

when he mentioned the campaign in the press which he had had to face for the last few months. This article will give an idea to the House of Commons of the constructive criticism which was levelled at the Secretary of State, and the respect which was shown, even in the criticism, for his personality. I have made the following translation:

In the first place, whatever be the intrinsic merit of the proposal, whatever peril it may conceal, we are one of those who, being cognizant of Mr. Cahan's early activities and of the heavy sacrifices—much heavier than one is apt to surmise—toward vindicating the rights of minorities, find it impossible to consider him in the light of an enemy of our ethnic group, and are unwilling to do anything towards diminishing the share of influence which rightly belongs to him in the sphere of dominion affairs.

In the second place, it may be—while we are ignorant of it—that the present organization, either through a defect inherent in the system, or through individual failings, does not give complete satisfaction.

But that being granted, and this is our third argument, it seems clear to any one who takes time to go into the details of the scheme that this measure making for the centralization of translations would neither answer the purpose of efficiency, nor even that of economy, which it purports to procure.

It seems also—and that is a fourth point to note—its outcome might quite possibly be to result, without appreciable economy, in a lower standard of efficiency, as regards both the quality and quantity of the translation turned out, and thus would the standard and importance of French, even as matters now stand, insufficiently recognized in the dominion government service, be further reduced.

To all these points and a few others we shall recur in the near future, with facts and illustrations in support.

Improvements may be in order; but the remedy is quite of a different nature from that proposed in the bill. And we believe that it would be comparatively an easy matter to prove our contention to the satisfaction even of the Secretary of State.

I believe in the sincerity of this article, and I know the Secretary of State also believes in it. It is not my intention to deal at greater length with this matter, because I believe the house is seized of the sincerity of the objections we have made to the bill, and I know that no ulterior motives are behind this discussion. In a discussion of this nature everyone must naturally and necessarily be within the bounds of logic, and be honest in his motives. On the coat of arms of the royal family of Great Britain are the words "Honi soit qui mal y pense." All we want is perfect coordination and understanding of every branch of this great Canadian family.

I believe that to a certain measure I have proven that this so-called centralization would not give us the measure of efficiency which,

[Mr. Bradette.]

at first glance, it might seem to offer. Secondly, I say that no economy would be accomplished by centralization. There are several other bureaus, several other governmental departments to which that principle could be applied. I can see where there would be objections from different ministers through the fact that they would lose some of the prerogatives they enjoy in their own departments.

I was not quite satisfied with the statements made this afternoon by the Secretary of State when he mentioned that the Speaker of the house should be satisfied by being Speaker alone. Surely we have enough faith and confidence in our Speakers, men who are honoured with that high office on account of their great training, on account of their understanding and personal knowledge, to believe that they can look after at least the administration of the House of Commons and its services.

Again may I say I know the Secretary of State will realize that hon. members on this side of the house are sincere in their appeal, and we are confident we shall receive the hearing to which we are entitled and which we expect from such a person as he is.

Mr. E. C. ST-PERE (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, the bill introduced by the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) has many features deserving of most careful attention. In fact, after the recital delivered by the hon. member in explanation of this measure the bill leaves us somewhat in confusion as to the true reason for submitting to parliament such a drastic and revolutionary piece of legislation. First of all, centralization of translation services is not a matter which is being studied for the first time. It has been discussed in the past. As far back as 1909 the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons of Canada sent Mr. Achille Frechette to Belgium and Switzerland to inquire into and report upon the system of translation obtaining in those countries. At that time there was more or less a system of centralization for the translation of departmental and parliamentary reports and documents.

Let us see what this investigator had to say in regard to centralization. Quoting from page 7 of the official report of Mr. Frechette, dated at Paris, September, 1910, I find the following:

But now that the publications of the public service deal with so many activities unknown to the primitive country that we were then; now that all the human interests, more and more specialized, find their expression in the