

vice, it can be done in a far safer way than through the centralization of translating staffs. Let us provide for the appointment of bilingual officers in every department. Such efficiency, production and economy as might be secured under the latter plan are surely more apparent than in the indefinite cooperation provided for in sections 3 and 4 of the bill now before the house. If it is desired to ensure the simultaneous publication of the house records in both languages, would it not—the only way to achieve the end in view—be better to leave the translators in direct contact with the ministers and officials entrusted with the preparation of such documents, as is the case at the present time.

I am willing to admit that to a certain extent there is room for improvement in the present system, but the conditions could not be improved through the crowding of the translators into one department. For instance, the French edition of the Hansard is being issued two or three days late. Why? Because of the fact that the translators have to wait for the English text proofs from the Printing Bureau. Should the typewritten copy, as it is being prepared, be handed over to the translating staffs, the French edition of the Hansard could be made available practically at the same time as the English edition. The same could be done, if desired, in connection with all other publications. But such is not the object aimed at by the hon. Secretary of State in introducing this legislation. The object in view may be found in his explanatory notes of the bill:

It is believed that the organization and administration of the proposed bureau for translations will result in improved efficiency and a considerable saving of public funds.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the debates translators, as well as the other translators generally could discharge their duties in a more efficient manner than they do at the present time, and I fail to see how economy would result from the proposed bureau for translations.

Efficiency and economy can only be obtained through the competency of the translators, and whatever system is put in force, better results in every respect will be secured with qualified men and the cost of translation will be accordingly less.

On the other hand, there was no demand from anywhere for the proposed legislation. The majority of those who are more directly affected by the bill, are opposed to it. The French press in this country has declared itself against it. Most of the French speaking members in this house are also opposed to the measure. I even suspect that, at the

[Mr. Jean.]

start, our honourable friends from the province of Quebec who sit on the other side of the house, were not in favour of the proposed plan. Why such an insistence to have it carried out and how are we to account, Mr. Speaker, for that distorted construction which is being placed on the bill? Has the hon. Secretary of State stated at any time that the end he had in view when introducing the bill was to recognize the principle of an equality of status for both languages, and does the bill itself contain a single provision the intent or letter of which warrants such an inference? Not a single word in the whole bill justifies that construction being placed on it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the bill in its details as well of the unfairness it involves as far as the translators are concerned. The point has already been fully covered and it is needless for me to go over the same ground again. But I am of the opinion that the arguments put forward in support of the bill have not been proven and that the objections raised against it have not been refuted. Our friends on the other side of the house have taken us to task because we failed to offer to them any advice as to the position they should take. Should they be willing to take a friendly word of advice from their friends on this side of the house, I may say to them in concluding: Do not press this bill to the end, or it might prove a boomerang against yourselves.

Mr. L. E. PARENT (Terrebonne) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the discussion on this bill, I feel that I owe it to my electors of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, to state my views before I cast my vote on the motion now before the house. By this Bill No. 4, entitled An Act Respecting the Bureau for Translations, introduced by the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan), it is sought, on the ground of efficiency and economy, to place all the translators under one direction and systematic control. The bill, Mr. Speaker, has met with a great deal of opposition, especially in the French section of the press in the province of Quebec, and even, I may add, in some districts of the province of Ontario where groups of French Canadians are located. The Secretary of State said that the various statements of the French press as well as the opposition, in a general way, against the bill had taken the form of violent outbursts. The discussion was as to whether this bill was harmful to the French language in this country or if it restricted its rights.