

perous Canada, a place where these two great races, proud of their ancestors and heritage, could forever live in peace, mutual understanding and respect, where the rights, principles, prerogatives and freedoms of the one would never be less or greater than those of the other. That, in my view, was the prevision of those great men whose love of country so dominated their minds that they could not be guilty of narrow-mindedness and unfair tactics.

I find that at page 937 of the debates of confederation Mr. Parker is reported as having said this:

I believe difficulties and embarrassments will grow up under this new constitution. I hope it will not be considered a finality but capable of amendment as time goes on. I sincerely trust that so far as its future defects may have their origin in matters of law, they will be redressed by wise, legal, and enlightened means, and so far as they may have their foundation in matters of sentiment or opinion, that they will be redressed by the cultivation of better and more fraternal feeling between the people of the different provinces. I trust and believe that by such happy means, although it is not now such a constitution as we can all approve, it may in the future be so modified and administered as to meet the requirements and expectations of the country, and that under it all the residents of these nine provinces may become one united, firm, prosperous and happy people.

Such was the vision, such was the dream, such were the hopes of the framers of the constitution. Is it for us to-day to say that those hopes, those dreams are not to be respected? After all, what was the intention of those who, in mutual respect and confidence, produced section 133? That section is to be found in the debates of confederation, this ponderous volume which has no index, but through which one must labour—as I did labour—through which one must read if one desires to learn about the sentiments of the fathers of confederation. This volume one must read if he wishes to find out what they had in contemplation. In view of the events of recent times, upon going through this ponderous volume one might be inclined to wonder at the paucity of remarks with reference to the status and the effect of the use of the French language in Canada. But, to one who has gone through the volume, to one who has laboriously read the lives and biographies of those who brought about confederation, one does not wonder that neither French nor English lost time to learn what the effect of section 133 would be. As gentlemen, as they were in those days, they simply wrote down in the book that so and so would be such and such; the French believed in the English, and the English believed in the

French, and the paucity, yet the clearness of the language simply meant that while heretofore they had been chivalrous foes, now they were friends who understood each other. Their minds were in tune with one thought—a confederation wherein both races should be equal as to rights and privileges.

May I quote the words of Sir Hector Langevin as they appear at page 368 of the reports:

Under confederation there will no longer be domination of one race over another, and if one section should be desirous of committing an act of injustice against another section, all the others would unite together to prevent it.

Then he goes on to say:

This measure, as I observed a short time ago, cannot last unless it protects the interests of all. . . . What we desire and wish is to defend the general interests of a great country, and of a powerful nation by means of a central power.

Then Sir Hector Langevin goes on to explain what benefits he expects will accrue to this new nation by reason of the mingling of the mentality of one with that of the other, a nation wherein one people respects the thoughts and the rights, and challenges none of whatever may have been the rights, privileges or principles of the other. Sir Hector Langevin continues:

The confederation, I am perfectly convinced will afford the best possible guarantee for our institutions, our languages, and all that we hold dearest in the world; under its protection we shall be strong against the common enemy;

Perhaps the Prime Minister will listen to this:

We shall be strong against the common enemy; we shall advance rapidly in the way of prosperity, and when we withdraw from the arena it will be with the consolation of leaving to our descendants an inheritance worthy of a free people.

Then, at page 833 Mr. Harwood is reported as follows:

As to us French-Canadians and Catholics, what have we to fear from confederation? Our language, our rights and our privileges are guaranteed to us.

Our language, our rights, our privileges, are guaranteed to us. Sir John A. Macdonald said:

. . . it was assented to by the deputation from each province that the use of the French language should form one of the principles upon which confederation should be established, and that its use as at present should be guaranteed by the Imperial Act.

This may seem far fetched. But if the use of the French language is guaranteed in all these processes of law that may emanate from a federal court, whether issued on birch bark