

requested that an inquiry be made into the translation service, and Mr. Achille Fréchette was sent abroad to Switzerland and Belgium to make an examination of the translation systems which prevailed in those countries. Mr. Fréchette was formerly chief of the translation branch of the House of Commons. He made his report in September, 1910, twenty-four years ago, setting forth the results of his official inquiry regarding the translation of debates, sessional papers and laws of parliament of Belgium and Switzerland, where the dual language system prevails. To that report several members of this house have made reference during this discussion, though they do not appear to have read it with sufficient care to have understood its real import.

In Belgium Mr. Fréchette then found that a stenographic report of the debates of their parliament is published in extenso under the name of *Annales Parlementaires* but only in the language in which the respective addresses are made, and in certain cases a synoptic report or resumé of the addresses is prepared for publication. The translator prepares the resumé only for distribution to the daily press, and he is the only translator belonging to the House of Representatives in that country. In Switzerland stenographic reports are made only of debates concerning federal laws and federal decrees which correspond to our orders in council. These speeches are published at the close of each session in the language in which they are made respectively in the bulletin *stenographique*, which comprises about 600 pages. As to the rest of the translating, at the close of each speech in parliament the translator sums up the conclusions of the speaker in German if the speech is made in French and in French if the speech is made in German. This is the only translator belonging to the house.

In Belgium there are fourteen other translators distributed among several departments for special work in those departments. The system which prevails in these two countries is so different from ours that Mr. Fréchette's report provided very meagre assistance in solving our problem. Our translation work is at least ten times that of either Belgium or Switzerland. As I understand it, the purport of the conclusion of Mr. Fréchette's report is that most of the work devolving upon the translators' branch of the House of Commons should be removed from that branch on the ground that the number employed constituted an abuse which should be remedied—the term used by Mr. Fréchette is "abuse"—but that the translation of the votes

[Mr. Cahan.]

and proceedings might well be retained for the House of Commons branch. Mr. Fréchette's report was not acted upon and the centralization of which he then complained in the House of Commons branch still continues. In my humble opinion this requires redress and reform, at least to the extent of which Mr. Fréchette complained. I think the conclusions of the Fréchette report may well be considered by the select special committee to which I trust this bill will be referred. The centralization of the work of translating departmental and other reports, which was then centralized in the appointees of the House of Commons, still continues and the abuses of which Mr. Fréchette complained have never yet been remedied. It was the intention of the government to submit a remedy in this bill now before the house for its second reading.

Reference has been made in this debate to the report of a select committee on the civil service which was appointed by the Senate in 1924. That special committee was set up on the motion of the leader of the Liberal government in the Senate, Senator Dandurand, and consisted of the Honourable Senators Béique, who acted as chairman, Belcourt, Bennett, Black, Bradbury, Calder, Dandurand, Sir George Foster, Hardy, L'Esperance, McCoig, Pardee, Robertson, Ross (Moose Jaw), Ross (Middleton), Turgeon, Watson and White. The appointment of the committee was authorized by a resolution which appears on page 12 of the journals of the Senate for 1924. At page 149 appears the circular letter addressed by Senator Béique on behalf of the committee to the various deputy ministers. Reference to translating is made on page 151, while the final report appears at page 494, et seq of the journals. In the report, as separately printed, the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission appears in appendix 2, page 21. I direct the attention of hon. members who are interested in this matter to this report and I have no doubt that it will receive the careful consideration of the select committee of this house to which I trust this bill will be referred. The report of the committee of the Senate had no results and, in my opinion, matters have gone on from bad to worse.

In connection with another issue which has been raised in this debate, may I say that the only work of translating required by section 133 of the British North America Act, 1867, is, first, for the use of both the English and French languages in the respective records and journals of the Senate and of the House of Commons, and, second, for the printing and publishing of the acts of parliament in