

in the whole bill which protects the principle of promotion as it applies to these men who are to-day translators in various departments of the government. When they are taken out of the respective departments in which they are at present employed and are placed in the central bureau, they become subject to the jurisdiction of the minister who will be in charge of the bureau, probably the Secretary of State, and when they come into the bureau they come under the Civil Service Act. They are eligible for promotion under the Civil Service Act but only in so far as that promotion pertains to the central bureau for translation, and not otherwise. On the other hand, if these translators are left in their respective departments, the French translator, for instance, in the Post Office Department is eligible for promotion to any branch within that department; but once he is placed in the central bureau he is eligible for promotion only to such positions as fall within the jurisdiction of the bureau, and they are mighty few. So far then as promotion is concerned there is absolutely nothing in this bill that gives to the translators placed in the central bureau any chance—in fact, it takes away the great opportunity which they have to-day—for promotion in the department from which they are being transferred.

There are two other points, Mr. Speaker, which I should like to make. I am convinced from the experience I have had in the past twenty-five or thirty years with the system of translation we have in this country that the Secretary of State, no matter how sincere he may be in his advocacy of this bill, and I give him credit for being sincere, has been ill advised in placing this measure before the house in the form in which we now have it. If he would bring in a bill looking towards specialization to a greater degree than it exists to-day in the translation services I would be wholeheartedly in favour of it, but I cannot see from the experience that I myself have had that efficiency will be attained in translation by adopting the principle laid down in this bill. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should not only oppose the bill in committee on particular sections of which I have made a study, but oppose the principle of the bill as it is now before the house.

The Secretary of State has also told us that one of the main reasons why French publications have not been issued as rapidly as they should have been was the fact that French translations could not be made in

time to allow the publications to come out any earlier. In making that statement he left the inference that the fault lay entirely with the translator. But let me point out, and this is a fact which I think cannot be gainsaid, that the delay in translation is not caused by the fact that the French translators do not do the work early enough, but in the majority of cases it is caused by the fact that the English matter is not handed over to the French translators in time. You will find, for instance, a report of perhaps four or five hundred pages being prepared as English matter, and the whole preparation of that report must be completed in English before a French translator can lay his finger upon a single page of it. As progress is made in the preparation of an English report; as a chapter or so or a certain portion of it is completed, say fifteen, twenty or thirty pages, why should not that portion be handed over immediately to the French translator? He would be able to keep up with the English preparation and when that preparation is ready for the press, the French translation would be completed within a very few days. The Secretary of State should direct his attention to this phase of the matter in order to bring about a more speedy issuing of these different reports and parliamentary papers.

As I said at the opening of my remarks, I could not allow this bill to go through without expressing my opinion. I appeal to the Secretary of State to consider carefully, before this bill gets too far, whether some amendment cannot be made along the lines of specialization instead of centralization, as is the present intention of the bill. I desire to say that I have the warmest feeling for the Secretary of State; I am not attempting to criticize him personally, but I think I have the right to criticize the method adopted to reach the object he has in view. I believe he is sincere in trying to effect an amelioration of existing conditions in his department in the system of translation as carried on to-day. So far as I am concerned, I do not think any question of race or nationality should be raised in this matter. I need no guarantee that this thought is not entertained in the mind of the hon. gentleman who introduced this bill, as I know what stand the Secretary of State has taken in the past in matters religious and national. I have every confidence in his feeling of fair play along these lines, but I do criticize the method he has adopted to bring about the changes which he thinks are necessary in the operation of his department.