

year in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Three Rivers-St. Maurice (Mr. Bourgeois). This return shows that outside of the House of Commons and the Senate, fifty-eight translators were employed. With those employed in the House of Commons and the Senate we have, all told, ninety-one translators. But at the time of introducing this bill one more position had been abolished, that of chief translator of the Senate debates. So there are now only ninety. The return to which I have referred included many stenographers, clerks and interpreters, so in reality there are not ninety or ninety-one translators in the service. The return included even the name of a remission officer who is not actually a translator. To prove my point, I ask hon. members to refer to the estimates of last year and those of the current year. In both cases we find only seventy-three or seventy-four translators classified as such. Why should bilingual clerks or stenographers be included among the translators? Why include interpreters and other officers having a completely different classification? The reason is obvious. It is to show that these services are overmanned and although the axe of the guillotine has been operating to the extent of decapitating five thousand civil servants in the short time hon. friends opposite have been in office, it is still sharp enough to cut off a few more heads at the expense of the due and rightful representation which a minority should receive in the public service.

This bill is a direct attack against the privileges of this house. We should have independent control over all officials, officers and employees of the House of Commons. This bill provides further for the abolition of the position of chief of French journals. It does not say so in so many words, but the inference is obvious. Why this attack against the constitution which established the French and English languages as official? Proceedings in this house can be carried on either in the French or in the English language. Let us see what some of the accepted authorities have to say about the House of Commons. Giving his evidence before the select special committee on the civil service and the Civil Service Act on April 13, 1932, as reported on pages 465 and 466 of the evidence, Mr. Beauchesne quoted Mr. Bourinot, who he stated was one of the most distinguished clerks, as follows:

The control and management of the officers of the houses are as completely within the privileges of the houses as are necessary to the conservation of dignity and the efficient conduct of public business.

Mr. Beauchesne also quoted the late Sydney Fisher, whose opinion on this matter will be found in Hansard of June 29, 1928, as follows:

The House of Commons is not a department of government. There are no departments of the service in which the duties are similar to those in the House of Commons.

In placing certain officers and employees of this house under a responsible minister of the crown, the government is acting in direct contradiction to the opinions of the well known authorities quoted by Mr. Beauchesne.

The duty of the chief of English journals is to record the proceedings of this house. The position which this gentleman occupies is one of the utmost importance. He has charge of the drafting of the votes and proceedings and his work forms part of the regular routine of parliament. Therefore, he cannot be removed and placed under a minister of the crown. I submit that the same can be said of the chief of French journals, because the proceedings of the house can be carried on either in French or in English and the French journals hold the same important place in the regular routine of this house as do the English journals. Any attack or any measure tending to remove this official or to abolish the position of chief of French journals is a direct attack against the privileges and authority of this house as well as an attack against the principle of equality between the French and English languages as guaranteed by the constitution.

This change is said to have been inspired for reasons of economy and through a sincere desire to increase efficiency in the services concerned. In this connection I should like to refer to the Beatty report, dated February, 1930. I did not refer before to this report because I wanted to do so at this stage. This report makes no mention of centralization of the translation services as a means of improving this important branch of the public service. I do not doubt that a more competent body has never been called upon to report on matters pertaining to translation and its related subjects. After a careful and complete study of the situation in general and of every aspect of this complex problem, the Beatty commission did not recommend centralization and its report says nothing about it. I contend that had this plan appealed to these investigators as being proper, advantageous and practical, both as to efficiency and to economy, they certainly would have made a recommendation to that effect. One of the most striking recommendations contained in this report is to be found