

on page 16. It is that a higher rate of salaries should be provided in order to ensure greater efficiency. Therefore, the closer you get to efficiency the further you are from her twin sister, economy. The hon. minister would have us believe that they are like the Siamese twins, but I am afraid that when the real test comes they will be due for a rude separation.

The minister speaks of economy, of efficiency, of improving the lot of these translators and so on; in fact, he says anything and everything. There is nothing but contradiction in the different assertions of the minister, both in his explanatory notes to the bill and in his statements made in and outside the house. How in the world is it possible to have greater efficiency with a reduced staff? How can we realize any economy by increasing the work? Taking the hon. gentleman at his word, how can he increase the number of translators and reduce it at the same time? How can he save by spending more? I am asking hon. members whom they will believe. Will they believe the minister when he says that a greater number of translators may be appointed later on, or believe the minister when he says that there is no need for any more translators if the work is properly divided amongst those now in the public service? Will they believe the minister when he says that translators will be placed on a higher plane, or believe the minister who says that the bill will result in a considerable saving which cannot of course be realized otherwise than by a downward revision of salaries or a drastic reduction of personnel?

Economy and efficiency are just empty words, meaning nothing. They are no indication of the real reason behind this bill. "Ce bloc enfarine ne me dit rien qui vaille." I am giving my hon. friends this timely warning lest it be too late to repent. Study this bill; compare the notes, the statements and the contradictory claims of the Secretary of State, and tell me sincerely if one can depend on such flimsy promises, vague assurances and problematical results. No, no; for my part I will not be a dupe to such a bargain.

This afternoon the Secretary of State assured this house that the translators of the various departments would be left in those departments though coming under the new centralized bureau. I will ask the hon. gentleman one question. He knows that according to the Civil Service Act the translators in all departments can be promoted to higher positions and can even be appointed deputy

Mr. St-Père.]

ministers. Will my hon. friend tell me whether the transference of translators to this new bureau will deprive them of such promotion?

Mr. CAHAN: I am not answering questions now. When the bill is in committee of the whole house I will answer questions, but I say this, that under this bill the translators will be under the Civil Service Act and there will be open to them the highest positions possible in the service.

Mr. ST-PERE: But not in the departments to which they formerly belonged. I would be the last to deprive any English speaking citizen of this country of rights he is entitled to in the civil service, but at the same time, as one representing the minority in Canada, I will be the last one to accept anything that will deprive any French Canadian of promotions and rights he is entitled to in the public service of Canada.

Mr. CAHAN: There is no position in the public service to which he will be deprived of promotion under this regime.

Mr. ST-PERE: He will belong to a new bureau; he will be taken away from his old position.

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. gentleman is making a speech without even having instructed himself as to the contents of the bill.

Mr. ST-PERE: The hon. member for St. Denis (Mr. Denis) inquired of the Secretary of State as to the day on which the investigation mentioned by him on January 29 had taken place, and by whom, and the hon. member received the following answer, which is not an answer at all but only an evasion of the question. The Secretary of State said:

The said committee, in March, 1933, reported to the treasury board on the matters submitted to it, including a report upon "Translations."

The Secretary of State, at the request of the Prime Minister, also interviewed Mr. Beauchesne, Clerk of the House of Commons, and Mr. C. H. Bland, of the Civil Service Commission, and certain statements were prepared by them, which they probably deemed confidential, for the information of the government.

The Secretary of State is very careful to say that these gentlemen made certain statements which they deemed confidential, and he refuses this house a positive answer with regard to those statements made to his department. Are we not entitled to receive real answers to questions we ask on different matters? Once more we realize that this government does not want the House of Commons to be clearly informed about what