

nearer to the truth than the hon. member for St. Mary's. This procedure would entail no delay and permit the house to give, perhaps, a more intelligent vote on this bill. Another important point, as the interested parties have not been heard, this committee would afford them an opportunity—which would be highly appreciated—of defending themselves against those who insult them and proving their gratitude to those who wish to do them justice.

According to the statement of the hon. member for Labelle, the stenographers of the House of Commons should be placed in the same class.

One must have very little knowledge of what takes place in the house to make such a statement. Both sides of the house are aware that to find a qualified French stenographer, the Civil Service Commission held a number of tests and that all of them, without exception proved a failure, owing to the difficulty of obtaining qualified men. I may even state that a number of official court stenographers, those who take down court evidence, have failed when put to the test, here. Disheartened, after a few days of trial, they were forced to return home and take up their work in the courts, where their remuneration is higher than that received at present, by the Hansard stenographers of the house. Yet, we heard an hon. member state in the house that the government is at liberty to dictate whatever terms they please to stenographers of the house. I state that if the Civil Service Commission, after a number of tests, were unable to find one qualified person, the government is not at liberty to dictate whatever terms they please to these officials.

Mr. BOUCHARD (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): Now, sir, may I somewhat discuss the question of the translators of the House of Commons, with whom I have the pleasure of being better acquainted than with the others. I had, personally, the opportunity on numerous occasions, since I am in parliament, to see them at their work, translating technical subjects which I had brought up in the house, such, for instances, electrifying our railways, occupational or trade disability, tuberculous cattle, the question of fruit and vegetable sprinkling, and the regulations which govern this trade abroad. All these subjects embody numerous formulas of industrial, organic and inorganic chemistry, etc., and I am able to state to the house that their work, in so difficult a field, which obliged them at times not only to show much patience, but also to

make researches devoid of any interest, was perfect, and I wish to bear witness of my appreciation.

Mr. BOUCHARD (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): May I, sir, in support of my contention, borrow one of the arguments of the hon. member for Labelle. This may seem somewhat paradoxical since he made use of it to prove quite the opposite. The argument of the hon. member for Labelle is as follows: He was obliged, at times, to pause two hours in searching for the exact term which would express his thought. I am willing to believe him, although I confess that it must have been an extraordinary thought, for, in the natural course of events,

Ce que l'on conçoit bien s'énonce clairement,  
Et les mots pour le dire arrivent aisément.

At all events, if it took him two hours to translate his thought, what merit must the translators of the house have when they must translate the thoughts of others, which is much more difficult! What merit must these men have? That is why I think that his argument may be retorted. If it be so deserving of praise to be a translator, why then criticize the translators, especially those of the House of Commons.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): When the thought is not there, it cannot be translated!

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): Perhaps, I admit.

I have been, sir, a general practitioner for thirty years—and when called upon between sessions, I still carry on—and I have had the opportunity of treating, among my clients, workers in various occupations; industrial workers, printers and hand labourers. In my career as a medical man, I observed that although they are all workers, there are, among them, people who are entitled, in all fairness, to higher salaries than those of their neighbour. To illustrate somewhat my argument, may I take, for instance, the printer who constantly comes in contact with antimony salts and who is compelled to retire at 45 years old; because his sight is defective. This man whose eyesight is affected at such an early age is entitled to a higher salary than the one who can earn a livelihood up to 60 or 70 years old. The same applies to polishers of copper and various metals. I now come, sir, to the brain worker who is obliged to accomplish his work at continuous high tension. It is unfair to wish to relegate him with his colleagues in offices so as to exact from him, during 12 months, mercenary work,