

folk—I myself being one—do not say that such a man “adapts himself to circumstances,” but that he is a double-faced fellow.

I have had sufficient experience with the liberal press to expect that I shall be charged with playing politics...

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): That is apparent.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): ...when making these remarks. Therefore, I wish to state why I have taken such a stand. If I occupy a seat on your right, sir, it is because I have full confidence in the government, and believe that the conservative policy is most appropriate, especially, under present circumstances; it is because I think that the conservative policy as applied by this government, under the leadership of one of the most outstanding men of the British Commonwealth, is the only sound policy to follow in the crisis we are passing through; it is because I feel confident that the conservative policy is the only one which will pull us through this crisis without too much upsetting things.

Some hon. MEMBERS (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): I wanted to make it plain, that even from the viewpoint of the French language and bilingualism, the conservative party neither has had in the past nor has in the present, any lesson to take or excuses to offer, as far as the record of the liberal party is concerned.

There is, sir, another aspect of the question to which I want to refer before closing my remarks, it is in connection with the French Canadian minority of this country. As in all countries where there exists a duality of language or race, the minority needs an independent press to uphold its rights. In order that such a press may fulfil its part, I readily recognize that it must have elbow-room and the right to criticize those who are false to the rights of this minority; however, may I add that it must give proof of its impartiality. To clearly state my point, I shall quote a concrete case, an example of impartiality! A few days after I had adjourned this debate, I received a communication from a group of young men of Montreal—I have no hesitation in stating that it was the same group who organized the meeting at Gésu, last autumn. These young men expressed their amazement at my adjourning this debate and wanted to know the reason. To justify their request, they quoted the comments of a certain newspaper, supposed to be free from any political alliance, which stated that this adjournment

[Mr. Gobeil.]

had no other purpose than to shut out all discussion on the motion or give it the six months' hoist. I immediately communicated to them some of the reasons which I gave the house, and which seemed to satisfy them. I am confident that this debate will prove that the comments of the newspaper in question were baseless. Nothing pleased me as much as this letter because it showed a sense of sincerity and a desire of being fair. I wish to point out to my province and race the means to which the press, supposed to be independent of party politics resorted, on this occasion. I do not do so to complain because I really think that it did itself more harm than it did to me. However, sir, if I had an advice to give them, it would be the following: if it wants to fulfil its part which is, I repeat it, very useful, it must be impartial in its criticism, so as to, at least, retain the respect of those with whom it differs.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): This is the first time the Conservative party advocate a policy!

Mr. LAFLECHE (Translation): You never had any.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): It is unnecessary, sir, to repeat in French the remarks that I made in English, however, I wish to clearly state that I entirely approve of the principle embodied in the motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse. I shall vote for it because I have always been in favour of such a motion and I shall always be. I am convinced that even if Canadian currency becomes bilingual, nobody will suffer from it or be the worse off, no more so than we are by the fact of having bilingual postage stamps.

However, a contract was awarded for the stamping of a unilingual currency, for a period of five years, dated April 1, 1930. It was signed by the Liberal government which preceded this administration, when the whole French Canadian representation of Quebec sat on the government benches, yet, not one protested. To my mind, that was a mistake on their part. It behooved the leaders, the old parliamentarians, as I mentioned a short while ago, to rise in the house, as we do to-day, and request the government of the day to give the country a bilingual currency. If these hon. gentlemen failed in their duty, I state that they must bear the consequences and not lay the blame on this government. If I moved the adjournment of the debate—as I previously mentioned, I have no excuses to make and do not offer any—it was because this motion was the ninth on the order paper and no one expected it would be called so