

The art of translation is a subsidiary art, and derivative. On this account it has never been granted the dignity of original work, and has suffered too much in the general judgment of letters. This natural under-estimation of its value has had the bad practical effect of lowering the standard demanded, and in some periods has almost destroyed the art altogether. The corresponding misunderstanding of its character has added to its degradation: neither its importance nor its difficulty has been grasped.

Writing men work in part for fame. Nearly all of those with any pretensions to write well—that is, to write as writing should be—take fame for a large part of their incentive; some, perhaps among the greatest, have the attainment of fame for their whole motive. If, therefore, in any department of writing it be impossible to attain fame, that department will presumably be neglected.

I am sorry my time is nearly up, but perhaps I can summarize the conclusions that may be drawn from what I have quoted. One is outstanding, namely, that translating is something not easy of accomplishment, and in order to maintain an efficient staff of translators they should not lose their personality by being merged in a big office, nor should they be deprived of the stimulus of desire for fame and for promotion. Moreover, unless a translator keeps in close touch with the department for which he works, he will soon lose sight of the realities which are essential to the complete fulfilment of his task. One of our greatest social evils to-day in our highly specialized and centralized world is that the labourer has lost pride in his work, because he never sees the finished product credited to him in particular. He is a number in a mass of men too often enslaved by machinery. If this excess of concentration is now an evil for the manual worker, how much greater an evil is it for those entrusted with so subtle an art as translation? The minister says, for instance, that for the sake of economy—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. L. DUBOIS (Nicolet) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it may, perhaps, be thought that I am somewhat out of my element in taking part in a debate which pertains more to the sphere of legal men. Like my good friend the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I have not the privilege of being a lawyer. However, I have the honour of representing a rural constituency which is interested in having translation done efficiently. Our farmers often require publications which pertain to branches or divisions such as those of the dairy industry, seed grain, livestock, eggs, poultry, fruit, vegetables and markets, etc., I, therefore, feel authorized to express my views on the

present bill which is being discussed by the house. I shall do so without wounding the feelings of any one so that I rely on the good will of my hon. colleagues. It might perhaps be that in the course of my remarks, I may not quite agree with the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan), I may also cause him some regret, although I have had, for a long time, much esteem for him. Shall I wound the susceptibility of the hon. member for Labelle? However, inwardly, I feel the necessity of expressing my views on this bill. I frankly confess that it is one of the few occasions that I find it difficult to fulfil my duty.

Before broaching the subject matter under discussion and seeing that it is the first time that I have the opportunity of addressing the house, this session, I wish to strongly protest against the statement made by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) with reference to the university of Montreal. I regret that such an unfortunate statement should have fallen from the lips of one of my fellow farmers. Because, we, who belong to the soil, have long understood the importance of an education for our people and, especially, the importance of our universities. Again, I state that I regret that my hon. friend used such insulting words towards this institution which has rendered, is rendering and will, in the future, render great services to the farming class.

Bill No. 4, which we are asked to consider has for its object: first, efficiency in the translation of the various documents of this house and governmental departments; secondly, to economize. In perusing the bill, I asked myself: Who prompted this measure? Who invented this new system? In what surrounding was this bill concocted?

There was an inquiry held in December, 1932, by a committee of representatives of the various departments who studied a number of questions dealing with a more efficient control of the expenditure of the administration. The committee was composed of Messrs. Watson Sellar, Roberts, Cook, Coolican, etc. They represented the various departments. I eagerly read the report of this committee. After sitting for quite a time the committee came to the following conclusion. All the high officials who were members of this committee, all without exception, most strongly opposed any scheme of centralization. Two principal reasons were given: First, the inconvenience which would result in the efficient administration of departments; secondly, the necessity of having in departments a bureau for translation where, without delay and fear