

considered it a duty to put clearly all facts before the people of Ontario. Hon. gentlemen are aware as to what happened, when in 1912, the famous regulation XVII was placed in the statutes of Ontario. Under the direction of this independent newspaper, interested in this question, the cooperation of not only the whole of Ontario but of Canada was asked, all were called upon to do their duty and to inform the people of the facts in this respect.

Thanks to the hon. gentlemen that we elected to the Ontario Legislative Assembly and thanks especially to the work accomplished by this excellent newspaper, the "Droit", peace reigns in Ontario and there is a complete understanding between the various classes in the community, between French and English Canadians. This result is due for the major part to the campaign waged by this newspaper. That is why I rise to protest against such a statement made in the house. I could point to a long list of distinguished persons who also did their utmost to solve the problem to which I have just referred. I may say that I also did my bit to improve conditions and help those who had to suffer on that account. That is why I feel quite at liberty to deny certain statements made this afternoon.

The hon. member for Labelle alluded to the conduct of certain officials in the house, of certain public employees, and particularly to certain translators. When he was asked and pressed to name them, he refused. He called them lazy fellows, drunkards, etc. Remember that such a statement falls from the lips of a distinguished and able man. The hon. member for Labelle attacks all public employees outside this house when he makes such a statement. When an hon. member makes a charge, he should, at least be very sure of his ground.

Other assertions were also made in the house by the hon. member for Labelle. He stated that certain translators in such and such departments translated so many pages—however, he mentioned no names. In one instance, a translator only translated 44 pages per year. When the hon. member refers to such translators he should give their names and not hide behind the immunity he enjoys in the house to make such charges.

I repeat that if the object of the bill was really what the hon. member for Labelle endeavours to make us believe, I, myself, would endorse the measure. Certainly, the hon. Secretary of State was not so clear in his remarks. In fact, he spoke of uniformity and economy, but he did not go so far as the hon. member for Labelle who stated that the object

of the bill was to increase French influence, to ensure greater recognition of the French language in all dominion government matters. I shall not endeavour to further reply to the statements of the hon. member for Labelle. However, there is one thing that hon. members of this house must have noted, it is the fact that the discussion has carried on outside the field of politics. The hon. Secretary of State, for whom I have the greatest esteem, must have noted that the hon. member for Ottawa made out a strong case from the viewpoint of translation, the efficiency of the service and even from an economic angle; he also found it possible to discuss this question without entering the field of politics. However, I greatly regretted to see that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) thought fit again to make insinuations stating that he could understand the sympathy displayed by the hon. member for Ottawa towards the civil service employees and that it might be to his interest to act thus. Such charges cannot be levelled against me because I do not think I have ten public employees in the constituency which I have the privilege of representing. However, it is recognized that the hon. member for Ottawa has proved himself greatly competent in discussing all questions which pertain to the civil service and those having a national issue. He again proved this fact, this afternoon. That is why I took this opportunity to refute the charges which the hon. member for Labelle thought fit to level against the hon. member for Ottawa.

(Text) Mr. Speaker, I fully realize the importance of the problem under discussion today, and I am sure it must have been gratifying to the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) as well as to others who followed him, to find this debate lifted entirely out of the realm of politics. The Secretary of State certainly put his case wonderfully well before the house, and he approached it to some extent from a different angle than he did on the first reading. At the time of the first reading of the bill the impression was created that the intention was primarily to promote efficiency and economy; this afternoon the minister enlarged upon his former explanation. We had the gratifying spectacle of one of his old colleagues—I refer to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa)—supporting this legislation. Speaking for myself, in view of all that was said this afternoon by the hon. member for Labelle, in view of what he propounded, if he had himself introduced this bill I do not think that any member of the house could find it possible to vote against it. In reply to a direct question asked by the senior member for Ottawa