

such a reply; however, I regret to state that he neither impressed me by his zeal, at that period, nor by his sincerity, to-day. If the hon. member had then shown the great activity which he has displayed since his party has gone out of power, he certainly could have found the means to introduce his resolution, especially when he already had, in 1929, a parliamentary experience of three years, and particularly when he must have realized that his efforts to restrict immigration had no results. However, sir, were we to admit, for the sake of arguing, that the hon. member was right, if we accept his views, that a new member, in his first stage of parliamentary life, has an excuse perhaps, for not championing his race, his language or liberty when he believes them threatened, does the same excuse apply to the sixty other members of Quebec, in 1929? Does the same excuse apply to such veteran parliamentarians who sit on the front benches? For instance, to the hon. member for l'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Seguin), to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcell)? Is such an excuse valid on behalf of the hon. member for St. Denis (Mr. Denis), with his sonorous voice, who rises in the house, at every moment, and likes to be looked upon as the great patriot of this chamber? Is it valid on behalf of the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), so loquacious since 1930.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Had the government given me my station sooner, I could have taken up this matter.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): . . . the most expensive member in the house, considering the services he renders? Is it possible to imagine or believe that he did not rise in the house, in 1929, to protest before the contract was awarded by the government of which he was a follower? And, the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) the great champion of the French Canadians, who, in 1925 and 1926, came to the county of Compton, at East Angus, to denounce the Conservatives and tell the people of my constituency how necessary and important it was for them to return a liberal so as to uphold the rights of the French Canadian race against the encroachments of these villainous Tories? Was such an excuse valid in the case of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin)? In brief was such an excuse valid in behalf of the solid phalanx?

All will remember—and the house will recall that at the time the famous solid phalanx was returned to power—the husting speeches of our hon. friends opposite, who stated that it was absolutely necessary for the honour of

[Mr. Gobeil.]

the French Canadian race and language to return the Quebec liberal phalanx "en bloc", and this Quebec solid phalanx, 61 strong, all members of my province, remained silent; not one rose in the house to request a bilingual currency, when, in 1929, it became necessary to renew the contract; I state, not one rose in the house!

The hon. member for Bellechasse made the other day, to my mind, a rather harsh statement. While listening to him, I could not help thinking that there was much spite infused in the remarks addressed to his colleagues of 1929. He made the following statement, page 1775 of Hansard:

I trust that no one will take the attitude of whipped dog that some of our public men have sometimes taken on national questions.

Where were the "whipped dogs" in 1919? Surely not on the left of the chair, because, as a result of the campaign of race prejudices carried on by our friends opposite, not a Conservative French Canadian of Quebec was elected. Therefore, there is no doubt that the whipped dogs to which the hon. member for Bellechasse referred were the 61 Liberal members of Quebec. Is this not a proof, sir, that the hon. member displayed harshness towards his friends?

I regret that the hon. member for Chicoutimi-Saguenay is not in the house; however, I hope he will appear before this debate closes. He should acquaint the house with his views, especially as whip of his party, he who since 1930, but particularly since the opening of this session, rises in his seat as if moved by a hidden spring each time some document or pamphlet is mentioned in the house, and inquires whether it has been printed in French—

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): There is no Chicoutimi-Saguenay county.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): When it has not been printed in French it is simply because it was not under the Liberal regime, however, each time the minister concerned replies: if such is the wish of the house, this pamphlet will be published in French. But the hon. member for Chicoutimi-Saguenay—

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): There is no Chicoutimi and Saguenay county.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): The hon. member for Charlevoix and Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) should inform the house whether in 1929 he made use of the whip, and, if so, how many strokes he gave each of our hon. friends to force them to adopt the humiliating position described by the hon. member for