

be adhered to, but under the control of a superintendent not connected with the other departments; but nevertheless, responsible to the minister.

Let us now pass to the question of parliamentary debates. The hon. Secretary of State gave us to understand, to-day, that there will be some change made to the bill, in order that this new department may be divided into branches. I think he is right.

I may even add that such are my views expressed more than once, in an intimate way, to a few persons who may have had some hand in the draughting of this act. I think that owing to the considerable difference between the work of the translators of the house and that of the translators of the various departments—always under one sole supervisor—it is quite proper that there should be two branches.

I repeat it, there is no constitutional question to be raised, on the second reading of the bill. One could prolong the debate on this question. Parliament, under the rule of Alexander Mackenzie, and having as sponsors Edward Blake, Mr. Fournier, later on a judge of the supreme court, Laurier, who was to be the future leader of the Liberal party, enacted two of the most beneficial measures that have ever been adopted in Canada: the act relieving the house of its jurisdiction over the mandates of its members, one of the fundamental principles of the liberty of the Commons; the other relieving the house of the daily and efficient control of the disposal of funds which it votes, by creating the Auditor General's office which our translators designate as "auditeur général"—a man who is listening, that is the translation given to designate the Auditor General's office. We have at present an auditor general's office over which parliament has no authority; and parliament, indirectly, has to bear up with this control over the funds we vote. This was found necessary for reasons of a political order. I need not go into details, the reason for such legislation may be found in the debates of that period; and I think that no Liberal can feel ashamed of these two acts, draughted by the most respected and eminent men of their party. I do not think that the Liberal party in Canada has ever produced two more eminent men than Edward Blake and Laurier.

Therefore, the question of parliamentary control does not strike me as being very important. However, I think that the two branches should be separate. Does this mean that about fifteen employees who work four months each year should, with the conditions

[Mr. Bourassa.]

that prevail at present in this country, remain inactive during eight months or earn some money elsewhere? We are paying them from \$3,000 to \$4,000 per year in round figures, to only work four months, or let us say five or six months. I ask the hon. member for Ottawa, but in particular the hon. members for the city of Montreal: When this measure is explained to their constituents, what figure will they cut? When their constituents are starving, fathers have no bread to give to their family, will they boast of having voted in the house to allow fifteen gentlemen, some of them bachelors, to earn \$4,000, in five or six months, so that they may rest seven months? They will soon find out what French Canadians think of this so-called claim of race rights. This also applies to the house stenographers. Here are employees that I have known for thirty years, and I have always considered a number of them as intimate friends. However, my duty to my country and social justice takes precedence over my friends; I therefore state that it is unprincipled at the present time, when we cut off 10 per cent of the salaries of all public employees, fathers of families who earn \$1,000 per year, working the year around, and having to sacrifice \$100; I say it is unprincipled not to make about thirty employees, whether stenographers or translators, work two or three months more, when commissions are sitting such as the ones investigating bank affairs, tariff or others which are not connected with parliament, but which, however, were appointed by parliament. Will hon. members contend that it is divesting ourselves of our privileges to force these gentlemen to work or must we allow them to loaf as we do? There are enough of us!

My dear friends—pardon my familiarity—a few weeks ago I told you: Feel the public's pulse. It is not a question of coming here and contending that to be in the good grace of our friends we must comply with the "Droit" or "Devoir," so as to draw their praise or avoid their abuse. I have been aware of this fact for forty years. We hold a mandate from all classes of people; I therefore, contend that we should, first preoccupy ourselves with the common welfare, especially that of the average.

I do not wish to prolong the debate, you will allow me, sir, to apply the five or ten minutes which remain of my time to discuss the question of the rights of the French language. The hon. member for Ottawa spoke with much skill and wit, as to the value of this bill in guaranteeing the rights of the