

decried the campaign that has been going on for the last two months in the French speaking section of the press of this country, he should not be surprised because the question is: Why was the translation service singled out from all the other recommendations that were made a few years ago? There is also the fact that when the deputy ministers were asked to give their views in regard to centralization of the translation staffs in their various departments, they unanimously declared that the system in vogue was giving satisfaction to all persons concerned. I agree with the hon. member for Labelle that if the present bill will assure us better translation service, certainly we would all be in favour of it, but the Secretary of State this afternoon mentioned the fact of delays of months in the printing bureau. Will he place the blame wholly on the translation staffs of the different departments? He was not very clear when he made that statement. Nevertheless the impression was given in the house that the blame should be placed entirely on the translators in the different departments. I do not believe the condition is so bad as has been stated, and surely the translators should not be expected to take all the blame.

Then there is the matter of more efficient service; as I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, everyone wants efficiency. This afternoon the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) made some reference to the wonderful improvement that had been made in the Department of Trade and Commerce. That is absolutely true. Some documents which were not printed simultaneously in both languages a few years ago are printed in that way now. I remember that last year I directed the attention of the House of Commons to the fact that a certain document dealing with statistics was being issued in the English language only, and a few days later we had that document translated into French. Surely the same improvement could be made in all the departments of the government. I know enough of the present Prime Minister, the Secretary of State and the government in general to be sure that they will never sacrifice efficiency for the sake of economy.

I hope the Secretary of State realizes that the criticism expressed this afternoon was not directed at him personally. We all know his personality and his true Canadianism; we all know that he always has been fairminded and just. The criticism was directed to the bill which he brought into the house, and the criticism was to the effect that he has been ill advised. We think this bill is illtimed; that it did not originate with the Secretary

[Mr. Bradette.]

of State but with some of his advisers, for some unknown reasons. Last fall I was fortunate enough to assist at a banquet given by the university of Ottawa at which the Prime Minister made a wonderful address. At that time he demonstrated his knowledge of the different elements which make up the population of this country, and their aspirations; and at the conclusion of his remarks he received great, spontaneous applause. That is why we do not direct our criticism against the Secretary of State personally; we know he wants to be fair to every section of the population.

With regard to the question of economy, I could enlarge on that subject at great length, but I believe it has been shown that no real economy will be brought about by this measure. According to the minister the present staff will be retained, at least, and presumably there will be some superior officers appointed. If the idea of centralization is carried out to the full, it will mean that the present translators in the different departments will have to be housed in one large office, and a staff will have to be engaged. I ask hon. gentlemen to visualize the number of messengers who will have to be employed if this central office is to keep in hourly contact with every department of the government. I should think a staff of at least sixty messengers would be required for that purpose, so I do not see where this measure will bring about any economy.

This afternoon the hon. member for Labelle made out a wonderful case against the translators and reporters of the Senate and House of Commons. I know something about stenography, and I can tell you that those people earn every cent they get for their work in this house. It is always possible to single out certain people in the civil service and say that they earn \$4,000 per year while other men are out of employment at the present time; that is what the hon. member for Labelle did. Surely it is not to the credit of the hon. member for Labelle to reflect on the civil servants employed in this house in order to build up a case; as I say, I know something about stenography and something about the work the reporters are called upon to perform, and they earn every cent they get. The same statement applies just as forcibly to the translators. They do not work in shifts; they work very long hours, but they are just as loyal as are any other civil servants. The senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) demonstrated this afternoon that these translators cannot work in shifts; you will not have efficient service if you try to