

That means in English: We have in the government three new millionaires since the declaration of the war. But how is that sentence in the French text translated in the English version of *Hansard*? It is translated this way:

We have here in the cabinet three new millionaires who have made their money since the war's outbreak.

That is not the same thing at all; it is entirely different.

I have listened to some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, especially the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Leduc), who said: I do not accept the withdrawal of the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not for him to decide whether the withdrawal is sufficient or not. No one but yourself, Mr. Speaker, can decide whether the withdrawal of the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains is sufficient to comply with the rules of the house. You, sir, are the only one in this house who may accept his withdrawal or not accept it.

I remember distinctly when I was sitting to the left of Mr. Speaker in the glorious times when Mr. Bennett was Prime Minister, I often had occasion to speak of Mr. Bennett, and in an innocent way sometimes I would say of him that he had a "million" air. Once I spoke in the house on very different lines. I was addressing Mr. Speaker and saying that we were all poor, that I was poor, that my desk-mate, who has since died, was a poor man, that another hon. gentleman who was sitting in front of me and who is now in the senate was a poor man. The gentleman who is now a senator did not object to my saying that, but my deskmate said I should not have said it, that it is embarrassing sometimes to say that we are poor. Of course it is an embarrassment, but it is not a shame to be poor. But to say that a man is a millionaire or that he looks like a millionaire—is that such a terrible accusation? Many a time we will greet our friends and say: "You have a million-dollar smile." Is there any insult in that? The thing must be taken broadly.

I think that when a man with the pride which we know the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains has withdraws in the terms in which he did, withdraws all that was offensive to any member of the house sitting on the treasury benches, he has done his utmost. What is there left to withdraw? There is nothing offensive left if he means what he said.

Further, the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains has said that he had in mind the dollar-a-year men, and according to the rules

[Mr. Pouliot.]

of the house we must accept his statement. He said he had in mind those men who are giving their time to the government for a dollar a year and who are a part of the government. They are not members of the house. They are employees of the government and a part of the government. So much is that the case that when the clerks and stenographers of grades 1 and 2 who are assigned to their offices are asked where they work, they say: I am working for the government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit very respectfully to you that what the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains has said in his withdrawal covers the case completely, and there is nothing left for the house to deal with, according to the rules that bind us all. I trust that you will consider what I have said, and I rely as usual on your wisdom to decide whether or not the withdrawal of the hon. member is sufficient according to the rules of the house.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege and to stop all this discussion, I withdraw unconditionally at the request of the Prime Minister the following words as reported in the French *Hansard*:

Nous avons dans le Gouvernement trois nouveaux millionnaires depuis la déclaration de la guerre. Nous les dénoncerons en temps et lieu. Les fortunes s'édifient.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I preface my remarks on this question by saying that I do not suppose there are two members of the House of Commons whose views are so diametrically opposite on most of the problems which confront us than those of the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains and myself. But I was in the house when the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains made his speech, and while I was able to follow it only imperfectly, I have given some consideration to it since. I would say as emphatically as I can that, particularly in a period of war, loose statements must not be made with reference to public men, public institutions or public services generally. I want to make my position perfectly clear in that respect. Whatever justification—and little justification can I see—there may be for such proceedings in time of peace, we now require the maximum of unity if we are to survive or if our institutions which are under attack are to be maintained. I was shocked at the statement which was made by the hon. member. I hope no other hon. members will follow his example. I trust that there will be no repetition of things of this kind. Reflections upon the government, upon parliament, upon public