

separate volumes. But he forgot to state that we lie side by side in Hansard. No harm is done. Any person can take Hansard and read the debates in either language column by column. I repeat, no harm is done. The two languages mingle in Hansard without hurt to anyone.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: Is the right honourable gentleman referring to Revised Hansard?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I am referring to Hansard as I get it.

Hon. Mr. SINCLAIR: As it is spoken.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: Unrevised Hansard?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Unrevised Hansard. Have it any way you like.

Hon. Mr. HOCKEN: Does the right honourable senator advocate bilingual notes?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I shall not, as is sometimes done, sit down without acquainting the honourable gentleman with my position.

I come now to the question of a bilingual note. This question was handed to us; we did not introduce it. It is our duty to decide what form of note would be most convenient and most economical, and bear the strongest national characteristic. It is conceded that one series of bilingual notes would be much cheaper than two series of notes in different languages. Some person has said that the two series would make French notes available to the French-speaking districts and English notes to the English-speaking districts. That is granted. But these notes are not going to remain in those districts. Once they are issued in the course of business they will be distributed all over Canada, and outside of Canada. So that will not bring about union between the races.

In discussing unity of feeling between the two races, it runs through my mind that we should be very careful to do nothing and say nothing that might lead any person even to suspect that we are trying to keep apart instead of endeavouring to become one people. We must remember that at one time strong allurements were held out to those who had recently passed from French rule to British rule to go elsewhere. But they remained true—they stuck loyally by the Union Jack and the old British constitution. I ask honourable gentlemen if they would have done likewise under similar circumstances. We cannot forget that.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM.

It is our duty to build up a united Canada. Will a bilingual note convey to the world at large that we are one people or that we are not? I maintain that the printing of notes in each language separately will tend to raise the suspicion that we have not been mixing very much; that each race is going its own way. To my mind it will show to the world that the English-speaking people of Canada are opposed to the French, inwardly at least, and that the French-speaking people want to be by themselves and do not want to be associated with other Canadians. These bank notes should not be French notes or English notes; they should be Canadian notes, and in the interest of harmony the two languages should be used side by side.

I have no prejudices, political or other, in regard to this matter; I am not caring what any person thinks; but from the national standpoint I believe it would be in the interest of Canada to have but one issue of notes, such issue bearing both languages.

Hon. J. J. HUGHES: Honourable members, I think I can approach this subject without heat and without feeling. To me the problem is a very simple one. We have agreed on the principle that both languages shall be recognized in the printing and the circulation of these notes. We differ in regard to detail, but the detail of any subject is not as serious as the principle.

It has been admitted, as the last speaker said, that the printing of two series of notes would be more expensive than the printing of but one; and, though I knew nothing about the letter, I was quite prepared to hear the statement read by the honourable leader on this side of the House from a letter written by a bank manager in Montreal. I do not know whether that was a French bank or an English bank—and it would not make much difference. The statement made in that letter was that, so far as the chartered banks are concerned, the two series of notes would be inconvenient and expensive. There is no doubt about that. That is the view the banks take.

Having agreed on the principle, surely it is better for us to adopt the more inexpensive and more convenient method in carrying out the details. Some of us think that is what we ought to do. Others for some reason seem to think we ought to adopt the more expensive and more inconvenient way. That, it seems to me, is the whole situation.

When we agree on the principle that both languages are to be recognized and that the notes are to be published in both languages, I can see no logical reason why we should