

adopt that method of procedure. So I believe I have shown that under the present bill there will be no economies brought about, and I am sincere in my statement, because I believe in the sincerity of every hon. member of this house. It would never enter my mind to cast any reflection on the sincerity of any hon. gentleman, no matter in what corner of the house he has his seat.

It may be said that it is impossible for the Secretary of State to withdraw this bill gracefully, but if a faux pas has been committed surely a way can be found to withdraw without dishonour. I have in mind a condition which existed for many years in the province of Ontario; I refer to a certain rule that was put on the statutes of Ontario in 1912 by the then Minister of Education. In all sincerity the French speaking minority in Ontario thought they were being done an injustice; we felt that we were being treated like the poor relation in the household. Through our press and our representatives in the Ontario legislature we created a feeling in Ontario which ultimately resulted in the withdrawal of the rule. We were not violent in our campaign, but we knew we had justice on our side. In 1927, fifteen years later, the gentleman who in 1912 had been Minister of Education was premier of the province of Ontario. I did not always agree with his political opinions; on a great many occasions I found it possible to criticize his administrative actions, but after that gentleman visited every section of Ontario, understanding our viewpoint, he realized that we only wanted to play our part in the development and advancement of the province, and eventually that rule was withdrawn from the statute. Do you think the then premier of the province of Ontario decreased in political stature in the least as a result of that action? No; he became not only a provincial but eventually a national statesman. Certainly he was not dishonoured, and I do not believe the Secretary of State will bring any dishonour on himself in withdrawing this measure. In his own speech this afternoon he practically admitted that there has been criticism of the bill from many organizations in all sections of Canada.

This afternoon the hon. member for Labelle said that you should not listen to the press. I was astonished at that statement, because I read with almost religious ardour several of the articles which I found on the editorial page of the newspaper of which he was the founder and, until recently, the owner and editor. The motto on the front page of that publication, in which I understand he has no

interest at the present time, is: *Fais ce que dois*. So I think we must believe in the sincerity of the things that are done both in and out of this house; I give all credit to the Secretary of State for being sincere, but I am afraid he has been badly advised in this connection. Should he find it possible to withdraw the bill he will not be disgraced because, as I have said, there was almost a parallel case in the province of Ontario.

Again I want to remind the Secretary of State that the criticism he has read in the newspapers and to which he has listened in this house was not directed at him personally. No one, I think, could cast any doubt on his sincerity, because we all know what he has done for every section of the population in Canada. He typifies to every citizen, and most particularly to French Canadians, the Anglo Canadian, the man who is naturally broadminded, and who speaks bilingually, and thinks and acts nationally. I believe, the same as he does, in our great British institutions, in the purpose of our parliaments. I am perfectly at ease making an appeal to him, knowing that my message will be received in the spirit in which it is given.

This afternoon the hon. member for Ottawa made allusion to the Frechette report. I was going to answer the hon. member for Labelle on the statements he made this afternoon, but I find that for a very good reason I am not in a position to do so. He built up a strong case in favour of centralization, stating that for the last ten, twenty or thirty years in the several visits he had made, almost weekly, to several government departments he had found great masses of documents in English which had not been translated into French. I thought we had had centralization prior to 1910, but the information I have received since is to the effect that in fact we have never had centralization in Canada.

This afternoon the senior member for Ottawa read almost the whole of the Frechette report into the record, so that at this time it is not my intention to go into it at length. This report was made after inquiry into the conditions in some bilingual countries. It was made by a man who did not belong to the civil service and who, because of that fact, was in a position to give an impartial and a just report of what he found. Upon returning he expressed himself as absolutely opposed to the centralization of the translation services, so far as efficiency was concerned.

I wish at this time to quote an article which appeared in *Le Devoir* in the month of February this year. No doubt this is the article to which the minister referred this afternoon