

(Mr. Chevrier) this afternoon, however, the Secretary of State did not discuss the subject from the same angle as did the hon. member for Labelle. As for the two reasons advanced by the minister when he first introduced the bill, the reasons of efficiency and of economy, I do not think that the members of parliament can find fault with it. Everyone wants efficiency, not only in the matter of translation but in every department of government; and while undoubtedly there are times when it is rather dangerous to go too far in the direction of economy, I do not think that on that score it can be complained that we shall not obtain greater efficiency.

If my recollection is correct, when the bill was originally introduced, the Secretary of State tried to build up his case for the centralization of the translation services on the fact that his own department had found it impossible to have a translation of the speech from the throne. Well, I know enough about the administrative powers of the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) to feel assured that if the Secretary of State had brought to his attention the fact that there was any difficulty about obtaining any translation in his department because of an insufficiency of money for the purpose, the Prime Minister would have seen to it that an adequate number of translators were provided for the purpose; because after all the Prime Minister would never sacrifice efficiency to economy.

On the question of the centralization of translators, a good deal can be said both for and against it. Personally, as a layman not very well versed in civil service matters, I think I could point out several departments that could be brought under a centralization scheme. But, as was pointed out this afternoon by the senior member for Ottawa, in the work of translating reports and so forth there are a certain number of experts, technicians, in the various departments, men who have spent long years of training to equip themselves for a particular type of translation. The question might be asked, for instance, as to what the Secretary of State would do with regard to centralizing chemistry. We know that throughout the activities of the government there are several departments in which chemistry plays an important part; we find this in the mint, in the mines branch, in the Department of National Revenue and in several other departments in each of which there are chemists working on the same kind of formula and each has had special training for that particular work. I know the Minister of Agriculture would certainly criticize anyone who would dare to transfer to the National

[Mr. Bradette.]

Research Council the chemists under his own supervision.

While it can be easily proved that certain departments could be centralized, it could also be easily proved that so far as ability and efficiency are concerned, there are certain other government departments which it would be impossible to centralize. What I have said in regard to chemists could apply as forcibly to other specialized type of employees. I have in my hand a memorandum by the Civil Service Commission under date of April 15, 1924, reading as follows:

Most departments have a small but expensive translating staff, not only to handle French correspondence, but also departmental publications and general translations. . . . A central unit would handle translation other than departmental correspondence. . . .

Under proper organization there would be a saving, not only by the elimination of positions which would naturally become surplus on amalgamation, but also by reduction in the classification of others, for example, eleven head translators would scarcely be required in the new branch.

From reading that part of their report one can readily see that it is not in conformity with the statement made by the Secretary of State this afternoon. Speaking of centralization he presented a picture that, if I understood him correctly, would lead one to believe that while this is called centralization, it is really decentralization because he will maintain as an entity the translating staffs of the House of Commons and of the Senate and in addition a certain amount of liberty in all the departments. He almost implied that in all the other departments they would maintain practically the same staffs. The only difference I can see is that over and above all the translators there will be a deputy minister or a man having the qualifications necessary to be at the head of the branch who will have complete control of all the translating. That is the inference I drew from the speech of the Secretary of State. If my inference is correct, we are not going to have centralization. It means simply that the Secretary of State now recognizes that centralization of translation is impossible of application.

This afternoon the hon. member for Labelle spoke of the superman, the man under whom we could centralize all the different translators and under whom the translating work would be perfect. He made allusion to certain words: he mentioned, for instance, the fact that "the Speaker of the house" is always wrongly translated in the French language. He should not be called "speaker" because as a member of parliament he never