

member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger)—because I would not care to be credited with some of the expressions he used—may I, however, assure him that his Conservative French Canadian colleagues of Quebec, rejoice in hearing that, since 1930 at least, he has suddenly become an ardent champion of bilingualism. I also wish to extend my congratulations to the members of the press gallery for the publicity they gave to his speech. This shows that the press realizes that public opinion takes an interest in this question and want to be well informed. I therefore feel confident that I shall be dealt with as fairly and that the question of bilingualism will be better understood when this debate closes.

Since January 30, last, certain newspapers, perhaps, with the best of intentions—I am willing to give them the benefit of the doubt in this respect—have criticized me for having adjourned the debate, thus preventing further discussion on this resolution. I have, sir, no apology to make to my province or fellow citizens, because I am convinced that, by adjourning the debate, I have better served the cause of bilingualism than the mover of the resolution, by his speech.

We are living in a country where two-thirds of the population are of British extraction or at least different from ours. We, French Canadians, contend that we are entitled to have bilingualism in this country, first, as original possessors or settlers of the land, secondly, in virtue of the British North America Act. However, it must be acknowledged—I think it is so acknowledged by everyone—that the British North America Act is not very clear on the question of currency. The motion before the house is a proof of this. The hon. member for Bellechasse requests the house to decide this point and declare that our currency should bear bilingual inscription. Briefly, this means that part of section 133, by the request of the hon. member for Bellechasse, becomes a question for the house to decide. Then, sir, is it not reasonable to believe that if the hon. member for Bellechasse had really had at heart the success of this motion, he would not in the course of his remarks, insulted, as he did, a certain group of his colleagues. To my mind, that is a proof—there are others—that the hon. member's intention, in introducing this resolution, was to make it a political issue and endeavour to make political capital out of it.

Moreover, sir, the hon. member and his party were guided by past experience, because the house must remember that, for the last forty years, never did the liberal party

assume power on an economic or political issue, but have always appealed to popular feelings. In 1896, the liberal party was hoisted to power on the Manitoba school question; in 1921 it resorted to the conscription issue. On the other hand, the liberal party was always put out of office on a question of policy and involving broad principles. They were put out, in 1911, on the reciprocity issue and, in 1930, on the question whether Canada would further allow foreign products to flood her markets.

Now, sir, if we agree on the principle of the resolution itself, the discussion of it will permit, however, to clear up certain aspects of the question which are not sufficiently known by the public and place the responsibility of certain acts where it should be.

First, it is not more a question of the hour than it was five or ten years ago. The hon. member for Bellechasse admitted it himself in his speech. He stated that numerous petitions had been forwarded to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes). Let me point out to him that most of these petitions were not sent to the present Minister of Finance but to his liberal predecessor and that, in the course of twelve months, between 1928 and 1929, more petitions of this kind were received by the then Minister of Finance than had ever been received since Confederation to this date. To inquiries made, at the last session, the government replied that, from May, 1928, to April 1929, 348 petitions had been received, requesting bilingual inscriptions on our currency, and that—a strange coincidence—on June 28, 1929, hardly two months after receiving all these petitions, the government under the leadership of the right hon. Mr. Mackenzie King, signed a five-year contract for the printing of our currency—a unilingual currency—dated April 1, 1930.

Last summer, I do not know why, when the hon. member for Bellechasse, in a letter addressed to the press, contended that I had conspired with the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Sauvé) and a few members on this side of the house, in order to prevent the discussion of this motion, I inquired, in my reply to his letter, why he had not introduced his resolution previous to the contract made in 1929. In a letter dated July 30, 1932, published by l'Action Catholique on August 2, 1932, the hon. member for Bellechasse replied as follows:

Mr. Gobeil wishes to know why I did not advocate bilingual currency under the Liberal regime. I shall frankly tell him. At the time to which he refers. I was opposing subsidized immigration. I thought that to struggle with that issue was enough work for a new member.

I wonder if the hon. member for Bellechasse satisfied a great number of people with