless you have two heads of the Journal—and the Journals are the most important part of the publications of the House—so recorded by Bourinot himself—you will not have entire satisfaction.

Mr. SPEAKER: I respectfully differ from my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland). I entirely disassociate myself from his argument. If it is logical to say that we must have two heads, a French and an English head, of the Journals, that argument would apply with equal force to every department of the Government. That, I submit is an unsound position to take. Surely there can be but one responsible head of any department. It only requires that an official shall have a competent knowledge of French and English to enable him to say that the French Journal is an exact transcription of the English Journal; at all events during such period of time as the Clerk of the House happens to be an English-speaking person. There was at the head of the English branch Mr. Dalton, an old and very capable official, who has been superannuated. It is not the purpose to appoint an official in his place. In the interest of economy as well as of efficiency, it has been thought wiser to amalgamate a number of the offices of the House under one head. By so doing we can get more efficient work and we will save this country several thousand dollars a year which