

Economy of the House of Commons, visited Belgium and Switzerland to observe the practice in effect in those countries. From the information before the committee the general consensus of opinion in the departments is in favour of the status quo.

I ask the minister, is that a reliable report? Anyhow the committee did not approve of centralization. I fail to see much in favour of amalgamation in any of these reports. I fail to see on what ground the minister bases his policy. Is it the result of deep thinking or of intense dreaming? Perhaps some have been moved by the complaints made by the minister in his own case. Let us read what he said in introducing his bill into this house on January 29 last at page 8 of Hansard:

The situation is such that the department of the Secretary of State either must have a number of translators attached to it or must be able to avail itself of the services of some one or more of these ninety-one translators. For instance, the Department of the Secretary of State has to procure a translation of the address of His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of parliament, but there is no translator to whom I can apply to have that work done, so I have been dependent upon the gratuitous service of personal friends, or to pay others to make that translation from time to time. In addition we have a very considerable number of important state documents of which the Secretary of State, as Registrar General, is the conservator or keeper or guardian. 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.

I take strong exception to that statement, Mr. Speaker. If as a result of the dismissal by the government of over a dozen translators the minister is unable to get proper service, then, if it is not his own fault, it is the fault of the government. Secondly, I have only to submit that had the minister entrusted the work to a translator in the Archives branch, such as the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Howard) mentioned, for instance, to Dr. Marion, a distinguished author, we would not have witnessed the spectacle of His Excellency being obliged to read a document with three-score or more inaccuracies, false sense, grammatical errors, and so on.

Mr. CAHAN: Would the hon. gentleman suggest to me what right I have as Secretary of State to take a gentleman in the Archives and appropriate his services for general business? He is appointed to the Archives for certain special work which requires his attention from time to time. Why should I trans-

fer him to another department? What authority have I to do so?

Mr. BOUCHARD: Unless I am mistaken the Archives comes under the jurisdiction of the minister.

Mr. CAHAN: No, it is not a part of the department of the Secretary of State. It is a separate and distinct department created for a special service of its own.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Then would the minister state what department the Archives does belong to?

Mr. CAHAN: It is the Department of Public Archives, with its own deputy minister.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Who is the Deputy Minister of Public Archives, may I ask?

Mr. CAHAN: My hon. friend can look into the record for himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the house is not in committee.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Anyhow, there are too many good translators around the house here and elsewhere in this city of Ottawa for it to have been at all difficult for the minister to have secured one.

Mr. CAHAN: But there is not a translator around this building or in Ottawa whose services I have the right to demand as a translator in the public service.

Mr. CARDIN: You could have appointed one, just as there are translators in other departments.

Mr. CAHAN: Why appoint them when a score who have been appointed are away on five or six months' holidays during the summer and the public service is suffering?

Mr. CARDIN: Force them to work.

Mr. CAHAN: I have no authority to force them to work.

Mr. CARDIN: The government has the power.

An hon. MEMBER: That is the reason for the bill.

Mr. CARDIN: Not at all. It is for a different purpose.

Mr. BOUCHARD: If what the minister understands by economy is this petty little saving, and if what he understands by efficiency is the translation of the speech from the throne and of the St. Lawrence deep waterway treaty, which I hold in my hand,