

of indiscretion, correspondence and confidential documents would continue to be well translated.

Moreover, in the report of the committee making the inquiry, under the chairmanship of Mr. Sellar, one may find in section 21, the following comments and findings:

The committee has received no complaints concerning the quality of the matter translated. They found that decentralization is general in all departments. This system was adopted following the investigation made on this question, in 1910, after the report of Mr. Achille Frechette, who, on an order of Internal Economy Committee of the House of Commons, visited Belgium and Switzerland to observe the systems in those countries. According to the information furnished to the committee, the departments are, in general, in favour of maintaining the statu quo.

I need not state, sir, that it is unnecessary to insist on the importance of such findings. If the present system is not perfect, if it requires timely improvements, there seems to be only one conclusion which we can arrive at from the impartial findings of the committee: the condemnation, without appeal, of the desire for centralization. Two persons were also consulted with reference to this bill No. 4, Mr. Bland and Mr. Beauchesne, however, their suggestions are considered as confidential. I wonder whether it is owing to such suggestions that the hon. Secretary of State thought fit to propose the centralization of translation?

I can almost assert, without gainsay, that Bill No. 4 did not take birth in the brains of the hon. Secretary of State. I think there exist hidden instigators who are the authors of this act. It is, to say the least, most untimely. It strikes me that the house at present has enough serious and important questions to settle without having to raise a discussion on such a controversial subject as that of translation. I am willing to believe that the hon. Secretary of State, who has accepted the sponsorship of this bill, is well intentioned. He has perhaps in mind the efficiency of translation and economy of public moneys. However, I am bound to state, from a farmer's viewpoint, that this gilded piece of legislation tells me nothing. I rather feel perplexed. I have my doubts as to the efficiency of the measure we are asked to approve. To prove this, I shall examine the two reasons invoked to induce us to support bill No. 4.

The hon. Secretary of State contends in his explanatory notes:

It is desirable in the interest of efficiency and economy that it should now be organized and the work of translating so distributed that no translator shall be idle or overworked, underpaid or overpaid.

[Mr. Dubois.]

This viewpoint was discussed with wit and pertinently by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier). The economic question was also discussed in a masterly way by my hon. friend. I regret that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) thought fit to express entirely opposite views from those held by the hon. member for Ottawa. The hon. member for Labelle is better qualified than I am to speak in this house. I have nothing to teach him. However, I represent the county of Nicolet while he represents the county of Labelle. Notwithstanding all the esteem and regard I have for him, I deem it my duty to openly and clearly express my views on this legislation. I regret to disagree with him; I more so regret it because he was one of those who exerted the strongest influence over my youthful ideas and fired my enthusiasm of twenty years ago. I thought I could as a young member look to him as a guide for future years; however, there is too much incoherence in his way of looking at this bill to induce me to place any trust in the statements he made the other day here in the house, and to accept his principles. I hope he will not bear me any grudge. He is broadminded and his heart is in the right place. He will forgive me for having my elbow room with him. The hon. member for Labelle endorsed what he considered the efficiency of bill No. 4.

May I, sir, submit to the consideration of the house an excerpt which an eminent journalist wrote recently:

Translating is not commonplace, a task; or an easy one to perform. To succeed one must have a sufficient knowledge of one language to be certain of the sense and the exact meaning of the text; one must also have a sufficient knowledge of another language to be certain of transcribing in a clear and precise way, with new expressions, this sense clearly unravelled. All those who have tried their hand recognize that it is a difficult task, even if it be an ordinary text which deals with current events. One may perfectly understand in reading, the sense of a document without being able to translate it properly in one's own language.

When it is a question of a technical subject, the problem, often, becomes extremely difficult. An entirely new vocabulary must be acquired and infinite details must be verified. With the decentralization system, which assigns a few translators to such and such a department, you have there individuals who have a particular interest in studying the vocabulary of their speciality. Bye and bye, that goes without saying, they will be in a position to perform their task in a shorter time and with less difficulty. It becomes a real hobby among a number of them. They collect dictionaries and technical reviews and when they make some discovery, it is classified on cards. It is an acquired wealth which will become useful in the future. This desire of always wanting to