

Mr. LARUE (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): Now, sir, the opposition made use of the word "centralization". What the bill really proposes is not so much centralization as unifying, coordinating supervising and controlling translation.

The criticism implying that the translation of technical matter will not be done by experts in the subjects, is not, in my opinion, well founded, because it is our desire that translators who have specialized in certain subjects should continue to devote to them their special care.

Translation work is not generally conducive to promotion in a sphere other than the translation service, and the chances of promotion referred to in certain speeches will certainly be as numerous in the bureau for translations as they are at present.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): That is good news.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): I acknowledge, however, that the case of the translators of debates, the conditions under which they work during the session, differ from other public employees and must be given special consideration when the organization of the bureau for translation takes place.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): It is contended, in this respect, that the new act does not follow the practice of other bilingual countries. First, we must admit: we are masters in our own house; I admit the Frechette report, to which my hon. friends opposite referred, is a well put together report; on the other hand, it is twenty years old. Much technical progress has been made since that date. After all, as to the principle, the present act conforms with the Frechette report by acknowledging the advantage to be derived from specializing. However, where it is superior, is in seeking to combine the benefits of specialization with those of centralization. Far from being a hindrance to specialization, this bill aims at completing and perfecting it by giving it all the advantages of a sole and central supervision.

My hon. friend the member for Nicolet (Mr. Dubois) stated, in his speech of March 2, that the house had enough serious questions to settle without bringing up such a burning question. Why burning? Why burning, sir? Because of a well intentioned opposition, if you wish, but not sufficiently informed. We shall settle this burning question in favour of the rights of the French

[Mr. Barrette.]

language. For years we have heard complaints about the deficiency in translation, and when we propose a remedy, we are told: Keep out, it is a burning question!

I summarize, sir. Here is a measure which in the opinion of the government, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, aims at placing French on a sounder—

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): To win elections.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): —more satisfactory foundation than it has ever been since confederation. Here is measure that emphasizes more so sec. 133, and completes it; which, as I stated a moment ago, implements the spirit in which must be interpreted sec. 133; which is a recognition, in a legal form, of what sec. 133 intimates, but does not state, which implements in an act and the abrogation of which will be found difficult, the interpretation, we, from the province of Quebec, have given to the spirit of sec. 133. Yet, we have to carry on the fight against whom? Against our own compatriots of the French language.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): Shame!

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): Mr. Speaker, such is life, such is politics! One must not take offence or lose one's temper. We shall pursue our task, in spite of taunts; however, putting to account whatever beneficial may be found in the criticism and suggestions. We shall endeavour to attain the aim we have been following for ever so long, but more especially since we are in office, since 1930, namely, the complete recognition of the rights of the French language pursuant to the spirit of our constitution and in keeping with the spirit which inspired the discussion and negotiations of the confederation pact, in keeping with our history, traditions, the written and unwritten law; recognition of the French language rights—

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Also of the Imperial conference.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): —of its status in parliament, in departments and all fields of Canadian activities.

I appeal to my compatriots, to the French Canadian press, to trust in us. Surely the French language's rights are not—as it was stated at the outset of the opposition in danger through this bill. Within a few months our opponents, such as the *Droit* and other newspapers—as I cannot cast any doubt on their good intentions—will recognize that they were somewhat led astray.