

languages in the public service, the government will want I am sure, every time there will be an opportunity to change those methods, to consult the House again but perhaps not, and certainly not each time, through the passing of an amendment to an existing legislation, which would be a loss of time.

The Leader of the Opposition—

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

**Mr. Pelletier (Hochelaga):** Of course.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I ask the minister whether he is giving an assurance that the government will bring a resolution before the House each time before there is any change made in its guidelines.

**Mr. Pelletier (Hochelaga):** I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I can give this assurance if what the hon. member has in mind is any change in the principles that are submitted to the House in this resolution.

[*Translation*]

I would also emphasize that the Leader of the Official Opposition was generous enough—and I commend him for it—to say that even if his amendment were not passed he would vote for the main resolution and I think that in this debate he contributed to creating a climate that, as far as I am concerned, I would not disrupt.

If I had time, I would tease him on the way he introduced monarchy into the bilingualism issue, but it would be only to tease him. However, he said in his speech—realizing that it was difficult to accept a relation between the two—that there were people who had compared the erosion—whatever that is—of anarchic institutions with bilingualism. I think on the contrary that in a certain “integrism” that he knows as well as I do, people tend to see in bilingualism an attack against monarchy. In fact, for those people almost everything is an attack against monarchy. I admit that I expected that kind of comment from the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), but not from the Leader of the Official Opposition himself.

To come back to serious things, the Leader of the Official Opposition expressed criticism. He said at the outset:

[*English*]

Let's discuss this frankly and openly.

[*Translation*]

I would have liked him to add another adverb and to put it into practice: the adverb “specifically”. I find that his numerous objections directed against the government do not constitute a well-founded criticism or at least not the substantial criticism I was expecting. I think that the Leader of the Opposition merely pointed out minor details and I could not help thinking that it is really very hard for the Leader of the Opposition or for the leader of any opposition party in this House, to make a realistic criticism. Because, after all, who criticizes the action of the government in this area? People who never had to face the extremely complex problems created by the balance of the official languages in the Civil Service, problems that are so complex that they would discourage any gov-

### *Official Languages*

ernment without optimism or deep faith in this country of ours, problems the difficulty of which one can hardly imagine before tackling them. And if I credit the opposition leader for waiting to deal with these problems, it is because he recognized himself last night that in the past positions he held, time had not yet come—I have to admit it considering the province where he was premier—to make this revolution and he never had the opportunity to undertake it. I would almost wish that he could one day take office, if no other inconveniences were related to that, so that he could finally realize how difficult efforts are in this very complex field.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to comment briefly on one of the remarks of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), a remark that he had already made in this House, at the beginning of this session, which, at that time, had shocked me and which shocked me once again last night. When I say “shocked”, I mean “distressed”, not “offended”.

The hon. member for York South said yesterday, and I quote:

I regret that this resolution has been brought before the House, not for some of the reasons I have heard but for another and perhaps deeper reason. I have learned that in life, particularly in collective life, there are matters with respect to which repeated argument produces confrontation and repeated confrontation polutes rather than clears the air.

The hon. member for York South had already adopted that attitude with respect to a speech by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and again, with respect to a speech by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) on the same subject as the one we are discussing this afternoon. This attitude, coming from a man like the hon. member for York South, had confounded me, all the more that he is ready, as are all the other members of his party, to discuss the most delicate problems in this House. He is willing at any time to discuss the death penalty, the status of women, abortion, the situation of our native peoples. Those are issues which are, as the hon. member for York South puts it, most controversial.

Why does he feel sorry only when it comes to the language problem? Would the language question in Canada be of an obscene, shameful or pornographic nature that would forbid us to discuss it or is it to be considered as so extraordinary or explosive that it should be ignored? Mr. Speaker, I think it has been ignored for too long, and I am surprised to see this kind of resistance from a man like the hon. member for York South who, as I said a while ago, does not lack daring.

The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Harney) just spoke, with a smile, about certain contradictions that might exist in our party. I think I could amuse myself in calling attention to a contradiction between him and his own leader.

Indeed, when a few months ago the member for York South had just said what more or less I have just reported, but in another context, the member for Scarborough West contradicted him in a television program. He had said that a speech by the Minister of Transport was “an emotional speech”. And he said, and I quote: