

important matter—a man who has no standing as a literary critic, as an organizer, or even as a translator; and further, this report was written at a time when there was no French commissioner to approve of such a report. In fact, I am sure that if the present French commissioner had been in office, that report would never have left the Civil Service Commission, at least in its original form. It was speeded up in the absence of one of the recognized representatives of the French Canadian minority in the cabinet.

Now let us see what the minister has to say in reference to this bill. I quote from Hansard, pages 7 and 8, of January 29:

In January last it was ascertained that there were employed in the public service 91 translators. . . .

The salaries of these 91 translators amount to \$252,000.

And further:

Yet some time ago, when a treaty dealing with the waterways was signed between the government of Canada and the government of the United States, there was not a single translator to whom I could apply or to whom I had the right to apply to make a translation of that document from English into French for circulation as required. In respect of private, confidential documents such as that, I had to enlist the services of a personal friend to make the translation. There were other documents such as the convention between Ontario and Quebec in regard to the same waterways, and in connection with them there was no one in the public service to whom I could apply for a translation. I had to go outside to procure the services of a friend to make such translation. And so it is that the different departments are from time to time called upon to prepare in both English and French very important state documents.

These remarks, to say the least, are confusing and may leave the house under a false impression. We would think that the minister has no translator available in his own department. The truth is that at least three translators are listed as being under the authority of the Secretary of State. One of them is even a graduate of the Sorbonne in France.

Mr. CAHAN: Who is he?

Mr. ST-PERE: He is connected with the Archives department, Mr. Marion. His services were very easily available to the minister. If we follow the same process of reasoning used by those who made up the return in answer to the question of the hon. member for Three Rivers-St. Maurice last year, we will find five of them, namely: One principal translator in the patent office, one principal translator in the Archives branch, one editor-translator for the Canada Gazette, and Mr. Van Veen, and Mr. Emond, a re-

[Mr. St-Père.]

mission officer who was also listed as a translator. Perhaps the hon. minister did not at the time realize that he had so many. At all events, why complain that he had no translator to whom he could apply for making the translation desired?

Mr. CAHAN: Because it is the truth. I have none.

Mr. ST-PERE: All right. I am sure the hon. gentleman did not want deliberately to deceive the house, but his statement would have us believe he had no one available. The minister says he must go outside or ask other departments to get his translation done. It is strange that such would be the case after what we now know about the number of translators under his own jurisdiction. At any rate, it proves that translation services are essential for the proper administration of his own department—we have his own words for it—and if they are essential in his department, they are just as essential in all other departments. The hon. minister's recital is simply an implied condemnation of the government's policy in regard to translators in general. The present government has abolished nearly a score of translators in the interior and finance departments and the civil service commission. They even dismissed a translator actually on duty and who had just been appointed to the railway board. If these services are essential, why abolish these positions? Why could not the Secretary of State appoint a few more translators for his own work? Instead of doing the practical thing, he brings down this bill to rectify a personal grievance, according to his own statement. By withdrawing the translation personnel from other departments to merge them in a central bureau, he is putting the other ministers or heads of departments in the same position as that about which he so bitterly complains. If the hon. minister finds fault in having to call upon outsiders to have his translation done, why should the House of Commons, for example, have to call upon the Secretary of State to have its parliamentary papers and official documents translated? The reason given by the hon. gentleman is not very convincing. Passing the difficulty to others is not a solution and I submit that the only and proper remedy is to add to his own staff according to his needs.

I should like to say a word as to the number of translators in the public service. The hon. gentleman says that ninety-one are employed by the government. No doubt he took this figure from the return made last