

dent whether I may speak to such or such a translator to complain, to alter or to be more explicit about some part of my speech.

We, members of the House of Commons, are perfectly satisfied with the translation of our speeches. It reaches us within 24 hours after the text is published, and so far as members are concerned we have no complaint to make about the official translators of the house. If it happens, as the hon. member for Labelle stated, that some of them work less than others, let an investigation be held. Let the house, through its worthy Speaker, inquire whether there is room for improvement on the debates staffs and make changes if necessary.

Section 3 continues:

. . . and all bureaus, branches, commissions and agencies created or appointed by act of parliament or by order of the governor in council, in making and revising all translations from one language into another of all departmental and other reports, documents, debates, bills, acts, proceedings and correspondence.

Where is to be found in the bill, in the legal sense, an immediate and statutory obligation to translate these documents? Absolutely no such stipulation is inserted. It is a collaboration—just like the collaboration between members on your right, sir and those on your left.

An hon. minister has just stated that he had before him, I think, 15 reports which had been translated out of a total of 29. He assures us that in the future such will not be the case. This can apply just as much to former ministers as to the present ones, I wish to be quite frank in my arguments—however, were any reasons given why these documents were not translated in French? It is not simply a case of applying a remedy, the cause for such deficiency must be found, yet no one gives any explanation. Again I state if you wish to remedy present condition, obtain more efficiency and economy in this service, gentlemen, I fail to see how you will do it, with the goodwill which characterize each of you! For such and such a department you will require translators. Where will you seek them? By virtue of bill 4, clause 4:

may be transferred to the bureau as herein provided . . . the translators of the various departments.

You will then, take them in all departments, removing these translators from the various governmental departments so as to place them in this new bureau for translations, at the head of which there is to be a superintendent and supervisor. If you are not going to

dismiss them, you will have the same men, the same intellects, the same qualifications and you will have the same efficiency.

Another reason given is the better distribution of the work. But is not a translator familiar with the work of his department, better qualified to do that departmental work, where he has been stationed for 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 15 or 20 years, where he has specialized himself in all its branches and acquired a technical working knowledge? Is this translator not in a position, to-day, to prove himself more efficient? I say: certainly, yes. It is contended that there is no future in the department for this translator; well, if he is a competent man, he can study the various activities of the department, and his chance for promotion will come. You will be unable to get qualified translators, because they will be untrained for this special work, even though our students in technical schools, in the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, briefly, in High Schools are well tutored—

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Not in the University of Montreal!

Mr. MERCIER (Translation): As to the University of Montreal, I wish to praise it for the splendid work it carries on in developing our gifted youths; to it, we owe our own education. It is the university where I followed my law lectures.

If these translators are brought together and submitted to strict rules, like in a college, if they are concentrated in a large office, their efficiency will be decreased. If it is intended by this bill to replace them for the sake of economy, where will you find immediately qualified men for the various departments? If you are in earnest you will keep the same staffs; otherwise, how are you going to maintain this bureau of translators? It is impossible, incomprehensible. If it be otherwise, then you wish to retire or dismiss some of them. If they are dismissed, others will have to replace them. This will simply mean the dismissal of efficient translators to replace them by ordinary ones. One may sometimes find fault with translators, but a good translation is not an easy task. Give a text to translate to ten persons and no two translations will be alike, while if a qualified translator is given the same text, his will be the only good one.

"Responsibility": "a responsible minister." But the present ministers are all responsible. If the work of translation is not being carried out, especially since 1930, it must be because there is some deficiency somewhere, in the departments.