

*Official Languages*

Mr. Speaker, now that we are done with external wars, we must come to grips with the internal ones, those that exist between the French fact and the English fact, as some are trying to make us believe. The two races are equal and, therefore, they must get along together.

● (5:00 p.m.)

The French nation must assert its rights without encroaching upon those of the English language and vice versa. We did our share and will continue to do so and I will tell you how. When one comes to think that in 1946-1947, not a single member spoke French in the House of Commons, except the present leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette), one cannot but be amazed at the progress made by the French language here, in this very house.

Mr. Speaker, that is only the result of the long, tenacious and relentless fight carried on by the Ralliement créditiste for the enforcement of the French Canadians' rights.

At this stage, I will refer to an article published in the October 16, 1962 edition of *Le Droit*, signed by Mr. Maurice Huot and entitled:

"Excellent attitude towards the French language".

I quote:

If they keep it up, the Cr ditistes will have done more in a few weeks for the advancement of French in the House of Commons than all political parties since confederation.

The Cr ditistes from Quebec have not only multiplied their interventions in favour of French in government services, but have created the necessary climate that has prompted many members from other parties to use that language.

And the author says further:

It would be impossible to quote all the strong protests made by the Cr ditistes in order that the French language be respected throughout Canada—

The Cr ditistes are very much criticized in some circles, especially as regards their monetary doctrine and economic principles. The unfortunate aspect of it all in that those who try to heap ridicule on that party are sometimes people who share the same culture and the same language.

Say what you will about the economic doctrines of the Cr ditistes, one thing cannot be denied: their devotion to the French language.

Their absolutely legitimate nationalism, that is never carried too far, does them great credit.

The Cr ditistes are right in requesting that the standing orders of the house, the procedure in the house, according to Beauchesne, should be given to them in French.

Mr. Caouette was right in requesting French in all the services—

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

—in Canada, especially with regard to—

—Air Canada... Mr. Dumont was right in asking the services of an interpreter when he met with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hamilton).

The Cr ditistes have every right to ask for French in the parliament cafeteria. The Cr ditistes have every right to demand a perfect simultaneous translation service in parliament and not a halting French translation.

Some English milieus have started to understand, either through a sense of justice or in their own interests. It is not any too soon. But the other French-speaking people must understand as well and set the example first of all through practical actions similar to those of the Cr ditistes.

Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement cr ditiste asked and obtained a lot for the French Canadians. I believe the present government, through its bill, wants to help us with what we started in 1946,—as the article says—and I for one agree with this bill which may not give us exactly all we would have liked, but which does meet a good number of our requests.

I continue:

The Cr ditistes asked and obtained for French Canadians the complete translation in French of the procedures in the House of Commons; a complete french service on all Air Canada lines; the posting in French of all railway schedules; an adequate and accurate system of simultaneous interpretation in the House of Commons; interpretation services in all government services, in all federal government departments; French spoken in the parliamentary restaurant; a perfectly bilingual telephone service provided in parliament by the Bell Company.

This is what I wanted to quote. It was written by Mr. Huot.

If the province of Quebec feels frustrated in its rights and future, should it blame others or itself? If the province of Quebec has been unable to elect leaders in order to assume its responsibilities, who is to blame? If Quebec fell a victim to the charms of a few separatists, whose fault is it? If Quebec was unable to get to the bottom of things and preferred to practice a shameful patronage, who is to blame?

In my opinion, the fault lies certainly with government representatives here in the house especially the French-speaking ones who by keeping silent, or practically, caused the dissatisfaction prevailing today.

If the Quebec leaders or those of every province had been able to look after their own business, they would have required Canadians to respect each others' rights and we would not have reached this point in Canada. If there is now discrimination among workers or in any other sector, it is actually