

poration of this Central Bank, which is going to furnish currency to the other banks. There is also a further change. In the past the chartered banks issued their notes in French, in English, or bilingually, as they wished. That privilege will be taken away from them as the years go by.

I could see no difficulty at all in the two-series system of bills but for the fact that, as has been pointed out, the money will not be confined to a certain area. The French bills issued at the request of a bank in a French community will flow over into the English centres, and people who understand only English will find themselves in possession of them. The only knowledge they will have of the bills will be from the figures on them. French-speaking people who come into possession of English bills will be in a similar position.

It is true that the question of cost enters into this matter, but I do not think it is of very serious consequence.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: It is the inconvenience.

Hon. Mr. FOSTER: If I were to disregard the question of expense, I should advocate a three-bill system. Then the man who wanted a French bill could get it; the man who wanted an English bill could also get it; and those who wanted a practical bill that would meet all conditions could secure it.

Hon. H. C. HOCKEN: Honourable senators, we were told by the honourable leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) that this amendment, passed in the Banking and Commerce Committee, was inspired by the idea in the mind of the honourable senator from Prince Edward Island that there would be some confusion in the handling of bills printed in accordance with the provisions of the measure now before us. I venture to submit to my honourable friend the leader on the opposite side that a simpler and more effective method of avoiding confusion would be to follow the constitutional practice that has prevailed in this country ever since Confederation. This Bill, I think, asks for a little too much. There is neither law nor practice to support the request for notes in both languages. No one will argue that the Constitution provides for anything of the kind, and ever since the passing of the British North America Act the practice of the Government has been to issue all its paper money in one language. Why make a change? The only reason there can be for a change is a desire to please the sentiment of one province. Were it not that French-speaking people wanted to have their

Hon. Mr. FOSTER.

language on the currency, the notes would be printed in English only, in strict accordance with the Constitution. If it is felt that two kinds of bills would lead to confusion and dissatisfaction, I suggest that some honourable member on the opposite side should move that the English language only be used. That would be advocating, not a new departure, but simply a continuance of our usual policy.

The occasion seems to me to present a highly appropriate opportunity for placing on record a statement of just what are the rights appertaining to the French language in the Dominion of Canada. I take honourable members back to 1840, when the Union Act was passed. Section 41 of that Act provided:

And be it enacted that from and after the said reunion of the said two Provinces, all writs, proclamations, instruments, for summoning and calling together the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada and for proroguing and dissolving the same, and all writs of summons and election, and all writs and public instruments whatsoever relating to the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly or either of them, and all returns to such writs and instruments, and all journals, entries, and written or printed proceedings of what nature soever of the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly and each of them respectively, and all written or printed proceedings and reports of committees of the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly respectively, shall be in the English language only.

That Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament, and it shows that Canada started as an English-speaking country. Provision was made for the use of the English language only.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But there was the Act of 1791 before that.

Hon. Mr. HOCKEN: The Act of 1791 had nothing to do with the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. Mr. PARENT: But the Act of 1867 did.

Hon. Mr. HOCKEN: The Act of 1840 superseded the earlier Acts, surely. The French members of the united Legislature felt that the Union Act was hard on them, for many of them could not speak English. So in the session of 1845 there was passed an address to Her Majesty praying for an amendment to permit the use of the French language in debates and in the Journals and Proceedings of the House. Mr. Gladstone sent word that the Queen had been graciously pleased to consent to the change. That is how the French language came into use in the Parliament of Canada, by way of a concession. Originally, as I have shown, the