

chief must not be a book worm, because the latter are generally short sighted, and as they require powerful glasses to examine a small text, they lose sight of the general perspective.

A chief of translation who would assemble his whole staff, distribute the work fairly and with circumspection—one cannot take for granted that the minister who is responsible will intentionally choose an imbecile, that is what a number of ministers have done in many departments; however, we must take a chance.

The whole question is whether or not, for the reasons I have pointed out, speed and efficiency in the performance of the work, a bureau for translation would be desirable.

Let us step down to the level where the hon. member for Ottawa has placed himself. I understand his position and sympathize with him. I recall the time when our old mutual friend Belcourt, had a weekly fit of bile, because people in Ottawa were ever seeking positions and promotions. The hon. member is obliged to take that stand, that is part of his parliamentary duties.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): No.

Mr. BOURASSA (Translation): Yes.

The hon. member for Ottawa should not say no. He carries out his task diligently and conscientiously, which permits me to state that he is one of the most efficient members that Ottawa has ever had. I shall not say that he is either a great man or a tall man. A tall man, he would be the first to deny it. A great man, time will tell, fifty years hence. Let us leave to posterity the care of erecting the moral stature of all and each of us. But, as a matter of justice towards employees, does he think that it is common sense, do my French Canadian colleagues think it common sense that, in one department, Agriculture, seven translators, in the course of the year, translate each 568 pages; that in another department, Immigration, two translators translate each 46 pages, in a whole year; that in the Labour department, two translators translate each 548 pages; that in the Public Works department, three translators translate each 108 pages; that in the Trade and Commerce department, four translators translate each 1719 pages; that in the department of Mines, three translators, the same number—no, one less—translate each 148 pages.

As the present system works out, it is most unfair to translators. So long as this system is in force, there will always be a number of parasites and lazy persons who will live at the public's expense and at the sacrifice of a

colleague who does the work of two persons and—I place this consideration before you, my colleagues speaking the French language—live at the expense of the good name of our race.

The hon. Secretary of State stated that it was not his intention to dismiss any translator. So much the better, if he can find work for them all. However, on behalf of French Canadians, I request the Secretary of State that when he finds a lazy, good for nothing fellow or a drunkard, whether he is a French Canadian or not, let him put him out.

Some hon. MEMBERS (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. BOURASSA (Translation): There are too many good people, heads of families who are starving in our respective counties, so that we have no right of taking to task a minister whose intentions are of the best, in order to force him to keep lazy men, when, every day, poor people knock at our doors.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me?

Mr. BOURASSA (Translation): No. I do not wish to be personal however, the hon. member is aware that there are some.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): No, I am not.

Mr. BOURASSA (Translation): First, I shall put a restriction and objection to the hon. Secretary of State. He limits himself, by section 5, to the appointments made by the Civil Service Commission. As a general principle, that is right, I opposed the bill introduced, two or three years ago, by my good friend, the member for Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon), so as to return to the political patronage system. I have always had and still have the patronage system in horror; however, once again, the rule is not without an exception. Owing to the unique character of translation, the difficulty of securing competent translators in agricultural matters or in other technical subjects, I think that—this will be considered by the committee—the minister should not be restricted by the Civil Service Act, in the appointment of the superintendent or technical translators, because he could find persons more competent, who, owing to their age or other matters of detail, would not be eligible according to the Civil Service Act and who, nevertheless, would be much more qualified to fill such posts than young men who might have successfully passed the examination. It is quite right that the act should