

improve was even responsible for the founding of a society which endeavours to improve the technological vocabulary.

If this organization is destroyed, if the translations are placed in one large office where all will be required, at times, to translate any kind of translation, is it not to be feared that this desire to improve will be sapped at its very foundation?

As matters stand, the translator in the Mines branch may hope to master the vocabulary of that industry. This is not out of reach of an intelligent man, possessing a general and proper preparation. He is aware that once he has attained this goal, his work will become easier, and at the same time, much improved. If he is placed in a large office, will he be able, will he even attempt to acquire this ability? He will have to become specialized in all subjects: that is impossible, and he will not put his heart in a task which is above human attainment.

The final result will be the grouping of persons who will have a superficial knowledge but, on the whole, no thorough knowledge of any subject. We mentioned "final" because centralization, if it decreases the desire and means of improving, will not deprive the present specialists of their worth and we can foresee that their help will be continuously in demand. Why then drag them away from the surroundings where they are in the habit of working, where they are given all the means to improve, and further increase their worth.

The specialization of translators would, in a short time, disappear. It could hardly maintain itself until the retirement or disappearance of the present generation of specialized translators.

It is not necessary to be well informed to understand that a translator who is in the habit of translating in the Department of Agriculture, who has specialized on such subjects as, seeding, aviculture or various chemical fertilizers, cannot become an expert if he is transferred to the Mines branch or Engineering branch.

The hon. member for Labelle complained, the other day, that in translation bureaux a number of employees do not work continuously. He even stated to support his arguments, that such a translator had translated 149 pages in a year, while another, during the same period, had translated a thousand and a few pages, etc.

I wish to first state that the figures he quoted do not appear to me to be correct. I am anxious to see the report of the committee which is to inquire as to the practical application of this bill. I even feel convinced that certain figures were falsified, not by the hon. member for Labelle, because, to my mind he is a very conscientious man, but by those who supplied him with such figures. I find the proof in this fact: that the person who was able to translate 1,076 pages, in one year, is an employee of the Bureau of Statis-

tics, Department of Trade and Commerce. It is unfair to compare the work of a translator in the Bureau of Statistics with a translator of the Mines branch. The former is often called upon to translate but figures, and figures whether in English or French are similar. One need not be very clever to know that tariff items, from No. 1 to No. 1,200, are translated in English by 1 to 1,200, without even having to look up the dictionary. While the translator employed in the Mines branch must make use of technical terms; his work is far more complicated and difficult, often he has to make researches. Furthermore, I shall again avail myself of an argument of the hon. member for Labelle: Did he not state, himself, that when he translated his speeches, he, at times, pondered two hours on one term to find the corresponding word? How do we know that the translators of the various departments are not obliged to devote sometimes two hours per day, to translate the exact meaning of a text? What happens when it is a case of translating documents of a constitutional order, constitutional law or international law? The translator must make researches, pore, hour after hour, over dictionaries so as to find out the thought of the author before translating it. And we expect that the translator, who is obliged to carry out long and careful researches to translate the thought of an author from the text which he is given, will translate the same number of pages as the one who has but figures to translate? That would be unfair.

I think that if we centralize translation, translation will suffer by it, because we smother individual effort. Although that is not the object of the hon. Secretary of State, since he denies that he intends to interfere with the translation of documents; we cannot, however, simply take the word of the hon. Secretary of State on this matter. If his statement was embodied in bill No. 4; if the interpretation given by the hon. member for Labelle was inserted in the bill, I would feel less skeptic and probably support the measure. If, to-day, in the house, the hon. Secretary of State, openly gave me his assurance that he would take special care not to smother the individual effort, to have all required documents translated, I would, to some extent, show myself more amenable to his views.

Another consideration. I may be mistaken, but, it was stated, that this bill No. 4 would help to improve translation. It is an instrument, a tool, states the Secretary of State. I cannot see clearly the necessity for such a tool at present. The decentralization sys-